

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

3.2 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – Medway Valley Heritage Forest Environmentally Significant Area (South) – Conservation Master Plan

- Jennifer Petruniak, Dillon Consulting – see attached presentation.
- *(Councillor T. Park indicating that there is a lot of talk about AODA and she did not hear anything about the general exceptions that are available under the AODA; under Section 80.1.5(5), it says that the exceptions to the requirements that apply to recreational trails and beach access routes are permitted where obligated organizations can demonstrate one or more of the following and in subsection 5, it says if there is a significant risk that the requirements, or some of them, would adversely affect water, fish, wildlife, plants, invertebrates, species at risk, ecological integrity or natural heritage value, whether the adverse effects are direct or indirect; the report itself, from her perspective, felt fairly silent on that; wondering if staff could address that; Mrs. J. Petruniak, Dillon Consulting, responding that through the Conservation Master Plan process, Phase 1 really dealt with identifying what needed that most amount of protection, what was the most ecologically sensitive within the Valley and that is where they defined the Nature Reserve zones; everything else that already had some indication of cultural disturbance, and this is through the Provincially recognized ecological land classification that these delineations are made to identify vegetation communities; these are areas that are already disturbed; where AODA compliant features, trails are proposed, that is only within the natural environment zone where it has already been determined that these features in here are not ecologically sensitive and are not prone to disturbance.*
- *Councillor A. Hopkins asking for clarification on the presentation; asking how many bridges are currently on there; Mrs. J. Petruniak, Dillon Consulting, responding that there are currently two proposed on the southern part of the Medway Valley Environmentally Significant Area; Councillor Hopkins asking to have the latest trails identified on the map; asking if trails have been installed recently; Mrs. J. Petruniak, Dillon Consulting, responding that the majority of trails in the plan are existing trails; there are some trails that have been identified for upgrade and these might be wet and muddy and as people use them, they go around so that causes the trail to widen; advising that those are existing trails that they have recommended improvements, a boardwalk may be more suitable; the only new trail is where they are proposing a Level 2 trail to direct users further away from the false rue anemone that loops in the northern part and to keep that Level 2 trail fully in the natural environment zone as well as the trail in the Attawandaron Park to delineate the naturalization zones in there as well as there is one trail that is currently temporarily closed that is proposed to be reopened on the top of the slope in the area that is currently mown grass as part of naturalization to help delineate where the naturalization begins; Mr. A. Macpherson, Manager, Environmental and Parks Planning, adding that on the slide shown at the meeting you can see the natural area that is mown grass and that is the only new trail that is being proposed, which is through the lawn area of parkland; the other ones that you can see on the map from A5, an existing trail, but the proposal is to upgrade that from a Level 1 to a Level 2, A11 down the hill towards proposed Bridge D is an existing trail and to upgrade that from a Level 1 to a Level 2; Councillor Hopkins confirming that it is just those two trails being upgraded; Mr. A. Macpherson, Manager, Environmental and Parks Planning responding yes, just those two trails.*
- *Councillor M. Salih enquiring about the \$2,100,000, in a ten year span, with maintenance and everything, does the \$2,100,000 include that long-term cost or what is the life expectancy costs of trail maintenance; Mr. A. Macpherson, Manager, Environmental and Parks Planning, responding that the City has an ongoing Capital Budget that is carried out each year and that funding is only \$200,000 divided amongst the seven Environmentally Significant Areas but for 2018 and 2019 there is money identified for the Medway Valley; they will have to come back through the next budget process seeking additional funding for that capital program to implement this Master Plan; the ongoing maintenance, fortunately, is covered through the Upper Thames River Conservation Authority's contract so they will look after trail maintenance, tree hazards, by-law enforcement,*

restoration of small boardwalks and structures through the Operating Budget as they do yearly; *Councillor M. Salih asking if they know, roughly, how much staff will be asking for when they come back asking for those additional funds*; Mr. A. Macpherson, Manager, Environmental and Parks Planning, responding that they will put it through a Business Case for a four year budget but it would be in the nature of approximately \$1,900,000 to implement this Master Plan over time and that will be stretched out beyond the four year budget ask because it is a ten year Master Plan.

