

Sept 25th,2023

Brandon Area Planning

Attn Andrew Mok

It has come to attention thru the Housing First letter and also a letter today from the City that a variation has been applied for by Ms Sigurdson current owner of 2211 Rosser Ave.

As long-time residents of 2141 Rosser Ave through the years we have seen a number of alarming problems with the 2211 Rosser property. Vandalism, drugs, alcohol, non bylaw compliance, the highest rate of 911 calls in Brandon for City Police, Fire and Ambulance, people overdosing on the street, tenants standing urinating off the back stairs, littering, extreme bad language and it just goes on. When it just about burned down we made the 911 call to save it. Numerous residents and professionals said we should just let it burn. But we refused to put our good neighbours at risk of loosing their property.

The people brought to the neighbourhood by the tenants include gun carrying tenants, a 3<sup>rd</sup> degree manslaughter warranted person, people who broke in to our properties etc. Not a good look. The owner had a live "manager" who got no respect and seemed some what handicapped. The house was a disaster. If one takes the time to read back in history we wrote a letter ( Nov 21, 2004 to Bdn Area Planning) predicting the outcome 2211 has suffered.

So what has this to do with the variance. As neighbours we are not prepared to have another 20 years of the disrespectful neighbour program provided by the owner, tenants and City who was always behind the power curve to ever resolve an issue. For the record Ms Sigurdson was not brought into alignment by the City regarding the property but by the neighbourhood engaging the Manitoba Justice Safer Communities program.

So what do we think? Well let's see the guard rails the City will set on this property.


1. How will the property be kept up? If the standard degrades will they be dealt with by Bylaw and not handed a "get out of bylaw free pass". Bylaw is a sorry bunch who ticket the strong and leave the weak alone.
2. Where is the business plan for this venture? Banks don't give money without a business plan and Mr Mok says they have failed to provide one.
3. What is the training and background of the people who will run the program? Are the employees paid? Or just volunteers?
4. How does the organization control the 45 and up age limit? What prevents them from adjusting such? What's the penalty for noncompliance?
5. Are the tenants keyed in? How's visiting work? Who has keys and who controls the door? Last round it was open for 24 months straight.
6. How is building security controlled? Does it become a BPS problem? Or is security not important? I suspect the people to the north in the Pacific Ave complex would be concerned and we know we are concerned for our young grand children.
7. Where's the funding coming from? Part of the business plan? Is it gov't, private or the bank? If it runs out then what? Does it revert back to the hobo flop house it was a year ago?

8. Does the owner, maintenance company and Housing 1<sup>st</sup> put them selves out in front of neighbours to make sure that this is a model property that's squeaky clean or just another place to park bodies so they can pat them selves on the back and take their money?
9. Who audits this organization to let the public know that they are making the benchmark? Part of the business plan and a plan to create an environment that makes sure the project functions within the neighbourhood is achieving goals and proving such. That takes auditing.
10. Parking? I believe that apartment owners must provide 1.5 spots per unit holder. Does the overflow become a parking problem already in a neighbourhood with parking issues from the university?
11. What happens when and if the property is sold? Does the variance travel on with the sale. If it does what prevents the next owner from abusing the variance. Morley Mabon previous owner sold to Ms Sigurdsson and that variance was in perpetuity. No guard rails at the time. An imminent failure now.

I find it interesting in the Housing 1<sup>st</sup> letter that they describe traffic as decreasing. That's because Brandon Maintenance removed all tenants so the building could be rehabbed not because a stellar group of residents were living in it. Well the decreased traffic was welcomed it only speaks to "no residents equal significantly less police, fire and ambulance calls".

This letter is being sent not to admonish what could be done but rather to ask the questions to find out if it fits within the neighbourhood. Should we not be able to attend the meeting we like to be on the record 20 years latter asking the tough questions that need to be asked. Until all these questions can be answered we'd suggest the Brandon Development Services is incapable of making an informed decision that effects the local neighbourhood

Sincerely

   
David Wall Karen Wall

2141 Rosser Ave  
Brandon, Mb