

COMMENTS ON THE LONDON PLAN – ENVIRONMENTAL POLICIES, MAY 2016

(Anita Caveney)

General Comment

Overall, I think the Environmental Policies in The London Plan are sound and clearly defined, and, if implemented well, should protect the city's Natural Heritage System. I wish to extend my thanks to all the planners and others involved in compiling the final draft, and for giving consideration to comments I have submitted since work on The London Plan started a few years ago. An example of a follow-up on my earlier comments is the inclusion of upland corridors and valleyland linkages on Map 5 of the May 2016 draft.

Specific Comments

Page 164, Policy 744: Thank you for adding this important policy. Light pollution and the fatal attraction of birds by reflective windows and illumination in high-rise buildings are harmful to life and should be avoided or mitigated to the fullest extent possible. Normal dark-light diurnal cycles are genetically programmed in living creatures and any disruption of the cycles by excessive or untimely light is disruptive and harmful. Dark skies are important.

Page 348, Wetlands: "Locally Significant Wetlands" appeared as category # 10 under Policy 1243, and as bullet 13 in Table 15 in the second draft of The London Plan, but has been omitted in the May 2016 draft. Is the category "Locally Significant Wetlands" no longer recognized?

Page 348, Policy 1313, line 13: I still feel that Provincially Significant Wetlands should have leading capitals, as used by the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry.

Page 352, Areas of Natural and Scientific Interest, Policy 1338, first sentence: Shouldn't the two provincially significant ANSIs in Warbler Woods and Komoka Provincial Park that represent glacial landforms be "earth science" rather than "life science" ANSIs? According to the Ontario Parks document *Komoka Background Information, Issues and Options* (Queen's Printer for Ontario, 2003), there is a Komoka Provincial Park Earth Science ANSI and a Kilworth Shores Earth Science ANSI. There is also a Komoka Park Reserve and Adjacent Lands Life Sciences ANSI encompassing much of Komoka Provincial Park. Policy 1338 does not mention the latter.

Page 361, Figure 22: Insert "META-" in front of "CORRIDORS" in the title for the Figure, as per the text in Policy 1399. The "Big Picture" meta-cores and meta-corridors shown in Fig. 22 are not indicated on MAP 5, although they were shown in the second draft of The London Plan. Why have they been mentioned in Policy 1399 and shown in the small Fig. 22, but not shown on MAP 5, where their importance as linkages would be clearly seen? Although they are not required under the PPS 2014 to be shown in the Official Plan, my understanding is that the City is entitled to go beyond the requirements of the PPS in protecting natural heritage in its policies and mapping.

Page 362, Policy 1401, last sentence: If the draft Trails guideline document, *Guidelines for Management Zones & Trails in Environmentally Significant Areas*, is approved by Council in June, 2016, I assume the title of the document in the last sentence of Policy 1401 will be changed accordingly in The London Plan after the latter has been adopted by Council.

Page 367, Title “WHY ARE NATURAL AND HUMAN-MADE HAZARDS IMPORTANT TO OUR FUTURE”: This title suggests that without these hazards we’d be at a loss! In an ideal world, we wouldn’t want any hazards. **Recommend:** Change the wording to “WHY ADDRESSING NATURAL AND HUMAN-MADE HAZARDS IS IMPORTANT FOR OUR FUTURE SAFETY”

COMMENTS ON THE LONDON PLAN MAP 5 - NATURAL HERITAGE, MAY 2016
(Anita Caveney)

1. I’m pleased to see Significant Valleylands, Valleylands, Upland Corridors, ANSIs, ESAs, Potential ESAs, Significant Woodlands, Woodlands, PSWs, Wetlands, Unevaluated Wetlands, Potential Naturalization Areas, and Unevaluated Vegetation Patches all clearly shown on MAP 5. I’m also very pleased to see that some important Upland Corridor-Wetland/Valleyland corridors have been shown, indicating some carryover of the Big Picture Meta-Cores and Meta-Corridors concept that appeared on MAP 4 -- Natural Heritage in Draft 2 of the London Plan.
2. The “Kains Woods ESA” label is shown only on the west side of the ESA. I suggest it should also be shown on the east side near Shore Rd to avoid confusion with the northern reaches of Warbler Woods ESA, and confusion caused by the overlapping “Kains Rd River Valley ANSI” covering the connection of the west and east portions of the ESA.
3. Is the current boundary of the East Lambeth Forest ESA in its southeast portion defined by the wiggly black urban boundary north of Dingman Creek, i.e. south of the Potential ESA?
4. Why is there no designated Valleyland joining the Significant Valleyland north of James St, Lambeth to the larger of the two Unevaluated Vegetation Patches and Valleyland in the northeast?
5. “Meadow Lily Woods ESA” should be “Meadowlily Woods ESA” (one word). I suggest that the ESA name also be inserted at the far east portion of the ESA on MAP 5, especially to avoid confusion until the Potential ESA in the middle has been incorporated into Meadowlily Woods ESA.
6. What is the name of the ESA shown along Pottersburg Creek?
7. Why does the City continue to perpetuate the incorrect spelling of “Kilally”? The correct spelling is “Killaly”.
8. What is the name of the ESA shown north of Southdale Rd W, and east of Wickerson Rd? It doesn’t appear to be part of Lower Dingman Creek Corridor ESA.
9. Where is Delaware East Woodland ESA? Only a dotted-yellow Potential ESA is shown, not a solid pale-yellow ESA.