

January 14th, 2022

To: The Council of the Township of North Huron
Attention: Carson Lamb, Clerk clamb@northhuron.ca

From: Jackie Cribb

RE: PROPOSED OFFICIAL PLAN AMENDMENT AND ZONING BY-LAWS AMENDMENT
AFFECTING LOTS 367-370 (166 John Street West) FOMRER TRAILER PARK STIE
WINGHAM

In regard to my objections to the above development, previously communicated to Council by letter, I have received correspondence from Mr. Jonathan Eelman.

I feel it is important for Council to know why unfortunately his response did not assuage any of my concerns. I therefore have attached la copy of my letter to Mr. Eelman for it's consideration.

Sincerely,

Jackie Cribb
119 john Street West
Wingham, Ontario
N0G 2W0

519-357-9295
jccribb615@gmail.com

January 13th, 2022

From: Jackie Cribb
119 John Street West
Wingham, Ontario
N0G 2W0

Dear Mr. Eelman,

Thank you for attempting to answer my concerns regarding your proposal to build a five story building on the former Wingham Trailer Park Site.

First, I would like to reiterate that it is not development to which I am opposed, nor am I against efforts to address a housing crisis that we are told exists. I believe you to be sincere in your desire to address the issues I have raised. I am afraid however, that the information you have sent me does not assuage my concerns and I believe that this development comes at too great a cost to make it the right thing to do.

We are aware of the two other developments, being Hutton Heights and the property by the Riverside Elementary School. Both of these developments seem to be logical ways to address housing in North Huron. We understand that there is a legal problem with the Riverside property preventing it from proceeding and that the other will not be ready for a long time due to the cost of running the utilities to the property. However, this does not in my view make it right, to cram a high density building onto a small piece of park land that will have long term repercussions.

To say that it is okay to develop park land because there are no other areas available is inconsistent with my core beliefs and does not reconcile for me the impropriety of development of this location. Three of these areas, seem to me to all be part of the same park land, in particular the Splash Pad is one of the areas that will be affected by the construction of this building. Additionally, while Cruikshank Park is a lovely park, this park is not suitable for children to play or people to walk. The same is true of Willow Park that, while very nice, is on the outskirts of town and not one that I would consider taking dogs to.

Your suggestion to have reduced speed signs and sidewalks the length of your laneway, may regulate those driving into your building but will not impact traffic on the road or help pedestrians, that are using the park, daycare or community centre. In regard to changing the address, those who need GPS to access the property will not be those who live there and therefore not the bulk of the cars accessing the property. I would also think that those living on Victoria Street might not appreciate this idea.

Concerning your proposal to increase the parking spots to 1.23 spots per unit, (which is lower than currently required), I am afraid I believe your assumption about how many spaces are needed to be misguided. This building has been designed to target those 55+ and not only do people of that age still drive, they still work. We also are a rural community with no transit which means that aside from the probability of over 100 residents going in different directions to work each day, they will be driving to the stores. I live four doors closer and cannot imagine walking home with a load of groceries. It is more likely that you will see 2 cars per unit rather than 1.23, not counting visitors. How do you stipulate that people cannot have more than one car per unit? Overflow of parked cars onto our streets is inevitable and I expect the legion and current parking designated for the park will also be affected.

I understand that you are not directly involved with who is notified about building proposals and agree that this is the responsibility of our council and township staff to assure that all of the residents receive notice in time to air any concerns. This is an important issue that needs to be addressed by the Township of North Huron going forward. It is true that you held an open house, although I was not invited to that either and found out about it after the fact. I do not know how you determined who would receive the invitation but as someone who has been wondering what was happening since I saw the trailers disappear, it would have been good to have known.

You seem to agree that this is generally a quiet section of town but have stated that the Township of North Huron is severely under populated for the services provided. I am not sure what services you are referring to. We do not have transit, any higher educational facilities and very few employment opportunities. The Town of Wingham, has very recently brought in three new gas stations and a McDonalds, however, I expect that these are largely manned by students. We have been told that Westcast feels they could hire 50 people if there was housing available. Is this information consistent with the jobs they have posted? and are those jobs of an income level that would make a 1600\$ to 2000\$ a month rental possible? I believe if decisions are being made based upon these factors that they should be made based upon research rather than supposition. We have seen no evidence to support these claims.

You have stated that between your development and the Riverside and Hutton Heights developments you feel well positioned to grow our community thoughtfully and responsibly. I am afraid the whole issue for me has been that I do not feel that this was thoughtful or responsible. I do not believe that the community was considered, advised or consulted or that the value of our park land was given any credence. Overall, the long term impact was not considered or properly weighted against the perceived benefits.

Further to that point, you have hoped to assuage my concerns about property values with information provided by a realtor. Interestingly, I have already been told by one realtor that while they may be in agreement with my concerns that they could not get involved due to conflict of interest. The opinion provided to me was in my view naturally biased and again full of speculation rather than data. Mr. Fischer states that development will improve the cost of housing. I am not sure how that would improve the value of my home if housing prices here become more affordable, but it also does not address the value of my home to me. The reason I invested in my home, was because of the quiet and tranquil setting. My home was built in 1890 and is one of the original homes in the Town of Wingham. How would building a 5 storey apartment five houses away from me, improve in any way, the value of my home to me? Your building will be even bigger than those across from Walmart in Listowel, (which are on vacant land in a developed area and not someone's back yard) How would it add to my property value, when the whole complexion of this neighbourhood changes from an older, quieter peaceful part of town to a busy street?

You have indicated to us that if you cannot build a 5 storey building that it is economically unsound for you and it makes sense not to embark on a losing proposition. That being said, I am doubtful that this is really all about helping the community solve a housing crisis, which is what we have been told and feel that is it rather being used to justify a business venture.

With all due respect, I think that this development has been rushed through without the proper considerations and that it is not going to be the solution it is proposed to be. I believe that

any development on that site is short sighted and that there are many more negative aspects than there are positive. I don't believe it is okay to trade trees for concrete and that as a society we should be encouraging the preservation of green space as much as possible. While you may be concerned about safety, concerned about the environment and concerned about the quality of life of the residents here, I believe the idea that any sacrifices will be worthwhile, is not an evidence based assumption. How did you determine that people 55+ won't drive, or that there will be no problems with traffic when you are proposing a 73 unit multi-residential compared to 29 trailers. Those occupants, all parked their cars on their lots, didn't travel for work and were there only seasonally

I do not believe that there are absolutely no other choices or better sites for the development of multi-residential units in North Huron. If encroachment onto park land is allowed and the precedent is set that we need only make changes to the rules when they don't suit anyone wanting the land for another purpose, then when will the encroachment stop? I believe this to be a bad decision which will permanently affect everyone who lives here and respectfully hope that it does not proceed.

Sincerely,

Jackie Cribb