



TOWN OF INGERSOLL MINUTES OF PUBLIC HEARING

A Public Meeting of the Council of the Town of Ingersoll held at 7:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers, the Town Centre, 130 Oxford Street on Monday July 12, 2010.

PRESENT: Mayor Paul Holbrough
Deputy Mayor Freeman
Councillors: Hunt, Lesser, McLeod, Fortner, Van Kooten-
Bossence

Also Present:
Elaine Clark, Clerk
Ann Meyer, Deputy Clerk
Bonnie Ward, Director of Parks & Recreation
Darell Parker, Fire Chief
Ron Versteegen, County Planner
Gary Seitz, Director of Finance/Treasurer
Gene McLaren, Director of Engineering Services
John Phillips, Director of Public Works

Mayor Holbrough welcomes members of Council and the public to this Public Hearing to hear comments on a Zoning Applications submitted by Reeves Realty Corporation.

The meeting is called to order at 7:08 p.m.

Moved by Councillor McLeod; seconded by Councillor Hunt

P10-07-011 That the public meeting to be held pursuant to Section 34(12) of the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, as amended, on the on applications submitted by Reeves Realty Corporation File No. ZON 6-09-04 be hereby opened.

CARRIED

DECLARATION OF CONFLICT

APPLICATIONa) Reeves Realty Corporation, File No. ZON 6-09-04

Ron Versteegen, County Planner, provides a planning review of the lands (west side of McKeand St., between Victoria St. and Bell Street, (County Road 119)) noting that the zoning of the lands currently is Special Residential Type 3 (R3-14) and the Official Plan designation is Residential (Low Density Residential). The applicant is requesting that the existing Special Residential Type 3 (R3-14) be amended to increase the number of multiple dwelling units on the subject property from 30 (September, 2004) to 46. The units will be development as one-storey and two-storey townhouses with approximately 86.9 m² (935 sq. ft) in gross floor area. Each unit is to have two (2) parking spaces and 19 visitor spaces.

The applicant provided a Traffic Impact Study and a detailed Servicing and Grading Plan in support of the proposed development. The traffic study concluded that traffic volume generated from the development should not significantly impact existing or future high level of traffic operations along McKeand St, or at the Bell St. or Victoria St. intersections and that traffic control measures are not required. The Servicing and Grading Plans identified that all stormwater runoff generated from the site will be controlled internally and directed to the Town's storm sewer system.

As the development is surrounded by primarily single family dwellings, Planning staff is recommending that during the Site Plan process that appropriate buffering be required in an attempt to provide the greatest amount of buffering between the development and the adjacent residential uses in addition to a wooden privacy fence being constructed along the perimeter of the property.

If approved, the applicant will be required to remove the draft approved plan of subdivision approved in 1988 from the subject property in order for the townhouse proposal to proceed.

It is the opinion of the Community & Strategic Planning Department that the zone change application is consistent with Provincial Policy Statement and in general compliance with the policies of the Official Plan and can be supported from a planning point of view. Recommendation is to approve-in-principle the application in order for Council to fully consider the concerns raised by residents.

Written correspondence has been received from Heather McDonald on behalf of Paula Todd, 173 McKeand St.; Mr. Howard DeJong and Mrs. Martina DeJong (copy of correspondence attached hereto as Schedule "A" and "B" and form part of these Minutes.

Deputy Mayor Freeman indicates that the Study shows little impact traffic with the proposed 46 units.

RonVersteegen, County Planner notes that no study was undertaken for the 30 unit development and the Traffic Impact Study (TIS) report is based on the 46 units. The development does not require a SWM on site as the storm sewers there can handle the runoff. Gene McLaren notes that the SWM is to be handled through underground storage and orifices will reduce the flow on the site to the storm water system as approved in the previous site plan.

Mayor Holbrough questions if the TIS is available for Council or public viewing? Note: the Report is available for viewing.

Councillor McLeod inquires how this matter is before the Ontario Municipal Board at this point. Mr. Versteegen provides the background of the application and notes that the Planning Act allows for the applicant to appeal to the OMB should the application not be considered within 120 days.

Councillor Lesser notes that the lands are zoned for 30 units and that a 50% increase seems quite large. Ron Versteegen notes that there is a test in OP for density requirement and this application is within the guideline. (buffering can accommodate this)

Councillor Hunt questions how the storm sewer system can handle the runoff.

