

April 5, 2017

From  
Steve Mallory  
Summertime Properties Limited

To  
Andrew Tees  
Canacre Field Services Manager

Re: new information on Road Allowance ownership

Hello Andrew

Since we last spoke I have been continuing to work on this Henvey Hydro Line situation. Although others will read this letter, I send it addressed to you because you are the sixth Canacre Rep to speak to me and the only one who has been able to arrange for a Henvey decision maker, Chris Gatien, for a meeting on Mar 9, 2017. A meeting which I have requested from the beginning through each other Canacre rep.

As you know the proposal from Henvey is to put this easement on the old road allowance adjacent to and 85 feet into our very active private land development and gravel pit area.

When we met I explained to Chris and yourself that I feel the most suitable place for the easement is fully on the Fowler property east of us--whose land it travels through in the adjacent northerly properties. As you know I have mentioned that to all Canacre reps since that route was first proposed.

You mentioned that time was a concern. As you know I did not relate to the time reason as I expressed my concern to Henvey at the beginning with no communication re this concern. Lets for the moment relate to time anyway. You and Chris mentioned that the reason time was a concern was that environmental studies would not have been done on the property just east of us on the east side of the old road allowance which is Lot 15 Con. 3 McDougall Twp. You said "it's all about PINs". You both mentioned that the studies take a while to complete.

I have copied a couple of deeds and my lawyer has pulled the pin maps for that area. I am attaching a copy of each of these for reference. The two old deeds show where the road allowance adjacent to us was purchased by previous owners in 1889 & also shown in 1959. The most important information is PIN map number [REDACTED] indicating that what used to be the old road allowance between [REDACTED] along our full eastern border is in fact merged with the balance of the Fowler old pit property on the same PIN number. **Because the environmental studies would have been done on the old road allowance section which is on [REDACTED] then those environmental studies have also been done on the same [REDACTED] for the whole property to the east where the hydro easement can be put.**

I am presuming that Henvey did not obtain environmental studies on [REDACTED] but did obtain them on [REDACTED] which is the road allowance north of us between Lot 15 & 16 Con 4. It would have been even simpler if the studies had been done on 0260.

I am assuming, then, that the easement route in Con 4 Lot 16, [REDACTED] (which is North of us), travels southerly encompassing the still public road allowance as well as 84 ft. west of the road

allowance (Fowler property) to our property line. As previously mentioned, at the N E corner of our property the extra 84 feet beyond the road allowance width should not be on our property. This Con 3 section of what was an old road allowance is now owned by Fowlers as confirmed by PIN. The full easement should be on Fowler property and would then be 150 feet on Fowler property easterly of our eastern boundary travelling south to Scullion road. Because there is not a road allowance there any more, the full 150 feet is on Fowler property which is Lot 15 Con. 3 [REDACTED] on which environmental studies will have been done.

At the NE corner of our property, [REDACTED], for the easement to maintain adequate width I will provide a small triangle or block shape easement section, as needed. I will also do the same, if it is required, at our SE corner where the line crosses Scullion road. I am confident that environmental studies will have been completed on all of these PIN numbers so time is not an issue. Affected property [REDACTED]

Because those studies have been completed on all relative PIN 's, as Henvey was required to do, the extra time that would have been required for them still to be done on the Fowler pit property is not necessary. Therefore, would you please send this to those that make the decisions. I am anticipating from this information that the line can be mapped out east of our property except possibly at the corners.

This is the route that I have suggested from the beginning. It is a much better route for both Henvey and for us and probably cheaper for Henvey (more open land, less flooded land, no extensive compensation for us, no legal proceedings, a quick settlement ), with no additional line distance.

I am also sending this information to the government bodies that I mentioned to you earlier that I have been in communication with.

If someone from Henvey had communicated with me on this from the beginning, I would not have had to spend the extensive time and money in research and formulating this letter. If a face to face meeting had occurred with Henvey decision makers, with both parties having mutual respect and consideration, this likely would have been settled satisfactorily a long time ago. Henvey also would have benefited by my knowledge of this land as not many people know the terrain as well as I do being a land holder and land developer in that area.

Andrew I would like to know if the decision makers concur with what I have said and that they will proceed this way. If you could have someone get back to me as soon as possible I would appreciate it. Thank You.

Steve Mallory, President  
Summertime Properties Limited

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

P.S.--If you think a meeting would be productive, feel free to give me a call and we will set up a time.