

Dec 30, 2018.

Re: Jan 8th Tudor Cashel Council Meeting

Keith Fletcher speaking as part of SLCA community re proposed **Steenburg Lake South Road closure By-law.**

To introduce myself, I am a recent owner to Steenburg Lake but have been visiting and enjoying lake and surrounding area for almost 4 decades.

My wife and I have made plans to retire here in the next few years, it is our retreat place of choice, away from the city. I also work from our property here on the lake on a regular basis so safety and use of the road is important.

Many of us on the lake are disturbed by the recent proposed By-Law and cannot conceive why the township ever thought it would be acceptable, to have a By-law that closes the road in winter season, restricts our right to access our properties and makes it illegal to travel or use a typical vehicle. How can we expect minimum and rightful access for living such as; emergency services, fire, ambulance, police support let alone requirements such as heat deliveries, supplies and just day to day commuting using our road.

We have 22 permanent residents on the road including over 100 properties supported by the South road. A large number of residents are paying taxes based upon full time use and MPAC assessments.

The South road community contribute a significant portion of township taxes. To be very clear firstly, **this By-Law is not acceptable and must not be passed.** Second, **We need closure and have the road supported year round.**

As you have seen by recent letters, various e-mails and communication with the township and councillors and by the support we have in the room today we jointly justify that this issue needs must be resolved. The most frustrating thing about this issue and as township tax payers, proper road maintenance and its support has been ignored by the township for a long time. I don't understand why are we spending tax payer and township funds on lawyers instead of sitting down with the adjacent township and property owners to close on solutions?

Why no progress ? What is it going to take to have this road supported ?

Working with the adjacent township, residences and tax payers is the diplomatic way. That being said, I am encouraged by recent meetings with roads committee and Limerick but clearly the bylaw shall not be approved and the taxpayers and residences of this lake want this road supported!

It is a fact that the township has shared ownership of the South road with Limerick the **road must be maintained to the minimum provincial standard year round!**

Furthermore, some of us on the lake had specific discussions with election candidates prior to election, road support year round was a top item for us. We expect support from the new council and a priority to resolve.

Limerick Township has asked Tudor to come to the table a few times as they see a shared interest in meeting the minimum standards and maintaining the road year round. This communication for a joint township solution must continue.

Question re Dec 17th letter from Libby Clark;

What is meant by "Modern snow removal equipment, surely a decent truck with a plow and a sanding auger is part of the solution. I believe the township already owns an appropriate truck.

I took a tour in the area mid December and found a few township roads plowed that are not through roads. Pine Ridge Road has about 17- 20 residents on it (such as Steenburg South Rd.) as a non-through road and it was plowed.

Final note;

We want public discussion on this road support as there are other residence impacted by this By-law content. More importantly, as I am new to the township operations, is there a By-law that allows the public to speak on draft issues such as this prior to going to council proposal and vote?

Thanks for letting me speak on behalf of the Steenburg Lake owners.

Keith Fletcher. 448 Steenburg Lake South Rd.

Reference Limerick / Tudor Township correspondence on South Road,

Re: Steenburg Lake Road South

We are the solicitors for the Township of Limerick with respect to the above captioned matter. We write to invite the Township of Tudor and Cashel to commence discussion with a view to entering into a joint maintenance agreement with the Township of Limerick.

As you are well aware, Steenburg Lake Road South is boundary road under the joint jurisdiction of both Townships. It is only a boundary road for a portion of its length. Beyond the boundary of Lots 21 and 22, Concession 1, Limerick, the road under the exclusive jurisdiction of the municipality within which it is located.

Although the entire length of the road is not a boundary road, considering its physical arrangement, the Township of Limerick is of the view that would be of great benefit to both Townships and the owners of property along the road for there to be joint maintenance and proportionate sharing of those maintenance costs between the two Municipalities.

At this juncture it would be helpful to understand whether the Township of Tudor and Cashel is willing to engage in discussions concerning the sharing of maintenance and costs concerning the entire length of the road. We would note that the Township of Limerick will require any such agreement to provide for and address year round maintenance.

Re: Steenburg Lake Road South

The Township of Limerick has considered your letter of May 8, 2018 which was in response to our letter of April 5th, 2018.

The Township of Limerick is seeking some further clarification of the assertion that "for safety reasons" the Township of Tudor and Cashel will not consider the joint provision of winter maintenance on this road.

Steenburg Lake Road South constitutes an open, maintained road which is subject to section 44(1) of the *Municipal Act, 2001* and the related Minimum Maintenance Standards. Regardless of the level of traffic, the Municipalities are subject to liability if they fail to maintain highways "... in a state of repair that is reasonable in the circumstances...". It is the Township of Limerick's position that the boundary road component and the remaining portion that is solely within Limerick is a Class 5 road; even if the road is a Class 6 road, the duty to maintain still applies. With the foregoing in mind how is it safer to refuse to provide winter maintenance than to provide such winter maintenance as warranted by the conditions?

Based upon the Township of Tudor and Cashel's disregard for its duty to maintain and the effect of such a choice on the Township of Limerick, it is considering taking a significant step to reduce the level of traffic on those portions of Steenburg Lake Road South for