



# REPORT

## MEETING TYPE: Regular Council

---

---

**TO:** Council

**FROM:** Brian MacKinnon, Manager of Corporate Services/ Municipal Clerk

**DATE:** February 21, 2018

**SUBJECT:** RP-2018-022 - Report of the Integrity Commissioner dated January 17, 2018 re: Complaint Against the Municipality of Sioux Lookout

---

---

### TITLE:

Report of the Integrity Commissioner dated January 17, 2018 re: Complaint Against the Municipality of Sioux Lookout

### RECOMMENDATION:

THAT Council receives the January 17, 2018 Report from the Integrity Commissioner, Mr. Paul Heayn, respecting a complaint filed by Mr. David Goodfellow; and further

THAT, as concluded and recommended in Mr. Heayn's report:

- Council adopts the finding that Mayor Doug Lawrance, Councillor John Bath, Councillor Steven Forbes and Court of Revision Chairperson Mr. Robert Durante **did not** have a conflict of interest when exercising their duties as Members of Council and Members of the Court of Revision, as applicable.
- Council concurs with Mr. Heayn's assessment that the current legislative and quasi-judicial process via the Ontario Drainage Act and Ontario Drainage Tribunal will allow Mr. Goodfellow the opportunity to advance his arguments respecting the proposed Sturgeon Meadows Municipal Drain.
- Council adopts Mr. Heayn's recommendation that Mr. Goodfellow shall submit to the Municipality, in writing, how he wishes to develop his property, prior to the end of the current Term of Council, and the Municipality shall provide a list of requirements to Mr. Goodfellow respecting his development plans.

### PURPOSE:

The purpose of this Report is to bring forward for Council's adoption and implementation of recommendations in the Integrity Commissioner's Report dated January 17, 2018,

and to consider and implement recommendations outlined therein, in accordance with the Municipality's Code of Conduct.

**BACKGROUND:**

Council approved Policy No. 1-4, being a Code of Conduct for Members of Municipal Council and Persons Appointed to Council Boards, Committees and Commissions on May 16, 2012. The Code of Conduct may be accessed on the Municipality's Corporate Documents Portal: [Policy No. 1-4, Code of Conduct](#).

The Policy includes a complaint process which is open to anyone who believes that someone to whom the *Code* applies has breached the *Code*.

Mr. David Goodfellow submitted a complaint to former Integrity Commissioner, Warren Paulson, and on October 29, 2017, Mr. Paulson, who had completed his Term as Integrity Commissioner on October 1, 2017, forwarded the complaint to Mr. Paul Heayn, whom the Council would appoint as its new Integrity Commissioner on November 15, 2017.

**DISCUSSION:**

In accordance with the Code of Conduct Policy, Mr. Heayn completed his investigation. The Report of his findings is attached to this staff report.

Mr. Heayn did not find any breach of the Code of Conduct by Mayor Lawrance, Councillor Bath, Councillor Forbes or the Chair of the Court of Revision, Mr. Robert Durante, as alleged by Mr. Goodfellow. Mr. Heayn did make several recommendations to facilitate improved communication between the Municipality and Mr. Goodfellow.

Council, in accordance with the Policy, must receive the Report, consider the recommendations and determine whether or not to adopt those recommendations.

**RELATIONSHIP TO THE STRATEGIC PLAN:**

This is an administrative matter with no direct correlation to the Strategic Plan.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:**

The fees for the Integrity Commissioner's investigation were not available at the time of writing this report.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

1. Integrity Commissioner's Report, "Report on a Code of Conduct Complaint by David Goodfellow Against the Municipality of Sioux Lookout".