- *Mayor M. Brown enquiring about the multi-use pathway that is being recommended; confirming that that is just outside of the Environmentally Significant Area to the west*; Mrs. J. Petruniak, Dillon Consulting, responding that it is right on the edge of the Environmentally Significant Area, currently it is mown grass; the idea is that they would be working with a local Trail Advisory Group to sight exactly where that trail is but to put that trail in and then to basically naturalize the area to continue to improve the ecological integrity in that area; *Mayor M. Brown asking about the reference to the independent ecologist and the credentials that person carries, asking why that was important to be part of this presentation and expand a bit on the credentials*; Mrs. J. Petruniak, Dillon Consulting, asking for confirmation that the Mayor is referring to Appendix "D" of the staff report; responding that the reason that they felt that it was important to include that in there is that Dillon Consulting has been working on this file since 2013 and the City of London has been working on it since it started and this is someone who came to them and asked them what they are doing in the Medway, they know there are historic populations of false rue anemone there and what are they seeing as they have the most current data; indicating that they worked with Holly and they worked with the Federal government and their mapping experts to really explain what past information the City of London had, what current information Dillon had collected and what, under the *Endangered Species Act*, Provincially, what they were doing to recover the species and what they had seen over the course of 2014, 2015 and 2016 and through that you will see references to the conversations that she had with them and to the documents the City provided, as well as Dillon Consulting, that helped inform the recovery strategy that was reviewed by Environment Canada scientists, has gone through their public consultation process as well; felt that her opinion would help the Planning and Environment Committee understand that what is being proposed here, they are already doing some great work to help recover the species and some of the things that are actually shown on this slide are completely aligned with the recovery strategy and what they are suggesting to help further recover and help protect the species and they have recognized that the population in Medway is healthy, it is thriving, they are seeing that the population, with any population of species it is going to fluctuate year over year and they are going to see those things, as the weather, it does crazy things and this is a floodplain plant that you can actually only see it for very few weeks of the year, it is something we call an ephemeral plant; working through all those things, it can be a very abstract concept to this so they thought it was important to somebody who is recognized who identifies species in decline, who works with the Ministry of Natural Resources, an independent body as part of COSSARO, to identify what kinds of things a species needs for recovery and what causes its decline and threats as well as working with the Federal government and she was the lead author on the recovery strategy; *Mayor M. Brown asking for an expansion on COSSARO*; Mrs. J. Petruniak, Dillon Consulting, responding that under the Provincial *Endangered Species Act*, they recognize an independent committee, much like the Advisory Committees that we have formed in the City of London, that acts as a scientific arm and what COSSARO's job is, is it is made up of twelve members and twice a year they assess species; they are given a list of species and they decide, is this species threatened, is this species endangered, is it of special concern, does the government need to sit up and pay attention as to what is going on with the species and create a plan for its recovery so that they do not lose it; COSSARO is different than the Federal government, COSEWICK might be something else that you have heard; COSEWICK is an Advisory Committee to the Minister for Environment Canada and for Fisheries and Oceans and they provide their recommendations; COSSARO, on the other hand, is independent and what

they say goes, the government must adopt their recommendations when it comes to species protection.

