

Sent: Friday, May 28, 2021, 12:42:46 p.m. EDT

Subject: Re: Briday Development Proposal

Mr. Mayor & Councilors we are somewhat encouraged by the Developers most recent proposal where it appears that they have finally made amendments to the proposal in an attempt to appease some of the abutting residents concerns. The reduction of the proposed THREE story building to a TWO story is a step in the right direction and a amendment that we support. However, many of the issues raised remain outstanding and unresolved. Concerns regarding the open storm retention pond (which should be enclosed - refer to our March 24th email submission) and road and infrastructure deficiencies remain. The enclosure of the storm water detention pond would not only eliminate the nuisances associated with an open pond but would also increase the public green space/parkland that would be available to local residents. Even with this added 'green space' the area would remain woefully underserved for this type of community amenity. Other concerns regarding 1) TRAFFIC IMPACTS related to the development and why an EXIT only (emergency entrance) road unto Little River (where no homes are on the south side to be impacted) has not been entertained is unfortunate., 2) Tecumseh Transit (refer to our previous email below), 3) ZONING (as the THREE story walkup continues to be part of the proposal which we and current zoning and Official Plan DO NOT support) and 4) PROJECT DENSITY that is excessive and not in compliance with our Official Plan need to be addressed. I hope these issues will be addressed in the forthcoming staff report.

We can't make this submission without raising the current substantial negative impacts associated with the 128 community mailboxes on Dillon directly across from our home. Would any of you welcome such a Post Office across from your home?? I doubt it! There are 11 homes on this block of Dillon and we all walk to the mailbox to collect our mail. The other 117 mailboxes are for residents of St. Pierre, Pinewood, Riverside Drive and Lacasse who all drive to the mailbox a number of times per week (approx. 30 to 40 cars/day). To give us some relief from the extra traffic that will come from this development maybe the TOWN can begin negotiations with CANADA POST to relocate mailboxes to suitable locations on Pinewood, St. Pierre and Lacasse which do exist within walkable distance of their homes.

Thank you, Ron & Lori McConnell, [REDACTED] Dillon Drive.

On Saturday, April 3, 2021, 09:18:42 a.m. EDT, Lori McConnell [REDACTED] > wrote:

Good morning. Councilor Dowie was good enough to provide a prompt response to my concerns and questions expressed in my email on April 1st. I then responded to his reply and I thought I should share those thoughts with each of you. Thank you Ron & Lori McConnell, [REDACTED] Dillon Drive, [REDACTED]

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Lori McConnell <[REDACTED]>

To: Andrew Dowie <adowie@tecumseh.ca>

Sent: Thursday, April 1, 2021, 12:42:58 p.m. EDT

Subject: Re: Briday Development Proposal

Hi Andrew, thanks for the prompt response. I did not intend to disparage the traffic analyst as I'm sure that they are "ethical individuals". But how they can make a comparison to something that they never experienced is beyond me. I may not have the professional credentials to be a 'traffic expert' BUT I consider myself one for this area due to my related historical experience. I stand by my assertion that this traffic comparison used by the Consultant (school traffic vs. development traffic) is totally meaningless, irrelevant and somewhat unprofessional. Should they not have based their entire analysis on existing and projected traffic impacts from the development NOT some meaningless comparison to the old school traffic? In fact, Andrew the current all day, every day traffic at the community mailboxes is probably more annoying and disruptive than the previous traffic associated with the school.

As far as the Bus Route I find it interesting that the route change took the bus away from the commercial area at Riverside & Lesperance and away from the lakefront park and existing trails. Hence, there is really NO rationale (based on ridership) for this bus to travel to this northerly part of Town and down our street. You have confirmed that the Town (and everyone else in the area) has deemed Dillon Drive to be a great shortcut to Lesperance to avoid the heavy Riverside Drive traffic. Do you think that 500 plus vehicles a day (for the 1st time in 39 years I have to be extra cautious crossing the street to get to the

mailboxes!) on an unimproved rural residential road is appropriate?