Len Reeves is pleased with the planning report and notes that neighbours should be provided with the background material for the increase from 30 to 46 units. The units are to be owned units not rentals (affordable) with Brian Conn as the builder. Mr. Reeves notes that the development on Garland Court is accommodating 30 units geared for seniors and retirees (14 rental senior on Garland Court and approved 24 units on King) sufficient to meet the needs for Seniors but there is still a shortage of affordable family units. The McKeand St. Site lends itself for family housing and seniors with amenities such as parks & schools.

Council addresses Mr. Reeves with the following questions & concerns:

Councillor McLeod is in favour of more density rather than urban sprawl and notes that he has no concerns at first blush and in favour of affordable housing but perhaps 46 is too much for this area with the additional 16 units there would be increased density and traffic. Should Council not approve the Zoning Amendment will the 30 units still be built? Mr. Reeves notes that there is no change in the 46 unit footprint from the 30 units and notes that more affordable housing is needed and locations are limited to meet the needs of the market at this time.

Councillor Van Kooten-Bossence queries if the developer would amend the plan to include a private road through the development to Dunn Court. Mr. Reeves initially did not think that this was an option but to do so would solve a lot of problems.

Deputy Mayor Freeman inquires as to the size and price of the units.

Councillor Fortner provides history of the site plan approval for the 30 units and the discussions pertaining to connecting to the lands south of Ossian Terrace.

Mayor Holbrough opens the floor to the public to receive comments and concerns.

Jim Winn, expresses concern that the prices of housing in this area are dropping due to townhouse proposal and requests clarification on the appeal process as it relates to the 120 days. Mr. Winn notes his opposition to this application and discusses the following issues:

- Snow removal storage area
- Fence construction as the playground area is proposed behind his dwelling and he works midnights.
- 1 storey and 2 storey buildings – why can't 2 storey be built on the street rather than behind his house and not looking into this property.

Mr. Howard DeJong notes that the previous problems with the proposed 30 unit development have been addressed; however expresses the following concerns with the new proposal:

- Traffic – dangers of traffic issues on McKeand – school bus will stop at this point and during winter traffic flow concern at R2 and R3 (all vacant lots gone)
- Second access not explored
- Affordable housing is needed but done properly
- Was offer to neighbours to purchase land for the extension of the road for only the land needed being approximately 15' or did the developer suggest a large part of the private property.
- Drainage – 4" pipe - does Delcan know how much water is up in this area that the proposed storm sewer may not be able to handle the natural flow of the water in addition to the drainage from this development as this land is built on an artisan well. He believes further investigation of this matter is warranted.
- Rights of residents to complain or address after the fact, the Notice states that those who do not voice their concerns loose the right to appeal to the OMB.
- When is council going to honour council's decision should a developer come in and check Zoning of the lands prior to purchasing.
- Feels like hostage taking
- Main concerns are traffic and drainage; fire resolved; ground water levels how preserve for UTRCA that depend on high water table.
- Is parkland required for this development as there is 2 small parks in close proximity but most of Garnet Elliott Park is going to disappear.
- Increased speed of traffic on McKeand
- There has been an increase in crime as this is a regular pathway out of Hillside to McKeand to Bell St. and with further families moving into the area, crime will further increase.

Mayor Holbrough notes that each Planning Application is reviewed on its own merit. Administration is aware that water is close to the surface and that this issue would be reviewed during the Site Plan Process and addressed at this time.

Councillor McLeod states that Council does honour its decision but issues and proposals do change and Developers have a right to change their development plans through the planning process.

Dale Vince, 6 Hillside questions as to what point Council will decide there is sufficient units on the site and the property values on surrounding homes have decreased sufficiently to not approve further applications. Mayor Holbrough notes that the planning process provides guidance.

Tom O'Neill, 39 Hillside notes that Council has not made a decision at this point and this is a means to consider the application and therefore, he is requesting Council not approve the application. Residents have needs as does the developer per the market requirements. Mr. O'Neill suggests that the fire route become a private road rather than a walkway with removable bollards and questions how the need for a park is determined. He informs Council that he does not want 46 units built in this area but wants the land to be developed in a way it fits into the community as he had full knowledge when he bought that there was a proposal for 30 unit development and sees no need to increase to 46 units. Does this mean that in another 2 years, that the Developer could apply for 60 units? Mr. O'Neill suggests that the Developer build what is approved and in conformity with the area. Safety is a concern and that the proposed increase will impact on all infrastructure and amenities.

