

Meeting Date: February 7, 2022
Department: Engineering and Public Works
Report No.: EPW-2022-01
Submitted by: Jake Straus, Director of Engineering and Public Works
Approved by: Fred Tranquilli, Chief Administrative Officer / Clerk

SUBJECT: Sanitary Sewer Private Drain Connection Charge

**RECOMMENDATION: THAT: Council receive Report EPW-2022-01- Sanitary Sewer Private Drain Connection Charge as information; and
THAT: Council approve a \$17,500 mandatory connection charge for all Owners of a property that receive a Sanitary Sewer connection point to their property line; and
THAT: Council direct staff to notify the affected Owners on Adelaide Road and Queen St. in Mt Brydges about the requirement for payment and payment options; and
THAT: Council direct staff to have payments start September 1, 2022.**

STRATEGIC PLAN ALIGNMENT:

This matter is in accord with the following strategic priorities:

- Local Infrastructure – Households and businesses in Strathroy-Caradoc are supported by reliable, financially responsible and well-maintained infrastructure networks

BACKGROUND:

New sanitary sewers are being added to facilitate growth and allow for development as the Municipality of Strathroy-Caradoc continues to grow. As roads are upgraded, the Municipality installs new infrastructure, such as new sanitary connections to the property line of each property to minimize future disruptions. If the Owner of the property would like to connect to the sanitary sewer, they could arrange to co-ordinate it during the construction or, if they elect to wait, they will then have a connection point at their property line.

The current By-Law 64-14 for Sewage System Discharge Regulations states that Owners of a building on land abutting a street or alley through which access to a sanitary sewer main is available, shall connect the building to the sanitary sewer system of the Municipality. The Owner of a building which is existing as of December 15, 2014 and which building is affected by the bylaw may be exempted from the connection requirement providing that the owner of the building pays a minimum monthly charge.

Staff recommend that Council consider revisiting this exemption in the future to further incentivize connections.

In the event that a Building has a septic system that requires replacement, the Owner is not permitted to install a new septic system, but is required to connect to the sanitary sewer where available.

The installation of new sanitary sewers and the associated piping to the property line shall be subject to cost recovery.

On October 17, 2019, Council approved proceeding with the Sanitary Sewer Extension of Queen St., Mt Brydges. The connection of these six units was completed with the mandatory fee of \$17,500 per service approved to recover the costs of this extension. At the time that the final connection fees are determined for the entire community servicing project, if it is less than the fee charged, the residents would be credited the difference. However, if the final approved fees are in excess of these charges, these six units would not be billed the additional costs. No costs to date have been charged to the Owners for this work.

On December 20, 2021, a staff report was presented to Council containing four options for recovery of the installation costs for the new sanitary sewer connection points to the property line.

Council directed staff to follow up with a report recommending a fixed fee of \$17,500 per connection. To summarize, a fixed fee of \$17,500 per connection will be assessed to the Owner(s) of a property for which a connection point is provided.

For this option, all Owners will be charged a fixed fee of \$17,500 per connection.

COMMENTS:

There are several projects, which have been completed, are currently under construction or are planned for construction. A consistent approach to billing Owners will need to be implemented and communicated to the affected Owners. The work completed in Mount Brydges on Queen Street in 2019 and on Adelaide Road in 2021 has not yet been billed to the Owners. The communication plan for this information includes sending a letter on February 10, 2022 directly to Owners notifying them that they have either already received the sanitary connections or will be receiving the sanitary connections on Adelaide Road and Queen St. This letter will detail the requirement for payment of connection fees and options for payment.

On February 16, 2022, a notice will be posted on the Municipal website regarding Sanitary Sewer Private Drain Connections.

On March 15, 2022, a follow up letter will be sent by registered mail to any Owners who have not responded to the initial letter. In this letter, Owners will be advised that in the absence of a response the connection fee will be added to their Property Tax Bill.