- *Councillor H.L. Usher wondering how much of this work is going to be new asphalt paving; Mrs. J. Petruniak, Dillon Consulting, confirming that the Councillor is asking what percentage of the trails are going to be AODA compliant; there have not been any determinations yet as to what the actual covering of the trail is going to be, Level 1 is dirt, Level 2 is firm and stable AODA compliant but that can take many forms, it can be limestone screenings or wood chips in some cases; this is a Valley, it is prone to flooding so those kinds of surfaces may not be appropriate so a more granular asphalt surface could be implemented but it is the specific details that are site specific that will happen once they get past the consultation planning; Councillor Usher indicating that he is glad that Mrs. Petruniak switched his question because what he wanted to know was pavement but AODA compliant is good enough for him; enquiring that all the asphalt is within the Environmentally Significant Area; Mrs. J. Petruniak, Dillon Consulting, responding that yes, any of the Level 2 AODA compliant trails are within the Environmentally Significant Area; Councillor Usher asking about the increased use of trails and any possible negative impacts on the species in the area; Mrs. J. Petruniak, Dillon Consulting, responding that that is one of the concerns that they have heard from the community, saying that if you build accessible, easy to use trails, that more people are going to use them; that part, you cannot predict the future; they are proposing no new parking, there is no parking for this Environmentally Significant Area, it is mostly used by the people in the community; will use go up, we hope so, it is a great Valley, there is going to be a lot of educational opportunities for people to go and explore and really learn about what they are looking at, will that increase use affect ecological integrity, it is her professional opinion that it will not; well-designed trails are known to keep and direct and manage the use of natural areas by people and is probably the best way for people in an urban environment, such as the City of London, to manage the use of a natural area within the urban limits; Councillor Usher asking about the \$500,000 for the annual contract with the Upper Thames River Conservation Authority (UTRCA), wondering if that will be increased or will it stay the same; Mr. A. Macpherson, Manager, Environmental and Parks Planning responding that this is an annual contract that they currently have and it is due for renewal as of January 1, 2019 so it is already built into the Operating budget for the City and they will be back to Council later this year with a report about renewing the contract with the UTRCA and it is already in the approved budget as a pre-approved expenditure, it is a five year contract; Councillor Usher asking if it is likely to increase as a result of this; Mr. A. Macpherson, Manager, Environmental and Parks Planning, responding that the budget only goes up if they add additional land area but what you find, however, and take it or leave it, hardened trails are actually easier to look after than wood chip trails, sometimes dirt trails, once they go in they are stable and firm for a long time, sometimes you would even look at the bridge that they showed you there that has a longer life span than any boardwalk that they are building, it is actually less maintenance than a lot of the lower key boardwalk infrastructure; there is not any proposed increase as a result of this Master Plan.*
- *Councillor M. van Holst wondering what would happen if either one of the proposed bridges were not included, to the trail system, what would you expect would happen to the patterns of use; Mrs. J. Petruniak, Dillon Consulting, responding that if they were to leave the system as it is, the current 5.4 kilometers of informal trails going through public property and habitats and features such as seepage areas would probably continue and would possibly even increase as the population increases or more people start to use this, if they were specifically not to put bridges in here, you would limit the amount of accessible trails that are in the Valley there would be a small loop that is accessible, currently there is an existing trail; there is evidence of people traversing the Creek, as well as D, not so much the A, so you end up with people in the Creek because people want to get from one side to the other; Councillor van Holst indicating that right now he notices that there are three loops almost being tied in the middle but they do not touch; wondering if, in the informal trails, do they expect that people are going to want to move across those or are we expecting people to take the larger loop; it looks like you can work your way around the whole trail system if you go through the subdivisions as well;*

Mrs. J. Petruniak, Dillon Consulting, responding that they felt that it was important to show this kind of neighbourhood connection; currently there is an informal trail that is going through these private properties and with the private property going right to the Creek, it is not possible to create a connection within the Environmentally Significant Area here plus they have the bigger colony of false rue anemone as well as some seepage areas and some slopes that are not safe for people to travel on; it is going to take a lot of work, that is part of the Plan, is to do an even better job of working to close these trails, not just to close them through landscape features but also to close them through signage, telling people why it is important that they not continue past this point to access here.

- Jacqueline Madden, Chair and M. Dawthorne, Member, Accessibility Advisory Committee – expressing support for the staff recommendation; believing the bridges are probably the biggest point of contention; pointing out that the two bridges connect the valley with the north, the trails to the west, the University, and adds a great deal of connectivity of an accessible pathway; an AODA compliant trail does not mean asphalt, it does not mean that plants and trees are being leveled or paved; the Accessibility Advisory Committee has never asked for this; believing this Plan works for everyone; accessibility and the environment are not in competition.
- Dr. Katrina Moser, on behalf of the Environmental and Ecological Planning Advisory Committee – see attached presentation.
- Tom Tillman, 1663 Gloucester Road, representing Gloucester Road, Green Acres and Ryersie Road – advising that this is a neighbourhood of approximately 89 properties; expressing opposition to the proposed staff recommendation; indicating that this was only brought to their attention three weeks ago as they are outside of the 200 metre circulation; stating that they have had no meaningful consultation; and requesting the removal of Access 11 and 12 from their neighbourhoods.
- Christian Therrien, Member, Environmental and Ecological Planning Advisory Committee – expressing opposition to the proposed staff recommendation; speaking to the aquatic environment at Medway Creek and species at risk; advising that the bridges A and D have been flagged for species at risk; indicating that he has observed species at risk at both locations; expressing concern that the footings would be in the flood plain and would flood in the Spring and possibly the Fall and would cause siltation which is a danger to species at risk; advising that the Conservation Master Plan does not have any aquatic habitat information.
- Roslyn Moorhead, 7 Hastings Gate – discussing the need to protect species at risk as well as other species that have the Medway Valley as their home; London is fortunate to have a niche for species that are rare.
- George Sinker, 1597 Gloucester Road – advising that trail A11 abuts their property to the west; indicating that the trail that is there now is a Level 1 trail; indicating that between 2017 and 2018 the Plan was completely changed; believing that trail A11 should remain a Level 1 trail; believing that the environment should be the first priority; this should not be ecology versus accessibility; stating that we only have on Carolinian forest in London; requesting deferral of decision until Councillors have a chance to walk the A11 trail.
- Kinan Tien, 1125 Western Road, Perth Hall, on behalf of Western's Wildlife Conservation Society – wondering how many of the over seven hundred comments that staff received were in support and how many were against this proposal; stating that the largest threat to false rue anemone is habitat destruction due to recreational activities; expressing concern if the pathways are to be asphalt; reading from the City of London Official Plan, indicating that it states that it should be retained in its natural state; indicating that this is one of the last remaining locations for false rue anemone.
- Professor Lila Kari – reading her letter included in the Planning and Environment Committee Agenda.
- Sal Pacifico, 1607 Gloucester Road – expressing opposition to the staff recommendation; advising that they do not have sidewalks or curbs on their street and the proposal would dump all the traffic coming out of the Environmentally Significant Area onto their street; advising that there is no accountability; stating that they asked for signs twenty years ago and they still do not have signs posted;

