

Letters

DEAR EDITOR:

Sutton's Municipal council has failed to respect the basic principles of transparency expected by its citizens. As he said himself to the media and at a public meeting early March, Mayor Louis Dandenault convened developers, surveyors, excavators and real estate agents last fall, asking them to participate in a closed-door meeting to hear their grievances. He did not specify whether the invitation was initiated at the request of an individual or a group. But it certainly was not publicized nor was it open to all. In favoring one interest group or several individuals over others, it has the appearance of a flagrant lack of judgment on the part of a public administration.

In addition, there was a clear lack of effort on the part of the town to inform the public about the consultation meeting held on March 21st. Ville de Sutton did the strict minimum and published a public notice as required by law not taking advantage of the Internet, social media or even their own website. The meeting finally aborted after too many concerned residents showed up, thanks to the effort deployed, not by the Town Council, but by a network of residents who rose to the occasion and efficiently relayed the information.

In spite of the fact that we are in full preparation for the public consultation rescheduled for Saturday, April 11, we have had

to deal with Sutton Town Hall offices being closed for two days due to relocation and two more days for the Easter holiday. No relevant documentation has been posted on Sutton's website other than the 300 pages of regulations in French. The sketches of the areas targeted by regulatory changes cannot be seen on the City's website or on the public notice issued by Le Guide.

With so many by-law changes, the openness and the transparency of the consultation process must be guaranteed, by ensuring the full participation of all Sutton taxpayers.

Last March 21, Mayor Dandenault has announced his intention to respect the 114-1 Urban Planning Program and facilitate access to home ownership.

However, he proposed to divide lots in two to increase population density of rural zones and of those situated between 350 and 550 meters. He also proclaimed his desire to increase the market for properties over \$400,000 after claiming he wishes to facilitate property acquisition by young families! Yet he makes no clear assessment of the real estate situation in Sutton and the province of Quebec. The impression emerging from the upcoming revision process for the zoning and subdivision by-laws suggests an apparent conflict of interest. Could this constitute a barely veiled intent to enrich a small group of individuals?

Other proposed changes allows for the creation of private

entrances of unlimited length and on steeper slopes. They run the risk of increasing soil erosion and furthering fragmentation of the forest. On this count, we are deeply concerned that the Town Council is showing a complete absence of judgment and vision, ignoring its own citizens' environmental and security concerns as well as showing an equal lack of concern for the additional expenses generated by the proposed Bylaw changes.

For all the above reasons, we declare that the integrity of our territory is being unduly threatened and we unanimously ask for the withdrawal of Bylaws 254 and 256.

DOMINIQUE PARENT
SUTTON

The letter was also signed by 20 other residents of Sutton.

DEAR EDITOR:

Coincidentally, the Bank of Montreal released the statistic that only 20 per cent of the Canadian population could afford to set aside any savings in 2014 on the same day as the beginning of the Mike Duffy trial. Duffy, Wallin, Brazeau, etc.

It's time to abolish the Senate completely or to severely reform it to get rid of most of the "pigs at the trough."

HENRY MUSTY
COOKSHIRE