On April 15, 2022 a follow up will be sent by regular mail to Owners who have still not responded, reminding them that if they do not respond and identify their payment preferences the Municipality will

add the full balance to their Tax Assessment. This fixed number will be reviewed annually to stay current with market conditions with recommendations to Council as needed.

CONSULTATION:

The preparation of this report and recommendation was completed in consultation with:

- Chief Administrative Officer
- Director of Building and Planning
- Director of Financial Services
- Manager of Environmental Services

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

Each Property Owner will be assessed \$17,500 for a new Sanitary Private Drain Connection installed to the property line.

The funding options include:

- 1) The Owner may pay the full amount once service is provided
- 2) The Municipality may offer a low interest loan program. This will be a loan at XX% for a term of XX years. This will result in a cost of \$XXX.XX per month and would be added to the Owner's Tax Bill.

It should be noted that connection fees paid previously by any of these Owners for their connection would be subtracted from the \$17,500 fee.

ATTACHMENTS:

None

February 8, 2022

Council went into an agreement with the developer, the residents of Queen Street Mount Brydges did not. This burden is being forced upon us, it was not request, required or wanted. We dispute the charges put forward as they are.

Seeing the manner in which council chose to proceed with this motion and the absence of allowing the taxpayer's input we are requesting the following:

Complete breakdown of costs resulting in the \$17,500 charge

Scope of work

Contractor assigned

All tender bids – Dates – Company name - Quotes

Dated agreement between Municipality & Contractor

Total additional costs to connect to house

Contractor bid for house connection – private choice or assigned

Monthly cost to those who choose not to hook up

We request this prior to any signing any payment plan or agreement of tax assessment

Thank you

From: [NORMAN LAROCQUE](#)
To: [Fred Tranquilli](#)
Subject: Sewers
Date: Wednesday, February 9, 2022 8:08:33 PM
Attachments: [cidFD6E4D4D-6E78-4CDD-8092-49DA13A89C0E.pdf](#)

Norm and Sherry Larocque

This email was scanned by Bitdefender

From: [Suzuki Rider](#)
To: [Fred Tranquilli](#); [Jennifer Huff](#); [Jake Straus](#); jvanderhayden@strathroy-caradoc.ca; [Neil Flegel](#); [Sandi Hipple](#); lcawan@strathroy-caradoc.ca
Subject: Fwd: Queen Street Sewer Charges
Date: Wednesday, February 9, 2022 5:25:55 PM

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Suzuki Rider** <[REDACTED]>
Date: Wed, Feb 9, 2022 at 5:19 PM
Subject: Fwd: Queen Street Sewer Charges
To: John McKinlay <[REDACTED]>

----- Forwarded message -----

From: [REDACTED]
Date: Wed, Feb 9, 2022 at 8:02 AM
Subject: Re: Queen Street Sewer Charges
To:

Jake Straus and Larry Cowan link is incorrect below is corrected

jstraus@strathroy-caradoc.ca

lcawan@strathroy-caradoc.ca

sorry

On 2022-02-08 23:32, [REDACTED] wrote:

I think we are all in the same situation and understanding with these sewer charges. The way council came about the passing of this motion was just wrong. I filed a formal complaint with the Ontario Ombudsman who oversees the municipal government. I have an appointment on Thursday with them to go over details. I asked if each of us individually would need to respond or if we can collectively do it. I will let everyone know what comes of the meeting. This attached letter in the meantime is in response to what happened last night at council meeting. I wrote the letter but I am asking if all of us can send it individually to council. It should get to them before we get our letter from them on Thursday. You can copy and paste, attach the file and send. If you have any trouble let me know

Please send to: franquilli@strathroy-caradoc.ca

jhuff@strathroy-caradoc.ca

jstraus@strathroy-caradoc.ca

jvanderheyden@strathroy-caradoc.ca

nflegel@dowlerkarn.com

shipple@strathroy-caradoc.ca

lcowan@strathroy-caradoc.ca

Thank you

2563 Queen Street - Karns

This email was scanned by Bitdefender

From: [Rachel Kelsey](#)
To: [Fred Tranquilli](#); [Jennifer Huff](#); jstrauss@strathroy-caradoc.ca; [Joanne Vanderheyden](#); [Neil Flegel](#); [Sandi Hipple](#)
Subject: Fwd:
Date: Wednesday, February 9, 2022 1:50:33 PM

Good morning,

I am forwarding on behalf of my husband. Please see the email below.

