

I have been a citizen of London for 80 years now, living in and/or working in the city. In South London, in 1945 I believe, the population was about 90,000 and as an 11 or 12 year old, I biked safely all over the city, traffic didn't seem to be an issue and all streets seemed to be all well-forested, creeks ran in the open down in vegetated valleys in most cases.

This city needs to keep some of its past picture and the London Plan needs to emphasize things that will make people want to stay here and come to live here even in tough economic times.

Generally I feel we need to work harder to keep the Forest City more than a lip service catch phrase. In the plan we need to continue to plant more vegetation but also need to keep more of the trees that we do have.

We need a tree-cutting bylaw with big teeth to prevent decimating woodlots that could be kept as part of the Forrest City. Included here are smaller wooded areas and other types of vegetation that may have a rare type of habitat for this area and/or Ontario. Hedgerows that have healthy vegetation are also becoming rare, support a lot of species and provide a safer corridor between areas These could in some part be kept instead of removal just to expedite construction

Vegetation beautifies an area at any time of the year as well as being habitat.

Another attraction to people is city architecture. Not all buildings are pleasant to the eyes but rare types of old buildings tell of our history and how we regard it. An antique like Blackfriars Bridge should be kept because it is scenic and historic, few of the old bridges remain.

New bridges should have some form or shape other than lumps of gray concrete. They should have solid sides that allow seeing what you are passing over so you see what the Thames River looks like.

Apartments of any height should be built to beautify their surrounding in some way, not detract from the area. This should be part of The Plan. Rows or whole areas of ugly building do not make this a place where people want to come. Developers may need some incentives to make this happen. An example of this is the area of student residences on Sarnia Rd., that are quite attractive so I am sure this could be done through The Plan.

2.

Public Green Space:

p. 184 says public access to green space should not have a negative effect. This also appears in this document in several places as negative impact especially where referring to any development in environmental NHS areas. This needs to be much clearer as to exactly what negative effect and impact mean.

How do we keep track of this after the development? There should be monitoring to determine if the same mistake is being made over and over, before it actually becomes a problem.

Another Term p. 184 (7.0) in appropriate locations only. This is not really defined and has NO teeth to define 'appropriate'.

p. 185 - Land Acquisition depends on adequacy of supply. Why does that control acquisition?

Environmental Review p. 189-191.

.189. Permitted uses kept – is this always written in gold ink?

Natural Heritage System:

p.350. 2.0 says: 'London is great because of its unique natural environment found within its urban fabric'? We need to stop filling in ravines and wetlands and cutting vegetation that is not needing to be cut.

p.353 ESA CRITERIA: Natural H. System:

Policies for Natural Heritage System should prevent excessive use and damage by stipulating through signs, trail placement, and emphasis that these are attempting to keep the area in its natural state as much as possible.

A policy similar to what is in the Urban Forest Plan should be in place for all Natural Heritage System elements such as Conservation Master Plans, Woodland Management Plans, etc.

Plantations need to be assessed on an individual basis. Where they provide interior forest protection and enlargement they should be kept in some fashion. They also have their own natural habitat, inhabitants and can be feeding areas especially in winter

.1260. The amount of a particular habit in this region, which MNR knows and we know from them. Are we trying to increase those habitats that are disappearing and rare. Policy is needed to address this.

.1261. Aquatic species in areas of development ...are they protected adequately by preserving their habitat - in small streams, creeks, ditches.
How important is it more than just the Thames?

3.

.1268. Why remove any healthy Forest City trees, because of a small acreage. Make subdivision plan subject to tree preservation if in a wooded area or has hedgerows on site.

.1273. How is negative effect determined? Just look at Stanton drain area to see negative effect. I know development is nowhere complete but a once pretty area has been and still is piles of earth and a creek bed that is wall to wall rock. Is this the final picture? Not very pretty to bike or hike by.

City policy should be that the city hires consultants for applications that affect the Natural Heritage System and the City would bill the developer for this.

p. 357. – 1278: When will guidelines for corridors and impact be implemented?

.1280. How do you guarantee negative impact to an ESA? We need to look at past successes/failures and rewrite what is necessary to get negative impact eg. Monitoring development beside ESA's.