Andrew in conclusion the elimination of the 3 storey buildings would go a long way in getting this development proceeding. This IS a case of 'not in my backyard' for those speakers (friend, Mr. Hill / relative, Mr. Rivard / & real estate agents, Messrs. Toldo & Innocente) in favor of the development as they live nowhere near here and the development won't be in their backyards!!

For your consideration, Ron & Lori.

On Thursday, April 1, 2021, 09:13:20 a.m. EDT, Andrew Dowie <adowie@tecumseh.ca> wrote:

Hi Lori and Ron,

Thank you for sending your comments and I acknowledge receipt of them.

It likely will not be of some assurance, but I personally know the authors of the traffic report. They are very ethical individuals and would not compromise their professional integrity by sealing and signing a report that is not accurate.

The Town's planner can speak to the transit route further but the routing along Dillon was part of a series of measures to reduce the time required to complete a full loop and keep it under an hour. This development proposal was not a consideration in that recommendation and decision.

I'm happy to discuss further by phone if you wish.

With warm regards,

Andrew Dowie

Councillor, Ward 1

Town of Tecumseh

From: Lori McConnell [REDACTED] [ca](#)>

Sent: April 1, 2021 2:23:13 AM

To: Andrew Dowie; Gary McNamara; Joe Bachetti; Rick Tonial; Bill Altenhof; Brian Houston; Tania Jobin

Cc: Laura Moy

Subject: Briday Development Proposal

Subsequent to our ZOOM meeting on the 30th I have been bothered by TWO other issues that were brought up a number of times by both the Developer and his Consultants and the Town staff. They are TRAFFIC and TRANSIT.

WE were hoping to submit these late comments and questions into the record if we could.

TRAFFIC - It was mentioned a number of times by the developers consultant that the traffic from this overly intense development would be NO more than the previous school traffic. As many of you know we have lived at this location, directly across from the school for 39 years, and can talk from experience regarding that school traffic. The school traffic obviously occurred in TWO peaks during the day generally from 8 to 8:30 and again from 3 to 3:30. This traffic would only occur from MONDAY thru FRIDAY and for about NINE months a year. NO school traffic on weekends, at night and during the summer months when people like to enjoy their outdoor spaces. To compare that traffic to the traffic that will be created by this development is ridiculous. It appears that the developer is expecting the people living in this area to have at least two cars per residence as I believe 144 surface parking spaces has been proposed. Lets presume conservatively that everyone comes and goes from this development at least once per day (we suspect that two trips a day may be more realistic). Using this minimum projection there will be at least 200 to 300 vehicle exits and entries onto this property daily. This will occur SEVEN days a week 24 HOURS of the day. My question is, HOW DOES THIS COMPARE IN ANY WAY TO THE 'SCHOOL TRAFFIC' as asserted by the consultants traffic expert?? We maintain that there is no such comparison. This added traffic, in addition to existing traffic volumes, should get this once quiet street to around 500 vehicles a day.

TRANSIT - It was mentioned on a number of occasions by both the Developer and the Town that a added feature of this development was that is was on a bus route. This leads us into a number of queries of why we are even on a bus route. Was it because the neighborhood demanded this service on this street? We think not as the empty bus rarely, if ever, picks up passengers at the existing bus stop at St. Pierre and Dillon. You have the records to confirm this to be a fact. Was the bus route put on Dillon to avoid waiting at Riverside Drive to turn left off Lacasse and again left at the light at Lesperance in an effort to keep the bus route on schedule? Did the Town recognize this street as a convenient shortcut to Lesperance just as many of our neighbors to the east have? OR Has the bus route been placed on Dillon to support the proposed development as it seems to be a real asset and selling point whenever the Developer and Town promote the Briday proposal? Considering the number of cars expected in this highend Development we doubt that Bus ridership will see any significant increase in ridership emanating from this development. Also by the time the development is completed and occupied will Tecumseh even still have a bus route? As a taxpayer, seeing the empty bus pass by 12 times a day I don't know how this service can be sustained from a financial perspective

Thank you for considering these late submissions for the record and we can be reached at [REDACTED] if anyone would like to discuss these comments and questions posed.

Ron & Lori McConnell, [REDACTED] Dillon Drive