Thank you
Rachel

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Joel deboer [REDACTED]
Date: February 9, 2022 at 1:37:36 PM EST
To: Rachel Kelsey [REDACTED]

Hello

I am writing you all today to advise of my opposition to what has been going on with regards to the Queen Street sewer and development projects. I am the father a young family with four kids on a tight budget and there is no way we will be able to afford this additional cost for the sewer. I am not sure why our own councillors would want to try and burden families in their own community and cause financial hardship potentially leading to a plethora of other issues.

Something has to be done about this. I am not sure why we are footing the bill for infrastructure work on the road as it's not even connecting the sewer to our house. I am totally fine with septic and do not even want sewer. If anything the developer should be footing the bill as none of this would've occurred if it was not for the new development in the area, which all the residents oppose. Most people in this town also oppose development because it's losing it small town feel.

Please come together and correct this wrong.

Thanks

From: [Bill Wardell](#)
To: [Fred Tranquilli](#); [Jennifer Huff](#); [Jake Straus](#); [Joanne Vanderheyden](#); [Neil Flegel](#); [Sandi Hipple](#); [Larry Cowan](#)
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Queen Street Sewers
Date: Wednesday, February 9, 2022 11:08:08 AM

Bill Wardell
2559 Queen Street

You have no right telling us that a septic tank replacement is 17,500 especially when council quoted replacement cost would be between between 13 and 16 thousand for a new system,
so we are all wondering where the where the other 1500 came from, I have absolutely no interest
and will not be part of paying an obscene rate to offset the builders cost, or help Strathroy-Caradoc
increase the future tax base.



From: [Kim Caley](#)
To: [Fred Tranquilli](#); [Jennifer Huff](#); [Jake Straus](#); [Joanne Vanderheyden](#); [Neil Flegel](#); [Sandi Hipple](#); lcawan@strathroy-caradoc.ca
Subject: Sewer system Mount Brydges
Date: Wednesday, February 9, 2022 8:58:17 AM

Good Morning.

I am writing to let you know that as a resident of Queen Street in Mount Brydges I do not agree with how everything is proceeding in regards to the sewer system. It was council that went into the agreement with the developer, not the residents. Forcing us to pay should not be our burden. The residents were not able to partake in the council meeting that occurred on February 6th, 2022 to allow us to voice our concerns and have our questions answered. We are requesting the following:

1. Complete breakdown of the costs resulting in the \$17,500 charge
2. Scope of the work being done
3. Who is the contractor assigned
4. All tender bids, dates, the company names and quotes
5. Dated agreement between the Municipality and Contractor
6. Total additional costs to connect a house
7. Contractor bid for house connection (private or assigned)
8. Monthly cost to those who choose not to hook up
9. Payment options for those that can not come up with that amount of money September 1st, 2022

These are all valid concerns that were not discussed at the meeting this past Monday evening. It will not just be a cost of \$17,500 to the homeowners but somewhere in the neighborhood of \$25,000-30,000.

We are requesting that these concerns be met prior to any signing of payment.

Thank you
Kim Caley

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Fred Tranquilli](#); [Jennifer Huff](#); jjstrauss@strathroy-caradoc.ca; [Joanne Vanderheyden](#)
Cc: [Sandi Hipple](#); bcowan@strathroy-caradoc.ca; [Neil Flegel](#)
Subject: Sewer Charges - Queen Street
Date: Wednesday, February 9, 2022 7:57:54 AM
Attachments: [Feb 8 Sewer.pdf](#)

Good Morning,

Please see attached letter. Requesting response.