Mayor Holbrough notes that there is a criteria for when park is created within a development. Mr. Versteegen reviews the options for required parkland as outlined in the Planning Act. The proposed play area is designated for the residents within this development as there are parks in close proximity to the development that satisfies the Official Plan requirement.

Elaine Frizelle, 272 Victoria notes that they have resided at this location for 41 years and that her lot is 286' deep and goes up the hill. She expresses concern about the drainage from the development and the lack of privacy with 2 storey units to the rear of her property. The previous plan had 1.5 units looking down into her land now there is proposed approximately 3 units being 2 storey in height and not even a fence will provide privacy.

Chris Pare, 12 Hillside notes that unit 15 (proposed 2 storey) will abut to their property and that they will lose their privacy. Further concerns pertain to safety due to the elevation of Hillside and McKeand. He states that the Brine works well but need to go out 4x a day and sometimes he still cannot make it up the hill and needs to go around. He asks that Council deny the application. When he purchased his home, he was advised that a 30 unit (1 storey) adult living development was proposed for the land to the rear of

his property; however, this application is for family units (1 and 2 storey units) and the area may see an increase in crime with low income property owners together with a loss of privacy.

Jorge Cota 155 McKeand St commends the development of low income housing for Ingersoll but suggests that the development be built elsewhere in town as McKeand St. is a small street and that the safety in the winter months is of concern. He urges Council to reject the application for 46 units. He encourages Council to have consideration for the residents as they pay your wages and vote for you.

Erin Attridge 168 McKeand St. bought in October and would have reconsidered if this development had been on the books at that time. Their land is 246' deep and would appreciate Council maintaining the 30 units to protect their privacy as 46 units will not afford privacy.

Adriana Allair, 252 Victoria queries when the TIS was completed, storage of snow and where is garbage is going to be located.

Paula Todd is offended at Reeves diversionary tactic and that the TIS studies were paid by him that is a conflict of interest and the proposed change to 46 units together with water level. There could be Insurance issues if water from the 46 slide down street will the town assume responsibility if flooding washes out the corner of our walls at bottom of hill. Ms. Todd notes that her concerns outlined in a letter are spelled out and Council needs to consider the good of the town not profit for the developer. People take ownership and the town should have Mr. Reeves take ownership for the zoned land that he purchased.

John Brown, 172 McKeand indicates that the traffic study and snow conditions are not his concern but questions when was the TIS completed. Does the TIS consider and address the speed on McKeand.

Ron Versteegen provides a summary of the TIS – evaluate traffic count existing and assessment of the local road conditions intersections and apply scenario with full built development and impact up to a 10 year projection and review existing road network and make recommendation for improvements if needed does not assess speed this is a enforcement issue.

Suni Ball, 171 North Town Line cautions Council to consider density of parkland and the loss of Garnet Elliott parkland.

Councillor Fortner calls for a point of order as this is not regarding this application

Jon Cussons, 278 Victoria considers the development too large of a density with an influx of more school children together with people looking into his backyard. Prefers to have the approved 30 units and make it a viable project rather than the 46 proposed. Access is

dangerous and proposed that an access to Dunn Court be considered. Mr. Cussons recommends denial of the application or reduce the number of infilling units.

A list of those in attendance at these meetings is attached hereto and form a part of the Minutes

ADJOURNMENT

Moved by Councillor McLeod; seconded by Councillor Hunt

P10-07-012 That the public meeting to be held pursuant to Section 34(12) of the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, as amended, on the on applications submitted by Reeves Realty Corporation, File No. ZON 6-09-04 be hereby closed.

CARRIED

9:08 PM

Paul Holbrough, Mayor

Elaine Clark, Clerk

Elaine Clark

From: Ron Versteegen [rversteegen@county.oxford.on.ca]
Sent: Friday, July 09, 2010 3:59 PM
To: pholbrough@ingersoll.ca; James Timlin ; Elaine Clark
Cc: Ann Meyer
Subject: FW: Applicant Reeves Realty Corporation File # ZON-6-09-4

Comments for Council's consideration.