not sure how By-law Enforcement can enforce dogs off leash and the dumping of trash; we will not be able to bring the Valley back once the pathways are built.

- Lynn Schmidt, 420 Lawson Road – indicating that it comes down to valuing what we have; feeling the presence of the Natives that were here before us; stating that it is a beautiful, peaceful spot; advising of the presentations held by City staff and Carolinian Canada at the Home and Garden Show on how beneficial it is to get out in nature; advising that at all the meetings they attended they were told that there would not be any bridges, now there are two; stating that this is an Environmentally Significant Area not a park; and, indicating that nature cannot survive us if we do not treasure it.
- Holden Rhodes, 1633 Gloucester Road – expressing opposition to the staff recommendation; understanding that the two access points, A11 and A12 were inserted there and kept as municipally owned allowances to access the Valley because there was no other access from the neighbourhood to the Valley; stating that the neighbourhood does not need access as there is better access through the Elsie Perrin Estate property; indicating that Gloucester Road is twenty-three feet wide, with no sidewalks, curbs or gutters; opening a trail between A11 and A12 will allow parking on a narrow street; advising that one person received notice in their neighbourhood; indicating that no one was asked to sit on the Local Advisory Committee; asking Council to defer this due to lack of notice.
- Alison Vanstone, 74 Green Acres Drive – advising that her property is situated directly beside where the pathway is proposed to go through their backyard and connect to A12; advising that she contacted staff approximately three years ago to ask about any proposed development; noting that she found out about this plan two weeks ago, she was very upset; thinking it is important for community consultation; advising that this feels too late and not enough.
- Dale Belucci, 1586 Gloucester Road – expressing concern with the potential increased crime in their neighbourhood and surrounding neighbourhoods; advising that there is little crime in their neighbourhood because they have limited access; advising that crime is committed when there is accessibility, connectivity and attractiveness; indicating that they do not have sidewalks and lighting; indicating that they were not consulted on these issues; indicating that she is willing to share her research; requesting deferral of the process.
- Mike Landers, 141 Ridgewood Place – advising that this Committee is in a unique position and can make the right decision and save two million dollars.
- Chris Sheculski, 2025 Wallingford Avenue – agreeing that the Valley is amazingly unique; advising that the environment and trails do not have to be at odds; people stay on the trail, help when asked to bust goutweed; understanding the fear of the unknown; advising that he would like to see it extended.
- Jim Davies, 60 Longbow Road – expressing disappointment that the bridges have come up again; relating to Bridge D, there is an interesting area at the bend in the River, the area called the beach, which is a magnet for people in the summer but there is an area behind it with endangered plants; stating that if you remove Bridge D, the area is accessible.
- Dr. Bill Maddeford – believing a lot of this goes back to the guideline for an Environmentally Significant Area, that is to protect it; seeing nothing in the Plan that protects this; believing access should be given to people in the neighbourhood; advising that this Valley is narrow and deep and has a very special value to the City; expressing concern with dogs off leash; advising that he has not seen anything about monitoring; indicating that there is a significant increase in birds in the south area; thinking if this is passed, this will be done in other Environmentally Significant Areas.
- Maddie Hymowitz, 59 Longbow Road – expressing opposition to the staff recommendation; commenting on the Local Advisory Committee process as it has been adversarial and unproductive; indicating that there was not site visit scheduled for the Local Advisory Committee members; public information sessions did not include information on species at risk; expressing that she feels managed and does not like it; requesting the Plan be referred back to staff.
- Aashish Goela, 1587 Ryersie Road – indicating that the key things here are process, what process gaps may have been there; wondering why, after the Environmental and Ecological Planning Advisory Committee made comments an independent consultant was hired; changing trails A11 and A12 from Level 1 to

Level 2 may seem reasonable but the neighbourhood nearby was not engaged; wondering why the neighbourhood was not consulted; wondering how the process works as a lot of people have found out about this in the last month.