Karns

2563 Queen Street

This email was scanned by Bitdefender

February 8, 2022

Council went into an agreement with the developer, the residents of Queen Street Mount Brydges did not. This burden is being forced upon us, it was not request, required or wanted. We dispute the charges put forward as they are.

Seeing the manner in which council chose to proceed with this motion and the absence of allowing the taxpayer's input we are requesting the following:

Complete breakdown of costs resulting in the \$17,500 charge

Scope of work

Contractor assigned

All tender bids – Dates – Company name - Quotes

Dated agreement between Municipality & Contractor

Total additional costs to connect to house

Contractor bid for house connection – private choice or assigned

Monthly cost to those who choose not to hook up

We request this prior to any signing any payment plan or agreement of tax assessment

Thank you

February 8, 2022

Council went into an agreement with the developer, the residents of Queen Street Mount Brydges did not. This burden is being forced upon us, it was not request, required or wanted. We dispute the charges put forward as they are.

Seeing the manner in which council chose to proceed with this motion and the absence of allowing the taxpayer's input we are requesting the following:

Complete breakdown of costs resulting in the \$17,500 charge

Scope of work

Contractor assigned

All tender bids – Dates – Company name - Quotes

Dated agreement between Municipality & Contractor

Total additional costs to connect to house

Contractor bid for house connection – private choice or assigned

Monthly cost to those who choose not to hook up

We request this prior to any signing any payment plan or agreement of tax assessment

Thank you

Counsel and Municipal Directors,

If you recall the Oct 5th 2021 5:30-6:30 meeting that was held and led by Catherine Liscomb from Dillion, I specifically requested information regarding a mandatory connection and associated fee. No representatives from counsel or the municipality could answer my simple question which both Jennifer Huff and Fred Tranquelli attended. No follow up was conducted either by Dillion or the directors. As I recall, your vague answer was redirected to both of you which then provided a classic divergent response that was uttered "counsel needed to review". What is interesting, is that your letter within the Background section references By-Law 64-14 as justification for the owners to pay. Did anyone know of this By-Law at the time? or was it the fact you didn't want to get into a discussion of the associated costs at that time? I also asked if every other current property owner in Mt. Brydges that was in a similar situation with pending dual water connections was required to pay a fee; again you did not have an answer nor any follow up.

The handling of this matter is a level of incompetence in which someone would be fired in my professional engineering field. The fact that you are elected officials and directors is more disturbing. It is vividly clear the intent is to push it along rather than speaking to residents and doing your job. The mayor's comments about people are eager to hook up; do you think that is the majority of residents when they learn of the costs? Counselman Cowan's comments about most people's sceptics coming to the end of their life cycle, are completely ridiculous. If you were to reach out to us directly, maybe you have your facts straight and that some of us have already replaced our system. Many of you mention the word compassion several times in your comments and questions, however I think many of you have forgotten the act of compassion and what is meant to listen to your constituents rather than your own agenda.

Once again, the interest of property owners of Mt. Brydges is not taken into account and only Counsel Pelkman and Flegal seem to ask and comment on the right questions. The rest of you are more concerned with getting the contractors in place and getting paid. People are literally disgusted with how you have handled most decision making with regards to this town. If you think you are making this town a better place, I can assure you you're not; take a performance poll like most companies to measure your growth and sustainable KPI's. People are tired of learning things after the fact or via rumor. Including a simple request on multiple occasions to have my mail sent to me and not my renters. Yet even if I do receive something it is always after a meeting or short notice. If your budget does not include US mail postage, I would be more than happy to cover the costs. Whatever happens to open lines of communication.

The timing of this project, which is evident the directors are eagerly pushing, is ironically inline with the new Bannon development down the road. Let me guess that J-AAR and Dillion are the engineering and contractors respectively, just like the sub-divisions. Have any of you driven through your approved subdivision behind the arena? Was it the intent to have only one car be able to travel through those townhomes? I was there last December to see these ridiculous small homes and as I passed another vehicle, one of us had to unfortunately go on the curb/lawn to pass. The rush to pass/approve anything without thoroughly looking at projects seems to be an inherent problem among the municipality.

