

From: Barb Cole [REDACTED]

Sent: March 22, 2021 1:28 PM

To: Andrew Dowie <adowie@tecumseh.ca>; Tania Jobin <tjobin@tecumseh.ca>; Bill Altenhof <baltenhof@tecumseh.ca>; Brian Houston <bhouston@tecumseh.ca>; Gary McNamara <gmcnamara@tecumseh.ca>; jbacheti@tecumseh.ca; Rick Tonial <rtonial@tecumseh.ca>

Subject: Fwd: Briday proposal of Dillon property

From the beginning of this eye-opening and disheartening process, we have realized that despite Briday's promised amendments to address neighbourhood concerns, the plans regarding density, height, flooding, style and traffic have remained unchanged. I anticipate this developer to be challenged and not embraced by the very people elected to oversee these matters, in a way that protects the interests of the citizens.

We, the constituents who chose to live in the oldest and most established neighbourhood in town, are left with a distinct feeling of not being heard, of not being respected, and of having the very fabric of our neighbourhood being negatively transformed. We are also left with a number of pressing questions deserving of consideration and answers:

--- Why would R3 zoning be considered acceptable or compatible with or within an area already zoned for either R1 or R2? Further to that, why would not consideration be given to plans not allowed under our current Official Plan, when the consideration should be to complement the surrounding neighbourhoods rather than re-inventing them in a way that promotes profitability over integration or livability?

--- Why would these high-density multi-storey structures be considered in an area that is not compatible with what is already there? Why are they now being considered as acceptable in the currently proposed location rather than on a future site (i.e. south of County Rd. 22/west of Manning), where the entire project would provide a range of housing types and densities appropriate for that location but not suitable to the one under consideration, the oldest and most established one in town?

New construction is currently taking place in the heart of the town to create more residential units, and yes, there are multi-level buildings taking shape. However, they are in areas already entertaining this form of structure. ie: 2 condo buildings on Tecumseh Road, and 3 storey townhomes on Amy Croft, etc. Tecumseh has a large footprint, and we do not need the Towns density commitments to be wholly concentrated in the nucleus!

--- Why is it that consideration is being given to a proposal that:

1) lacks an ERCA-approved Flood Plain?

2) lacks adequate parking, which will result in on-street parking, thereby clogging the residential streets where we live?

3) involves higher-density than what is deemed acceptable for the area?

4) purports to help our town achieve residential intensity goals that will be achieved without Briday's help.

--- Why did the Town not act in accordance with the Official Plan regarding parkland and acquire the property in question to add to our area's much-needed parkland quotient, rather than directing that the McColl property be sold to Briday without a general offering of sale to the public?

--- Why does the deed not require payment until all appeals are exhausted, and why does the deed require condos be built, without consideration for single-family homes which would be a better fit, considering the neighbourhood?

--- Why was a proposal that is so at odds with the Official Plan so readily accepted as being beneficial to the town, despite opinions, objections and facts to the contrary?

--- Finally, and possibly even more telling, will our councillors be standing up for those of us who will be so negatively and permanently impacted?

After failing to meet the agreed-upon demolition permit's cleanup deadline, and then after receiving a 2-year extension, Briday also failed to meet that new, seemingly over-generous deadline as well. That failure, along with the Ministry's stated lack of knowledge regarding both the teardown and its confirmed asbestos components, allowed the rubble to sit unattended and out in the open for months. We are extremely anxious about the risk factors associated with such prolonged exposure to asbestos dust and its airborne capabilities, and cannot understand how or why that was allowed to happen. It is not unreasonable to assume that much more than the physical well-being of our immediate neighbourhood may have been negatively impacted by such negligent failing to act on such a serious matter.

Expecting that Briday be required, at a minimum, to adhere to previously agreed-upon terms seems to be not only a reasonable expectation on our parts, but a deserved and legal one as well. We are left to wonder what it means when that situation and its potential for disastrous medical consequences was not uppermost in the minds of the powers-that-be.

Briday's lack of concern for the deleterious ways in which the proposed development will affect our neighbourhood, lifestyle and quality of living is further evidenced by the fact that one of Briday's principal owners and its Planner live not anywhere near the area affected, but hundreds of kms away in London -- with no vested interest in the outcome/effect on day-today-living for the residents involved.

We have come to realize that Briday does not truly have us or our neighbourhood's best interests at heart, and so we are counting on our elected officials to do the job they

promised to do: protect not only the concerns of the Town of Tecumseh as a whole, but also the best interests of its neighbourhoods and its individual citizens as well.

Please realize that the Briday project as it stands now has major negative consequences for those of us who moved here for a quality of life that will be taken from us if this proposal goes through unchanged. Please know that this is not a case of NIMBY (not in my back yard) on our part. If parkland is out of the question, then a plan that complements the atmosphere of our neighbourhood is totally acceptable. The possibility of single-family dwellings, one storey townhomes and lower density, putting less stress on all avenues of neighbourhood living, would be an ideal solution. We would ask one final question of our elected officials: When giving consideration to this proposal, who stands to benefit? We only see the developer as a beneficiary!

Our confidence in Briday's ability or intent to indeed 'have our backs' has been completely eroded by past actions, broken deadlines and assurances. It remains now up to our elected officials to restore our faith and trust in council's intentions by standing up to Briday and re-working this proposal to take into account our best interests. Surely an acceptable compromise can be reached, if the desire is there to achieve one.

John and Barb Cole

██████ Little River Blvd, Tecumseh