Ron Versteegen, MCIP, RPP
 Development Planner
 Community and Strategic Planning
 County of Oxford
 Phone: 519-539-9800
 Direct Line: 519-539-0015 ext. 3214
 Email: rversteegen@county.oxford.on.ca

This email communication is CONFIDENTIAL AND LEGALLY PRIVILEGED. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify me at the telephone number shown above or by return email and delete this communication and any copy immediately. Thank you.



Think about our Environment. Print only if necessary

From: Howard De Jong [mailto:howard.dejong@sympatico.ca]
Sent: Friday, July 09, 2010 2:09 PM
To: planning@county.oxford.on.ca
Subject: FW: Applicant Reeves Realty Corporation File # ZON-6-09-4

From: Howard De Jong [mailto:howard.dejong@sympatico.ca]
Sent: Friday, July 09, 2010 1:52 PM
To: howard.dejong@sympatico.ca
Subject: Applicant Reeves Realty Corporation File # ZON-6-09-4

To the honourable members of Council and your Worship the mayor and those in attendance at the hearing meeting regarding Reeves Realty Corporation.

I take serious issue with the notice statement, and I quote
 "Please be advised that Council may approve, modify or refuse the requested zone change at the meeting. If you do NOT attend or are not represented at the meeting. Council may proceed and may not advise you of any proposed modifications. If a by-law is approved, notice of passing of the by-law will be mailed or published in a local newspaper. If a person or public body that files an appeal of a decision of the Town of Ingersoll in respect of the proposed zoning by-law does not make oral submissions at a public meeting or make written submissions to the Town of Ingersoll before the proposed zoning by-law is adopted, the Ontario Municipal Board may dismiss all or part of the appeal."

Mr. mayor and honourable members of council I would like to suggest that the neighboring group of approximately fifty or so households have regularly been well represented regarding proposed changes to this property. We the neighborhood have all accepted councils' decisions although the last one very begrudgingly, and haven't taken said decisions to the OMB. At least four times to a hearing/decision making evening such as this and all the times spent by

all of us researching problems. I feel we the collective group of neighbors are the ones being held hostage to this rule, we are the ones following councils decisions, we show up to these meetings, raise our concerns under this premise, because if we don't we lose the right to appeal to OMB. That's quite a threat, all of us affected property owners in the area have been quite diligent each time to show and raise our concerns although limited usually to one question each to move the meeting along.

MY First QUESTION THEN IS IF WE, THE EXISTING RESIDENTS LOSE THE RIGHT TO APPEAL, THE PREVIOUS FOUR RULINGS, AND THIS ONE, WHEN DOES A NEW PROPERTY OWNER/APPLICANT, SUCH AS THIS, WHEN DO THEY HAVE TO FOLLOW THE SAME RULES !!!!!!!!!!!!!!! We the resident people of the area are the ones who are following the "said" rules, Council is not sticking to their previous decisions, and new property owners are the ones let off with NO responsibility to checking zoning before they purchase. Who gets that luxury? We all had to check that out for our properties, we follow the rules, WHY not these people?

MY Second QUESTION THEN IS AT THE LAST COUNCIL MEETING, ADDRESSING THIS PROPERTY, Council chose to increase the proposed density, Council did change the Zoning to accommodate the previous proposal, from an R-2 to an R-3special, and if you check the minutes of the last meeting it was raised in the meeting, and still lives on in taped copies of local Rogers cable. Concerns from the floor asked of council that once this was turned to an R-3special, what would stop the developer from coming back, re-applying, coming to a point where "he" was crying the blues saying he needed more units to be profitable. COUNCILS RESPONSE Was that those situations could not happen based on an R-3 special if at that time they agreed to it. Please address this.

All other questions are related to the proposed development itself and in many cases are similar to those previously addressed at other council meetings, regarding this property. Most appearing in the meeting at which council voted for a change from an R-2 to an R-3special.

THIRD Experts from the town were requested for input regarding traffic during the second last zoning change attempt. This council meeting was presented with the total amount of traffic which would have to enter McKeand st in the very middle of the steepest hill in the town of Ingersoll, no other roadways exist, nor have been increased in this application. At that time there was still an empty lot in the subdivision immediately West of the development which could have solved the single access but the applicant chose not to act to use this secondary access. At that time the approx. 30 houses with an average of two cars per would be sixty cars entering that hill exactly where people start sliding backwards on slippery winter days. It was stated by a councilor in response that it was an accident waiting to happen. What has changed? Now we are applying for 46 units and fifteen visitors, totaling 107 potential vehicles.