Obviously I oppose these mandatory charges to basically facilitate the new subdivision. Unfortunately, and with careful intent, the rhetoric that is used is that it is to "replace" old infrastructure. It seems that decisions are eagerly passed for "new in coming people", however the long-time property owners of the community are basically ignored.

Attached is a communal letter in which I am sure you have received from others. I agree that questions from the public need to be answered. Flirting and implementing financial strain on people's livelihood while still in a 2 year pandemic, inflation on the rise, interest rates going up is enough mental strain on all families is indescribable. Does this sound like the definition of "compassion"? With the exception of Couselman Flegal and Pelkman, are any of you sensitive to the fact of what this does to families? Using the example that a septic could go at any time does not provide justification to slam a 17.5K charge in 8 months as a preemptive precaution. If that is not poor planning then I do not know what is. Whoever stated that analogy should be embarrassed of their comments. Sure, my pipes could burst and flood my basement and my insurance adjuster will only approve a certain item....does that mean I should re-plumb my house with the greatest material out of the abundance of caution? That fact you do not even have a defined payment option plan in place, but yet it's more important to inform owners of the upcoming cost, is absurd. Why is Sept the date for repayment so important, what is the rush.....you have already noted that the budget and municipality is not a bank, and I agreed with those comments. However, you should have as many options for owners as possible no matter how long that takes, rather than a deadline of repayment to something you have already committed to...i.e. the new subdivision.

I feel very sorry for the very young and older families that live along "mature" Queen Street. And you're right in saying that it is a mature street; however, that should be in reference to the long time residents and people that have paid their taxes. Not trees.

This email may be ignored and I fully accept that; however if you have any value in the integrity of your position, you will work with the residents and stop following your own agenda.

Issues with Queen Street Construction & Lack of Transparency

Strathroy-Caradoc Council:

Brad Richards	Frank Kennes	John Brennan	Larry Cowan
Marie Baker	Neil Flegel	Sandi Hipple	Steve Pelkman
Joanne Vanderheyden			
Fred Tranquilli			
Jennifer Huff			
Jake Straus			

We are writing to report the issues with the ongoing subdivision plans, the amendments made to Zoning By-Laws, and the proposed Sanitary Sewer Private Drain Connection Charge of \$17,500 per residence on Queen Street.

Strathroy-Caradoc Council has an accountability to their residents to operate under open and transparent governance which we believe has not been satisfied throughout this project. This is not to dispute the subdivision itself, it is with the manner in which it has taken place.

There has been a lack of transparency to the Queen Street residents surrounding the “Statutory” meetings that are required under the Planning Act. The meetings that have occurred have yet to follow “Statutory” meeting requirements. All Council Meetings are to be Public Meetings. Not all Queen Street residents were notified in the manner required. When we began looking into the information surrounding the development, our first thought was a lack of transparency due to Covid, however conducting a Content Audit of the Strathroy-Caradoc municipal website we have come to the realization that this is not the case. The “North Meadows Development” had an “Open House” and 4 “Public Meeting” Notifications that were all posted as required on Strathroy-Caradoc municipal website followed by additional notices distributed to the residents. The residents of Mount Brydges should have been granted the same practice. We found that the “Timberview Development” in Mount Brydges did have an “Open House” letter mailed dated January 27, 2020 with the date of Open House being January 29, 2020, therefore many residents did not get the information until after the “Open House” took place. Given the information above the municipality has not been consistent with Strathroy-Caradoc municipal procedures By-Law 97-18 regarding Statutory Public meetings and principles. Please note Strathroy-Caradoc Procedure By-Law below;

ff) “Public Planning Meeting” means the statutory public Meeting held pursuant to the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13, as amended, or other statute;

3. Principles of the Procedure By-law

a) The principles of openness, transparency and accountability to the public guide the Municipality’s decision-making process. In the context of Meetings, this is accomplished by:

- i) Ensuring the decision-making process is understood by the public and other stakeholders;***
- ii) Providing access to information and opportunities for input by the public and other stakeholders consistent with the requirements of this Procedure By-law and other statutory requirements;***
- iii) Exercising and respecting individual and collective roles and responsibilities provided for in this Procedure By-law and other statutory requirements.***

20. Notice of Meetings

a) General Provisions

i) The Clerk or Secretary gives Notice of a Meeting by:

(a) Posting the annual approved schedule of Meetings; or

(b) Using the Municipality's social media accounts and website; or

(c) Publishing Notice on the Municipality's regular advertising page in the local newspaper; or

(d) Providing the agenda to Members and the public; or

(e) All of the above

We are aware that there is an amendment dated November 2, 2020 to By-Law 67-20. The amendment does not affect the dates in which we question.

The building by-law amended in order for the building of 3 Semi-Detached homes to go on lots 15, 16 and 17 clearly should have been disclosed to the directly affected residents. The Strathroy-Caradoc Zoning By-Law states that Semi-Detached homes require 300 square meters minimum area, the amendment changed this minimum to 260 square meters this also states that Semi-detached homes require 10 meters minimum frontage, the amendment changed to this to 9.5 meters. These bylaw changes allow for 3 Semi-Detached homes to be built on a plot of land that is clearly not suitable.

These 3 Semi-Detached homes are directly affecting the residents on Queen Street, 2559 Queen Street (since 2005), 2563 Queen Street (since 2004), and 2567 Queen Street (since 2000). These proposed Semi-Detached homes have resulted in the Queen Street residents to lose their entire animal ecosystem and lose over a dozen trees along the property lines. These proposed Semi-Detached homes behind these 3 particular residents on Queen Street directly affect their enjoyment of surroundings, and the loss of their entire privacy with the proposed semi-detached homes being unreasonably close to property lines. One residents is being forced have a fenced in yard against their wishes due to the development. We have not asked to live in a box or in a subdivision. We would like to note that these 3 properties have maintained and enjoyed the land behind their properties for 17-21 years, one of the properties has a pass through gate for maintenance for the field. This information can be verified via an Arial map search of the properties along with the no fence and the pass through gate. The residents equally affected with the Sanitary Sewer Private Drain Connection Charge are 2543, 2571, 2573, 2577 and 2585 Queen Street.

This is not merely a piece of land on a map, as home owners we have financial and emotional connections to our properties and the land that surrounds it, however to a consultant developer it is just a piece of land to develop. This is where our families have grown up. A healthy 15 foot spruce tree given as a single sprig to one of these residents on her first Mother's Day, moved from her past homes was put into a chipper without any notice or concern despite the fact Dillon Consulting team was aware of the sentimental connection to this tree. The connections we have to the field, trees, and wildlife that we have enjoyed our entire lives has been ripped away without respect or empathy to the impact on these residents. We deserve as residents and taxpayers to love where we live.

Issues with Queen Street Construction & Lack of Transparency

The builder stated on his draft plan application "The proposed residential development increase in density is minor in nature and will not negatively impact the surrounding residences, municipal services or traffic on surrounding streets and maintains a small village character of Mount Brydges." It is apparent that the proposed developed is negatively affecting the surrounding residences and municipal services as all residents on Queen Street are expected to incur a \$17,500 bill for Sanitary Sewer connection charges due to the subdivision development behind the properties.

This process is directly affecting these residents on Queen Street and the surrounding areas. Since the construction has begun there has been ongoing vibration from the work being done, this extreme vibration is shaking glasses, picture frames and furniture in houses for several hours a day. The vibration can be verified with sound recordings. Residents have been unable to work from home due to the constant distraction. For the past 3+ weeks there is a generator running 24 hours a day right at the property line, giving off diesel fumes, causing a lack of sleep and increased stress to the residents directly surrounding the construction site. This can also be verified with sound recordings.