.1283. How do we protect coldwater tributaries eg. Tributary C in the Oxford-Westdel Borne area where a SWM will empty into it warming the water negating habitat for cold water species.

.1300. Trails in ESA are to have no negative impact.

.1307. Infrastructure in ESAs are to have no negative impact

p. 358 Need a plan to define this distinctly to the best of our knowledge. Don't repeat mistakes. Do we have any stewardship – if not what do we want?

p. 364. 7.3 Buffers – there are guidelines

.1319. (2) Rules need monitoring.

.1321. Buffers should protect interior forest and if not need to be increased not bargained with.

p. 366. 1326. Refinement of ESA boundaries. These should be determined well before development is planned and necessary protection be in place and kept, emphasizing conservation in defining the boundary

p. 374. Floodplain:

p. 376. Floodproofing terms: first floor height for new buildings. Are there restrictions now for grandfathered ones to be flood proofed?

4.

p.379. 1384 (5) development in green space will 'generally' be passive uses and non intensive. Too 'general' and vague. Be more specific and name the things that could possibly have to go in green space. A river corridor should be building free except for things connected with flood control and perhaps boat traffic, if allowed. Natural Heritage areas along it should be protected and excluded from trail system use eg. paved trails and their traffic.

Storm Water Management:

409: SWMs should protect and enhance the environment. How well do they protect erosion downstream? They do not enhance the environment when they remove good wetland and replace it with a puddle. Better research individually in a streams assessment may be needed here.

412: should be outside the Natural Heritage System. If there is NO alternative to in, then much more effort to replace lost wetland needs to be done and specified in the Plan. The SWM itself just doesn't do it. SWMs can be designed to be much more environmental in looks and deed than they have been as well.

413: Important: Design and construction should suit the adjacent stream and minimize damage to adjacent wetland areas.

Questions re SWM's.

I think the use by citizens of some ponds in winter to skate on is great. However since homes with pools require fencing and gates that latch tightly why are the ponds exempt??? Moreso a risk in spring. I would think someone from city would need to check ice safety in winter if this allowed. Perhaps some ponds in scattered areas could be privately supervised and in this way used. I think it a great idea to see them being used.

Add Ons:

P437. The city will accept ravine and hazard land only if flat land is unavailable.

Why is this a fixed rule? In the event there was already enough parkland why not accept this as an asset?

Grassland:

I found little about preservation of this habitat. Issues about species at risk that would live and feed here; bees, Monarch butterflies, grassland birds, amphibians don't seem part of the Plan.

Available here in the urban area are very few pasture or uncut grassy areas. Are there cattle and horse restrictions in the city boundaries? Most arable land in the city is crop

5.

Planted, sterile areas due to pesticide use. Farmers, often make lawns of the roadside grassy areas and ditches that front their properties, and thus losing more habitats for species at risk.

Undeveloped lands (as yet), owned by developers are perhaps the largest acreages that support grassland vegetation. Could an arrangement be made with these owners to leave these as is until they were ready to develop? And not block plans because grassland species were now present which hopefully would move over to the next undeveloped plot. Better than nothing!!

p.268: Old Victoria Area:

929. The last council allowed a small development area into an area surrounded by ESA land in exchange for floodplain land along the Thames (which couldn't be built on). If an enlargement of this area is being sought it shouldn't be allowed, the ESA will already be being compromised. ESAs should have definitive protection.

Monitoring:

Issues where wetlands in particular are at risk from adjacent development either by their water supply being depleted by the development itself or by silt and chemical discharge, leaching, or running in, and the policy of negative impact just isn't working. In either situation often a lack of monitoring isn't in place. It should be done by the developer for a specified period and then the city take over on a regular basis, certainly for large wetlands like Sifton Bog, Westminster Ponds, Highland Woods, Talbot subdivision, etc. where there are standing water areas. If we get into heavier rainfall weather patterns these may become more important and need to become more strict.

Mainstreet Hyde Park:

Where is some kind of picture of what is envisioned? Right now it looks ugly! Give us some hope! Just zoning areas gives little vision.

Thank you for all the hard work,
Dr.Bill Maddeford