STEVE CLARKE & THE EMERGENCY-ACCESS QUESTION

The Tort Lacuna concern, in plain language

JOHN TAIT'S PERSONAL QUESTION

“Why would I vote for anyone who, in my view, shows total disregard for taxpayers' well-being?”

The concern we raised

John Tait's 2023 Tort Lacuna / Letter of Intent warned that development affecting the family's private driveway could remove a route to North Shore residents and delay police, fire or ambulance access. It raised neighbours' safety alongside the family's proposed land use. [1]

FROM THE HISTORICAL NOTICE

“This action would deny our emergency services timely access to the North Shore residents.”

This is the concern expressed in John Tait's notice, not a verified emergency-response-time assessment. [1]

The solution we proposed

The family's account says it kept the driveway available while proposing four lots with a registered right-of-way for neighbours. John retains a four-page driveway-use agreement. The request concerned an actual access arrangement and a proposed way to preserve it. [1-2]

The responses John describes

John reports that written responses from the emergency services indicated, in substance, that they could not comment. He retains Word copies. He separately recalls OPP Superintendent Yateman telephoning, being reluctant to provide a letter of support for residents, and saying the matter was not the mayor's responsibility. John says he received no response from Steve Clarke at that time. [3]

John Tait's opinion

“In my opinion, the response to this emergency-access concern, including the absence of a reply from Steve Clarke at the time, fell short of the leadership residents should expect. For that reason, I consider him unsuitable for public office.”

This is John's political assessment. Mr. Clarke is invited to identify any response, referral or action taken and the records supporting it.

WHO ADVISED WHOM?

Questions for officials and emergency-service leaders

YELLOW NOTICE

Did anyone advise or direct the officials or emergency services we approached to decline support for our emergency-access request?

If so:

1. Who gave that advice, when, and why?

2. Did existing or proposed Greenlands restrictions influence it?

3. What were affected landowners told about those restrictions, and when?

Please identify the emails, meeting notes, instructions or other records that answer these questions.

John's position is that his family raised a practical safety concern without having been advised of the restrictions affecting its proposed solution. Whether anyone instructed officials to decline support, or whether Greenlands restrictions influenced their responses, remains an unanswered question. [3]

Supporting records held

John confirms that he retains Word copies of the concerns raised and responses received, together with the four-page driveway-use agreement. His recollection of Yateman's telephone call is recorded separately. The original emergency-service reply emails have not been located in the search completed for this issue; that does not establish that they were lost.

The agreement transcript in EVI-02 contains a 2017-2022 five-year term and blank execution fields. John describes a yearly arrangement. The retained executed agreement and any renewals should establish the applicable terms; this issue therefore calls it the 'driveway-use agreement'.

Source and record notes

[1] APPENDED IN FULL: *Tort Lacuna / Letter of Intent*, December 17, 2023 email; EVI-01, pages 1-3. Names and allegations are preserved as the author's account. The retained email is addressed to a Watershed mailbox; it does not independently prove delivery to each named official.

[2] *Open Discussion with Mayor*, November 24, 2023 email to Mark Taylor; EVI-02, pages 2-6 (account and proposal), pages 7-12 (agreement transcript). It is not an acknowledgment by Steve Clarke.

[3] John Tait's account and confirmation of retained records, October 5, 2026. Exact quotations from the emergency-service replies await review of those copies.

Responses, records and corrections: info.watersheddebacle@gmail.com

Tort Lacuna / Letter of Intent

Janes Lane Safety Issues

Source subject	LETTER OF INTENT
Email date	Sun, 17 Dec 2023 19:19:17 -0500
From	John Tait <jbh.tait@gmail.com>
To	watersheddebacle@gmail.com

About this copy

Prepared on October 3, 2026 from the original email retained in John Tait's mailbox. The following pages reproduce the complete plain-text email body. Wording, spelling and punctuation are retained; line wrapping, spacing and emphasis have been reformatted for reading. This is a transcription, not a screenshot or a newly signed declaration.