Noise pollution is defined as any form of sound that disrupts a natural ecosystem or personal property to become unusable or unpleasant. Which impacts loss of sleep, increased stress, and hearing loss. The construction vibration as well as generator are causing noise pollution to the residents surrounding the site. There have been several formal complaints filed regarding these two issues with the Bylaw officer and consulting company and excuses, not solutions have been the response.

We have gone back to 2019 and have completed an extensive Content Audit on the website, we have viewed the agendas posted for "Council Meetings", have watched and recorded "Council Meetings" and we consider the way in which the municipality has proceeded with this development has resulted in us not being given reasonable opportunity for input.

Unfortunately, at this point in the process our only course of action as the residents of Queen Street in Mount Brydges may be to file an "Application to Quash By-Laws" with the Superior Court of Justice available to us under the *Planning Act* Section 51 (20) and Section 273 of the *Municipal Act, 2001*. As to challenge the By-Laws passed by council directly affecting the residents of Queen Street in Mount Brydges regarding the "Timberview Development" behind our properties.

Section 273 of the Municipal Act, 2001 permits the Superior Court of Justice to quash any by-law of a municipality in whole or in part for illegality and may be brought by any person.

Sincerely,

Wm B Wardell
J. Maclell
K. Karno
J. M. R. R. R. R.
I. Harold Smith

signing on behalf of
Jeff McLeod
Joel Deboer
(out of country but wanted
to sign)

Strathroy-Caradoc - Website News & Announcements

January 3, 2020 – Christmas Tree Disposal
January 14, 2020 – Notice of Public Meeting regarding North Meadows secondary plan
January 20, 2020 – Strathroy Council Briefs
February 3, 2020 – Council Briefs
February 19, 2020 – Caradoc Street Reconstruction Bid Approved (Strathroy)
February 21, 2020 – Pass Development Charges Bylaw
March 3, 2020 – Council Briefs
March 10, 2020 – Notice of Public Open House – Caradoc Street Reconstruction (Strathroy)
March 12, 2020 – Mayors Statement on Covid
March 15, 2020 – Chief of Police Statement
March 15, 2020 – Closure of Facilities
March 17, 2020 – Declaration of Emergency
March 23, 2020 – Mayors March Break Statement
March 25, 2020 – Transportation Service Postponed
April 8, 2020 – First Electronic Council Meeting
April 9, 2020 – Key Decisions and Activity (Electronic)
April 17, 2020 – Lay Off 12 Workers
May 1, 2020 – Caradoc Street Reconstruction Kicks Off (Strathroy)
May 12, 2020 – Public Notice – Temporary Water Service Disruption due to Caradoc Street Reconstruction Project
May 26, 2020 – Residents and Businesses Invited to Complete Survey
June 10, 2020 – Update Summer Camp
July 20, 2020 – Counsel Briefs - Patio Construction / Mandate Facemasks
July 23, 2020 – Transit Service
August 13, 2020 – Public info – McEvoy Road and Inadale Drive
August 27, 2020 – Notice of Open House and Public Meeting (Strathroy)
September 3, 2020 – Notice of Public Meeting No.3 North Meadows
September 14, 2020 – Boot Drive
October 20, 2020 – Joanne Re-Elected to Federation of Canadian Municipalities
November 26, 2020 – Notice of Public Meeting Drury Lane Reconstruction Project
December 7, 2020 – Senior Programming
December 17, 2020 – Notice of Statutory Public Meeting – North Meadows for January 18, 2021
December 22, 2020 – Declaration of 137 Frank Street
January 2, 2021 – Municipal Office Closure
January 14, 2021 – Notice of Study/Official Plan Update
January 15, 2021 – Chief of Police Stay at Home
January 19, 2021 – Key Activities and Decisions Draft of North Meadows Considered
February 2, 2021 – Public Notice – Official Plan
February 4, 2021 – Vaccination Covid
February 5, 2021 – Attainable Housing Project Update – Mount Brydges – Considering other Lands

