

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

From: **Steve** [REDACTED]
Date: Mon, Jun 19, 2023, 7:07 PM
Subject: Howden/Vodden Fencing
To: <Patrick.brown@brampton.ca>, <rod.power@brampton.ca>, <pat.fortini@brampton.ca>

On June 21st, 2023 Committee of Council will hear final submissions on the fencing concerns of the neighbourhood situated at Howden and Vodden. Unfortunately, due to an eye specialist appointment that is required to be kept, I am unable to attend in person. A copy of this email will be forwarded to the City Clerk for inclusion on the agenda as a written submission.

It has been six years that I have spent trying to facilitate the orderly transition from end of life fencing, to the mandated sound attenuation fencing required by Provincial/Municipal regulations. This process is the equivalent of being put through the meat grinder. In his report, Bishnu Parajuli reiterated the poor state of the affected fencing, and further stated it posed a safety hazard to pedestrians using the city sidewalk. The only two viable solutions offered by Bishnu Parajuli were to either have the City of Brampton assume ownership at a cost of 1.9 million, or legislate the offending homeowners to comply with Provincial/Municipal regulations. Both options have preconceived negative outcomes.

It appears that the biggest fear of Council is that an agreement to assume ownership at a cost of 1.9 million would open the floodgates to the other residents with similar mandated fencing to be treated similarly. However, given the circumstances, and based on the unique factors (plaza directly across from affected area/two city bus routes in operation) that come into play with this particular application, I fail to see why Council would still not require each and every neighbourhood to complete the same 6-year process I have been subjected to. Further, on top of the requirement to complete the process I have endured, given the complete apathy of every neighbourhood in Brampton with regard to fencing, it is highly unlikely this Council will be approached any time soon for consideration.

Finally, the legal route of enforcing compliance comes with its own difficult scenarios. Why would this neighbourhood be subjected to enforced compliance to adhere to strict, extremely expensive fencing requirements while the rest of the city and in particular the other 64 kms of similar fencing get a free ride? The enforcement of this neighbourhood's fencing deficiencies would have to prompt the complete enforcement city wide as per the Constitutional promise of the adherence to the Rule of Law.

I do look forward to being part of the solution and hope that Council considers everything on the table when moving forward.

Respectively,

Stephen Sayers