This copy records an email to watersheddebacle@gmail.com. The body lists “Mr. Steve Clark” among officials the author states were notified. These email headers do not themselves document delivery to Mr. Clarke.

Source Message-ID
<CAHGiLbVVhVTRhd2qw2jzwmgLRNSgtgU4USFpbtSs5fosnVdRSg@mail.gmail.com>

PDF prepared for John Tait | WatershedDebacle.ca

LETTER OF INTENT

RE: JANES LANE SAFETY ISSUES

TAIT FAMILY DECLARATION and NOTICE TO SEVERN OFFICIALS

The Tait family are the owners of a property known as 2715 Janes Lane in Severn Township. Janes Lane is a private road. (see documents)

The Tait family, on several occasions, have attempted to sever some lots for investment purposes, as shown with the documents contained in this affidavit.

Development in accordance with a deeded by-law attachment to the Tait property, would close off the Tait driveway. This action would deny our emergency services timely access to the North Shore residents.

At a preliminary level, we invited officials to support the solution. This is in keeping with OUR on-going due diligence. These government officials appear to have avoided any attempts to put forth recommendations that would serve and protect the community at large. Officials are ignoring THEIR mission statements. This evasive attitude only hampers the efficiency and safety of our frontline responders who would actually be working against the clock.

The officials, named within, have denied any responsibility to the taxpayer's peaceful possession of their property. This position completely ignores their own mission declarations. (see documents)

As shown within this instrument, by official communication, the Tait family in conjunction with the North Shore Corporation has attempted to negotiate a deal with the township which ensures the safety of the neighboring community known as the North Shore Corporation. The Tait family would negotiate a fair barter with the planning department and deed a right-of-way along that driveway to the North Shore Road. We actually thought this would be a no-brainer.

As shown by contained documents, the residents within this corporate community, particularly those in the most southerly point of this private road, are faced with life and real property concerns.

If the Tait family is forced to disregard our neighbor's dilemma, as the following named officials have done, we, the Tait family, are waiving our responsibility to any North Shore Corporation litigation in the future, that may be incurred as a result of untimely emergency service that results in death, grievous bodily harm, or property loss.

We have done our due diligence by offering a simple solution therefore any final decision that may be rendered by a court of law will be based on our submission of documentation.

This declaration will be delivered to the appropriate policy holders and their Insurance representatives, should litigation ever become a factor. This is not of an immediate concern, as we do have a safety contract in place with North Shore pending resolve.

TORT NEGLIGENCE

"When the evidence shows that a lacuna in professional practice exists by which risks of grave danger are knowingly taken, then, however small the risk, the court must anxiously examine that lacuna—particularly if the risk can be easily and inexpensively avoided. If the court finds, on an analysis of the reasons given for not taking those precautions that, in the light of current professional knowledge, there is no proper basis for the lacuna, and that it is definitely not reasonable that those risks should have been taken, its function is to state that fact and where necessary to state that it constitutes negligence. In such a case the practice will no doubt thereafter be altered to the benefit of patients."

The following officials were duly notified on the dates specified by the documents herein.

1. Senior Planner for Severn On. Ms. Katie Mandeville

2. Senior Planner for Severn On. Ms. Andrea Woodrow

3. The Orillia Mayor Mr. Steve Clark

4. The OPP Superintendent Mr. Coyer Yateman

5. The Severn Fire Chief Mr. Tim Cranny

5. Simcoe Paramedic Services Chief

Mr. Andrew Roberts

By this instrument the Tait family (named below) acknowledges the documented facts surrounding the circumstances, and the family’s attempts to rectify the situation.

We the undersigned, claim zero negligence or responsibility in the face of a tragedy.

John Tait (husband) Donna Tait (spouse)

)

Sworn before me at _____ this day of _____ 20 _____

Signed _____

John Tait _____ Donna Tait _____