Issues with Queen Street Construction & Lack of Transparency

February 17, 2021 – Key Activities and Decisions – Mount Brydges Playground – North Meadows Plan Approved

April 9, 2021 – Strathroy Caradoc Ranked – MacLean’s Article

April 12, 2021 – Welcome Jennifer Huff

April 22, 2021 – Cancellation of Property Available for Tax Sale

May 3, 2021 – Public Notice of Pesticide Use

May 5, 2021 – New Director of Fire Services

May 6, 2021 – Two Community Hubs Proposed – Nustadia

May 7, 2021 – CN Rail Crossing Improvement Schedule

June 4, 2021 – Joanne President of Federation of Canadian Municipalities

July 28, 2021 – Class Environment Assessment – Agnes Drive

September 8, 2021 – Awarded \$25,000 Grant to Plant Trees

September 21, 2021 – Covid 19 Vaccine Required Recreation Facilities

September 29, 2021 – Notice of Public Information Meeting – Queen Street Reconstruction (Mount Brydges)

October 6, 2021 – Queen Street Reconstruction Meeting

November 15, 2021 – Notice of Public Meeting regarding Building Permit Fee Bylaw

November 29, 2021 – Holiday Facility Closure and Program Changes

January 3, 2022 – Recreation Facility Closed Temporarily (January 5)

January 5, 2022 – Closure Announcement

January 6, 2022 - Infrastructure Fund 1.7 Million Dollars

8 Residences on Queen Street directly affected

2559 Queen Street – Wardell

2563 Queen Street – Karns

2567 Queen Street – McKinlay

2571 Queen Street – Smith

2573 Queen Street – DeBoer

2577 Queen Street – McLeod

2585 Queen Street – McLeod

2594 Queen Street – Madell

So... why weren't questions taken in person for the open house? They limited us with only questions in the chat box? What a joke meeting.. I couldn't type all my questions/ concerns

Guess the doors weren't truly open.. what an embarrassment on their part

That meeting was BS. As soon as they didnt like the questions they ended it.

What a cowardly agenda by the CAO.. our voices need to be heard and not typed in a chatbox

We need a serious change of council. I cant wait for the next election.

That London Lawyer for sure needs to go!

Joanne Vanderheyden when is the meeting that in person voices can be heard and not through a chatbox?

Thanks

We the people are facing enough censorship in this day and age, we do not need municipal censorship added on!! **Sandi Hipple** please explain that meeting agenda.

Thanks

I have found over the years and dealing with....the council will do whatever they want ...you may say no to that statement but we have a been here a long time...I don't involve myself because nothing comes of it

Lee Jacques yup! They don't care about opinions. It's whatever they want.

Lee Jacques you should see the wise-ass emails I get in return from the CAO.. it would make ones blood boil

Kim Piazza Merklinger smart ass too, you should see his email responses to me lol

Karla Kingma I'd be happy to share via PM. I will not be posting on here lol

They ignored answering the tough questions many of us asked. I left disappointed.

But they cannot answer questions in person? Due to Covid Zoom meetings? SMH come on people!! What a haphazard attempt to defer the community!

I missed the meeting can someone fill me in ,reading the comments sounds like they are doing what they wantwithout any regards to what the community wants

Julie Arnold Williamson they didn't care about our concerns at all. They talked in circles and didn't give any reasonable answers to any questions. Typical BS politician answers. It sounds like a done deal without any respect for the residents concerns

Jesse, the host's should have taken 'in person' comments in this 'open house' but rather censored the public by way of the chat box. All other meetings have had in person (in camera) opportunities. I only counted 40 +/- people that had registered and it was a complete disregard for public input in my opinion

Hello, I'm back! There hasn't been any response from council or Freddie regarding the format of the 'open house' last evening.. not even a peep from our elected representatives via email or FB requests. What is wrong with them? Questionable tactics at they're finest I presume

I respectfully emailed her as well... no response.. only springtime crickets