Fourth Representations were made at the last council meeting by Fire chief Darryl Parker. Concerns were raised by the public that the design didn't allow for proper turning radius for the fire truck. Chief Parker addressed this situation. The developer stated that he needed the space with extra units to keep the project viable but after the decision agreed to make alterations to accommodate the fire truck. If it wasn't possible then at presentation, then from 30 plus units was dropped to 30 to accommodate, how does 46 work a couple of years later? Have our fire trucks gotten smaller or have other necessary things been taken out?

Fifth Ground water levels, previous applicants mostly appeared unaware of the very high ground water levels existing on the property. After the meeting alterations were made to eliminate this ground water. Large drainage and catchment and excavation areas were suggested to handle the water. My question is: IT IS Fine to find ways to eliminate the high water levels with drainage plans for the developer but what about neighbors who have learned to live with the high ground water, planted specific fruit and nut producing trees that depend on a close water table. Past plans involved deep excavating alongside of some neighbor properties with a retaining wall without maintaining their neighbors ground water levels.

*Att: Paul Holbrough v City Council
Send Delivered July 6 - 2:05*

Mr. Gordon K. Hough, MCIP, RPP
Community and Strategic Planning Office – County of Oxford
P.O.Box 1614, 21 Reeve St.
Woodstock, Ont.

Re: ZON 6-09-4 Reeves Realty Corporation

I am writing to request that my concerns re the above noted Application for Zone Change to amend the existing “Special Residential Type 3 (R3-14)” be raised and recorded and that I be notified of any current or future meetings re this subject.

DENSITY – ‘SPECIAL RESIDENTIAL TYPE’

With each new purchaser of this property, there appears to be an increase in the number of units that are to be built on this parcel of land. It is now proposed that it be raised from 30 to 46. The density regulations have been pushed to the maximum level for this size of property. We have recently had one of our major parks expropriated to provide a site for a new regional school. No comparable green space within our community has been set aside to offset this loss. Over and above this concern, there would appear to be a disproportionate amount of high density housing within my immediate area. I believe it should be distributed in a more balanced manner across the township. I do not feel that continually approving variances re lot size, parking, green spaces, grading etc. is the solution as it diminishes our level of enjoyment of our property by increasing noise, traffic, and a denser population.

GRADING

I understand that a portion of the land abutting the southern edge of my property is to be lowered while the western edge is to be raised significantly. Dropping the property to the south will seriously lower the water table, which is 3 ft. from the surface and will have a substantial impact on the vegetation. The intent is to raise the land level by 6 ft. at the rear of my property to meet Dunn Ct. Road, thereby providing access for emergency vehicles only, with removable bollards to block normal traffic. The contractors have designated this area as excess parking and for the storage of salted snow plowed of the roads. Oddly enough, half of the snow storage area is on the opposite side of the removable bollards and would be inaccessible unless they drove over the parked cars or removed the bollards, thereby negating the “Emergency Vehicles Only” designation. The grade length is relatively short for the required rise to meet Dun Court Road and has what looks to be about a 90 degree turn at the top, into a subdivision. I question the ability of fire trucks to maneuver this approach in the summer, never mind in winter when there will be overflow parking, piles of plowed snow and removable bollards.

The intent is to store the salty snow from the road clearing against my property line to the south and west, which in the spring will trigger a salty run off that will have a damaging

impact on the grass and trees on my property. I understand all road maintenance/clearing and the collection of run-off water will be the responsibility of the Condo Association. Should there be future issues regarding road safety, accessibility for emergency vehicles, safety concerns about exit planning for residents, property damage or a personal injury claim, will the Condo Board have the resources available to them, to meet financial obligations and ensure all issues are dealt with in a timely and acceptable manner. Should it be deemed that poor design of unit accessibility in case of fire, insufficient alternate exits for residents, or high risk traffic approaches played any part in future potential claims, will the township be liable in any capacity as they approved the plan?