- Lisa Bildy, 1370 Corley Drive – believing this is similar to the tragedy of the Commons; stating that when people have a sense of entitlement to an area it becomes something that people can take as much as they want to from and this could become a running or cycling event as it is no longer a significant area; requesting that bridges not be built in this area; requesting that this area be kept natural as there are several parks in the city that can be used for bicycling and walking; indicating that pretty soon there will be nothing left to protect.
- Dave Potten, 110 West Rivertrace Walk – expressing support for the staff recommendation; advising that he supports recreation in the city and improving the habitat; indicating that the community has taken ownership of the northern portion of the Medway Valley Heritage Forest; providing the history of the Valley; indicating that when you close trails, people make their own; Hiking for Happiness is held for people who are disabled, not necessarily wheelchair bound, who enjoy hiking.
- Vicki Van Linden, 431 Ridgewood Crescent – expressing opposition to the staff recommendation; urging the Planning and Environment Committee to accept the concerns expressed by the Environmental and Ecological Planning Advisory Committee; believing that Environmentally Significant Areas should not be treated as parks or recreational areas; indicating that all species of wildlife are declining; asking that the wildlife be considered; asking for increased by-law enforcement in all Environmentally Significant Areas.
- Bruce Morton, Doncaster Avenue – advising that his property abuts an existing Level 2 trail that goes into the Environmentally Significant Area; observing people using the trail all times of the year; expressing concern about the protection of the Environmentally Significant Area; indicating that people dump gardening debris into the Environmentally Significant Area; contacting By-law Enforcement and they do not have the resources to deal with matters of dumping in Environmentally Significant Area; asking Council to invest in mechanisms of oversight in the interest of protecting the Environmentally Significant Area.
- Gil Warren, 16-624 William Street – expressing support for the staff recommendation; using the Kilally Environmentally Significant Area on a regular basis; pointing out that the proposed bridges are not in environmentally sensitive area; believing that the position put forward by the Planning Services area is a compromise; believing that it is time to make a decision on this matter; indicating that there has been consultation on this issue and there will never be consensus; advising that trails are temporary and there are other places that would be happy to have the bridges.
- Sandy Levin, 59 Longbow Road – see [attached](#) presentation.
- David Donnelly, Environmental Lawyer, Toronto, representing the Lower Medway Valley Rate Payers Group (LMVRG) - expressing opposition to the proposed staff recommendation; expressing concern with the traffic and species at risk; indicating that the bridges should not be built; requesting a deferral of the Planning and Environment Committee's decision so a more accommodating discussion can be had; pointing out a lack of First Nations consultation is a serious legal liability; outlining that the issue is not more access but better access; bring people to nature, do not build more bridges; building bridges is not a legal obligation of the City under the AODA.
- John Bestard, 1526 Ryersie Road – expressing opposition to the proposed staff recommendation; expressing concern about crime where currently they are backed against a river but once bridges are built they will be into Whitehills and further; expressing concern about the First Nations not being mentioned; expressing concern about adding more people to the BRT zone; advising that citizens have not had any proper knowledge or consultation.
- Jack Blocker, 367 Grosvenor Street – indicating that there are a variety of species are at risk; advising that the Medway is under severe threat from the Conservation Master Plan (CMP); pointing out that the AODA does not require the City to build a bridge where none exists; expressing opposition to the proposed staff recommendation; connecting neighbourhoods is not the job of an ESA; advising that increased through traffic will threaten sensitive species; identifying that access can be provided in nature friendly ways; stating that the bridges will invite more

foot and bicycle traffic; ESA's are not parks, if adopted they will become really nice parks; and delete the bridge building proposal.

