

June 9, 2012

To whom it may concern:

The subdivision consists of two separate roads; Mahood Drive and Millar Crescent.

The majority, five out of seven residents on Millar Crescent, do not wish to be paved. We are told that it is all or nothing, with the only explanation from administration, being that they do not wish to have a patchwork of pavement and gravel. That, of course, is what we and many other subdivisions already have, and will have, without a problem. Sounds like a philosophical reason, rather than legal.

Another possibility, suggested by others, is cost. Millar Crescent is the longer of the two roads, with seven residents and two reserves. Mahood's road is shorter with twelve residents and no reserve. It would seem Mahood Drive would be subsidizing this project. By removing Millar Crescent from the project there will be a cost savings for Mahood residents. Also, there would be a savings to the county as a whole by removing the two reserve frontages.

There is consideration of allowing a keyhole area, not part of the Erin Estates subdivision, consisting of three residences and one vacant property, abutting Millar Crescent, to be paved under the Erin Estates program. This would be allowed by petition of their own, not including their subdivision. This would appear to be a contradiction of county, if not provincial policy.

If, indeed, theirs is a special case to opt in, then why cannot the residents of Millar Crescent, with an already signed petition, not be afforded the same consideration, to opt out? This would seem to be a questionable contradiction.



Nic Wales