TRAFFIC FLOW

There is only one entrance/exit to the development, on the side of a hill that is treacherous in the winter and has a high rate of collisions. When there is a skim of snow or ice on the hill, it is extremely difficult to stop at the bottom of the hill and avoid having cars slide through the intersection. With 50 or more vehicles entering and exiting the traffic flow mid way down the hill I believe it will greatly increase the risk of accidents and potential personal injury. I understand that a traffic assessment study was completed and approved by a London firm (paid for by the developer) and they deemed the single entrance/exit to be satisfactory. I understand Jean McLaren, an Engineer for the Town of Ingersoll, will review the assessment and report to Council. As a constant user of McKeand St., and well aware of the winter hazards on the hill, I believe my safety and the safety of my family will be put at risk.

FIRE/EMERGENCY ACCESS

With one entrance/exit and a completely fenced development, should there ever be a fire towards the front of the development, how would residents exit as the entire development will be enclosed with a fence and the other roadway would be the only approach for emergency vehicles? The firemen would have to fight any blaze at the rear of a unit, from the front as there is no access for fire trucks towards the back i.e. between the fence and unit #1 there is 3.88 m, others being 6 m with turns that I doubt a fire truck could make. I would request that the Fire Chief sign off on their emergency response ability to access all parts of this development prior to approval of the re-zoning.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

I request that an environmental impact review be undertaken by the Upper Thames Conservation Authority to define the impact of this development relevant to grading and subsequent impact on the water table which is currently 3 ft from the surface? How will it impact the aqua fer? The run off water and the plowed snow will eventually be drained into the municipal disposal system, what is the developer's plan to deal with this issue prior to the water reaching that point and is it environmentally suitable?

PERSONAL ISSUES

I understand that all the topsoil will be scrapped off and stored on the south side of my property directly beside my garage, for future use in landscaping. Due to the quantity involved, it will represent a small mountain of soil that over the duration of the construction – which could represent several years, will create water and mud running down against the side of my wooden structure with the potential of rotting the wood.

The plan calls for the property to be fenced, however that is generally the last step in a development and I would ask that it be installed immediately along the southern edge of my property due to the fact that I have a severely handicapped son who should not be denied the use of the yard for the duration of the development. Previously I was told that they would put up a temporary shorter fence, (snow fence) this will not ensure his safety as it is too short and unstable.

What is the intended use of the Amenity Area – is it to be maintained as a small park/green space, playground for children, or a storage area for equipment. Apparently, as it stands, it will be a green space with no structures slated. Once the development is complete, can this be enforced or could it possibly be used to store equipment?

I believe that the density, access, grading and water issues will impact significantly on the value, safety and enjoyment of my property and would like these concerns addressed prior to approval.

Sincerely,

Paula Todd
173 McKeand St.
Ingersoll, Ont.
July 5, 2010



c.c. Mr. Euken Lui – Manager OMB
416-326-5363

SIGN-IN LIST

FOR

Public Hearing – July 12, 2010

Reeves Realty Corporation
McKeand St., Ingersoll, ON

Please Print Clearly!

NAME	ADDRESS	POSTAL CODE
FRASER PARSONS	175 King HIRAM ST	N5C 1G9
ELAINE FRIZELLE	274 VICTORIA ST.	N5C 2W4
Steve DeCours	7 RIVERVIEW RD.	N5C 4B5
SUNI BALL	171 NORTH TOWN LANE	N5C 2S77
NOV CUSSON.	278 VICTORIA ST	N5C-2W4
HOWARD DEJONG	166 MCKEAND ST	N5C 3H9
SEAN ATTRIDGE	168 MCKEAND ST	N5C 3H9
Erin Attridge	168 MCKEAND	N5C 3H9
JORGE COSTA	155 Mc Keand St.	N5C 3J1
Maria Costa	11	11
Tine DeJong	166 M'Keand	N5C3H9
Adriana Allair	252 Victoria St.	N5C 2W7
Jason Allair	252 Victoria St.	N5C 2W7

SIGN-IN LIST

FOR

Public Hearing – July 12, 2010
Reeves Realty Corporation
McKeand St., Ingersoll, ON

Please Print Clearly!

NAME	ADDRESS	POSTAL CODE
Chris Hotchkiss	14 Hillside Rd	N5C4B5
Chris Paro	12 Hillside Rd	N5C4B5
Dianne Harnett	172 McKeand St.	N5C3H9
John Brown	172 McKeand St.	N5C3H9
PAULA TODD	173 MCKEAND ST	N5C3J1
WALLY TODD	" "	" "
DALL VINE	6 Hillside	N5C4B5