- Charlie Shore, 6th Grade Student – advising that he loves the outdoors and the wildlife; indicating that this plan may not help the preservation of wildlife; believing that if a new path is constructed, lots of animals will leave or die during construction or because of increase of human traffic; everything needs to be considered when we disturb an area.
- Gary Brown, 35A - 59 Ridout Street South – indicating that he requires more information about the path that is being installed; putting in a bridge will protect nature from people stepping on the protected species; believing that the case for building a bridge has not been made but a case for not building a bridge has been made; pointing out that there has been no indigenous consultation; advising that they fought for no pavement in The Coves and it was done and was also made accessible; stating that, if a pathway is constructed, although not permitted, bikes will use this.
- Rene Agathos – advising that she has lived in the Sunningdale area for 18 years and has been asking questions since 2011 about the trails in the area; indicating that she was advised in 2011 that when the sewer trunk was put through or around the Medway Valley so would a multi-use pathway system; pointing out that there are lots of trails in the City but nothing is connected; indicating that people are staying on the trails and causing less damage in the trails in her area; outlining that wildlife and plant life has adapted and flourished; believing they need to come to some sort of a compromise; pointing out that damage has already been done; and the City has done their due diligence in the consulting process.
- Gary Smith, 141 Meadowlily Road South – indicating that these decisions do establish a precedent; advising that green space needs to be protected and appreciated; pointing out that he is not sure how hard paths improve the green quality; asking that Council give consideration to “less is more”; leaving our natural areas alone is a wise philosophy.
- Mike Blewett, 73 Green Acres Drive – advising that he was not notified about the public participation meeting and does not read The Londoner; expressing opposition to the proposed staff recommendation; indicating that the City is trying to put a square peg into a round hole; indicating that if the area is developed then the wildlife will disappear.
- Sarah Jones – advising that, first we must address the issue of safety; expressing concern with increased traffic; pointing out that these are fast flowing waters; expressing concern about people jumping from the bridge into fast flowing water and children drowning; expressing concern about the increased amount of unsupervised young people; expressing concern about drugs and alcohol being used in the area; asking people to consider the risk Council is taking by allowing increased traffic.
- Janet Peters, 2048 Valleyrun Boulevard – advising that she is a hiker, nature lover, adventurer and gardener; indicating that she currently uses the local trails such as Fanshawe, Elgin, and Thames Valley; looking for the continuity for a natural route through the valley floor; stating that the valley's and creeks are not private lands; indicating that she does not want to walk along the property line which is close to people's homes; believing that the City should be enhancing London's trail system.
- John Levstik, 206 St. Bees Close – advising that he served on the Local Advisory Committee that helped put this together; indicating that there are ways to protect the environment and have greater access; believing that enhanced trails and bridges may help lessen the impact on the deterioration of the park.
- Bernie VanDenBelt, 9987 Longwoods Road, President of Nature London – advising that the proposals to create more pathways and bridges has more to do with recreational than conservation; indicating that it is hard to see how more bridges and greater trails will help conservation and the plants of Medway; stating that if you want to preserve habitat you need to delete the bridges from the Master Plan; believing the needs of native and flora fauna should be coming first; pointing out that species are at risk of being trampled on; indicating that Nature London requests that the plan be sent back to staff for revision including the deletion of proposed bridges.

- Judy Ponti-Scargi, Valleyrun Boulevard – advising that she would like to photograph the Medway Valley pre-implementation and post-implementation and offering her services to photograph the Medway Valley.
- K. Zarebecki 205 - 240 Villagewalk Boulevard Unit, representing the Sunningdale Ratepayers Association – advising that he served on the Local Advisory Committee (LAC); advising that the experience at the LAC was much what you have felt and seen tonight; looking at a map of the north section, you would see a continuous path from the north to the south with a couple connection points; pointing out that the utility overlay that the pathway runs over is maybe four or five percent at the most of the whole valley and the pathway system is maybe about three percent of the whole valley system so we have not turned this into a park; advising that Council has made major decisions around pathways up in the north and connection to the Thames Valley Pathway system, he thinks you can do that at here and you'll complete that section of the pathway.
- Mohamed Moussa, 155 Thornton Avenue - requesting that the Plan not be approved in this fashion; expressing agreement with former Councillor Levin and Mr. Donnelly's submissions; adding that crafters of AODA have included exceptions; advising that his property adjoins pathway and in his experience, signage does nothing to keep people on the trail and dogs on-leash without expensive proper enforcement; further stating that bridges and connectivity are not needed.
- Tammy Hogan, 1540 Gloucester - advising that she walks the pathway every day and cannot figure out how a bridge could be built without severe impact to environment and animals.
- Maria Howshell, 1526 Ryersie Road - raising a question about A13 path beside Elsie Perrin; wondering why work has already begun, clear cutting large trees that canopied the path.