

Mayor Bridge and members of Town of Minto Council,

I am in full agreement there is a need for quality rental accommodation in Minto. You have the opportunity to be responsible for the creation of a vibrant seniors community as part of a development. With that said I'm not in favour of charging ahead at all cost just to get something in place.

I live at 61 George St. N. in Harriston and living right across the road from a construction project, which has been ongoing for approx. 3 years and may continue for 5 years or more, is unpleasant. In my opinion it hasn't had to be as unpleasant as it has been however the developers have not been considerate neighbours in the past and have openly admitted their shortcomings.

That's enough about the past, let's try to get some clarity about the future and this site plan approval. I'm confused regarding what the protocol or process should be and what appears to be happening. Before the proposal was presented to Council at the May 17th meeting the Town owned property had already been filled and compacted. Jeremy Metzger even told Council during the meeting the "fill's in there now". So, before Council was even presented with a draft plan the work was completed on the subject property to the specifications of the soon to be proposed plan without as much as a discussion regarding price or the knowledge of the Town or it's Engineers.

On May 24th I met on site with Jeff and Jeremy Metzger. We talked about many things including the fact the subject property was already filled, compacted and "lasered" to a new grade plan that wasn't supposed to exist. As a result of that meeting I relayed the information to CAO White, Mayor Bridge and some members of Council that J & J Metzger Construction may start construction. On May 25th construction on 2 fourplexes started on the site. Now keep in mind the construction which was halted by the CBO was not in compliance with the original plan or the revised plan which was presented to Council. Again it appears to be in accordance with plans no one knows about and without permission from any authority. According to the Stop Work Order there wasn't a building permit for either building.

That's the timeline as how things have progressed as I've perceived them to this point. Now we are going to have a public meeting to get feedback on the proposed project including rezoning, transfer of ownership of property and a new site servicing agreement. Is the meeting just protocol or is Council genuinely interested in the public viewpoint?

During my meeting with Jeremy and Jeff Metzger on May 24th we argued that past behaviours are indicative of future performance. I think I won that one as they proceeded to violate the Building Code the following day. Proceeding as they have has shown disrespect and total disregard for Town of Minto Council, the Planning process, the Building Code, the public, the immediate existing neighbourhood, their Professional Engineers, their leasing agent, the prospective tenants and especially the Chief Building Official and Chief Administrative Officer. Why risk a project worth hundreds of thousands of dollars with such cavalier entitled behaviour?

The original site servicing agreement states there will be a combination park / storm water pond of no less the 1 acre in size. The large park was a positive component of the development used to obtain original approval. The original size of the water detention pond was deemed

sufficient to control storm water. I realize the agreement is a fluid document but the proposed changes are substantial; too substantial to charge ahead without approval.

Families believed the representations made by J & J Metzger and bought homes. In my talks with my neighbours they are upset with the possibility of reducing the greenspace that influenced them to purchase their new homes.

We can agree some sort of rental project or condominium project will go ahead. However, at the moment I think everyone should take a breath and at least figure out what set of plans to use. I understand there is a panic to get going because of occupancy commitments, which may or may not be reasonable, but this is another case of the tail wagging the dog or the developer wagging the Council, staff and the approval process.

Granted, people can change but in this case I'm still of the belief that former behaviours will predict future performance. I hope I'm wrong but if allowed to continue I could see the developers become Landlords with the same attitudes towards property standards, safety and the Landlord and Tenant Act. Your actions can help create something good but your actions also have the potential to be a detriment to a nice neighbourhood. A vote to proceed at the moment would be a vote to condone the actions of the developers; it may even be viewed as a reward for what should be considered unacceptable behaviour. It's clear when the project does move forward there'll be a need for a more specific site development agreement with more stringent oversight from the applicable authorities.

Respectfully Submitted,
Ken Porter,
61 George St. North, Harriston, ON