**SIGNATURES:**



---

**Brian P. MacKinnon**  
Manager of Corporate Services and Municipal Clerk



---

**Ann Mitchell**  
Chief Administrative Officer

# REPORT ON A CODE OF CONDUCT COMPLAINT BY DAVID GOODFELLOW AGAINST THE MUNICIPALITY OF SIOUX LOOKOUT

*REPORT AUTHOR: Paul S. Heayn, Integrity Commissioner for Municipality of Sioux Lookout*

*January 17, 2018*

## 1. INTRODUCTION

On October 29<sup>th</sup>, 2017 I was contacted by Warren Paulson by email asking if I would take on an integrity complaint for him. Warren was the Integrity Commissioner for the Municipality of Sioux Lookout until October 1, 2017. The CAO, Ann Mitchell of the Municipality has agreed to allow me to take on the complaint and I was formally appointed as Integrity Commissioner for the Municipality by Council at its November 15, 2017 Regular Council Meeting. I agreed to process this complaint and Warren forwarded me the Complaint filed by David Goodfellow as well as other documents he previously received from Mr. Goodfellow to support his complaint.

## 2. BACKGROUND

The Complainant, Mr. David Goodfellow of 93 Sturgeon Meadows Road, Sioux Lookout, Ontario provides a three page description where he outlines his complaint of “ethical wrongdoing by the Municipality of Sioux Lookout”. He stated that “he and his family have been literally dealing with a vendetta of persecution, harassment and extortion ever since the town amalgamated the area they live in.”

## 3. Summary of the Complaint

Using the wording from the formal Complaint Form (shown in italics), I list the complaints by numbers below:

- 1. In conflict of interest, the town’s roads manager at the time, a Mr. Rasetti, used his position to obstruct me and create an environment of persecution because I was trying to process a rural subdivision which was two doors over from his residence.*
- 2. In 2007 it became openly obvious and hostile when, with the assistance of the local engineering firm owned by our present-day mayor, this roads manager caused the flooding of my lands by redirecting road drainage water onto it, in violation of the Drainage Act and which persists to this day.*
- 3. Presently, the new roads manager, a Mr. Jewell, and, mayor and council by way of the drainage petition act, are trying to have me pay to correct the negligence that it and its engineering firm, owned by Mr. Lawrence (the Mayor now in 2017) at the time, caused in 2007.*

4. In addition to the above, it is Mr. Goodfellow's contention that the following officials violated the Municipal Conflict of Interest Act:
- Mayor Doug Lawrence
  - Councillor Calvin Southall
  - Councillor John Bath
  - Councillor Steven Forbes
  - Court of Revision Appointee Steven Forbes
  - Court of Revision Appointee Robert Durante

#### **4. INVESTIGATIVE PROCESS**

In order to prepare for this investigation, I read through the documents that were provided by Mr. Goodfellow and the documents provided by the Municipality.

Mr. Goodfellow's documents included:

A bound book of a letter to the District Manager/Ministry of Natural Resources, 49 Prince Street, Box 309, Sioux Lookout Ontario with the following Exhibits attached:

- Ex A - Newspaper clipping from the Sioux Lookout Bulletin Volume 25, No. 16 reporting on the Sioux Lookout Council Proceedings – namely Petition for Drainage Works by Road Authority.
- Ex B - Section 77 of the Ontario Drainage Act
- Ex C - Letter Dated December 17, 2007 from Danalyn J. MacKinnon, Barrister, Solicitor replying to a letter from M. John Ewart of Howell, Fleming LLP, Peterborough regarding David Goodfellow .
- Ex E – Drainage Report to David Goodfellow from Tetra Teck, Thunder Bay dated June 11, 2012 for the Pelto Subdivision
- Ex F – Comment by David Goodfellow to CBC's "The Current" related to a British Columbia legal case involving Betty Krawczk in an apparent "misuse of the legal system".
- Ex G – A letter from John Baird, CAO of the Municipality of Sioux Lookout dated June 24, 2004 to Mr. Ron Davies, Sioux Lookout regarding Brushing on Sturgeon Meadows Road.
- Ex H – An excerpt from Superior Court of Justice the Corporation of the Municipality of Sioux Lookout, Plaintiff/Defendant by Counterclaim and David Warren Goodfellow, Defendant/Plaintiff by Counterclaim, October 17, 2014.
- Ex I – Letter to Ann Mitchell & Peter Moyer, Municipality of Sioux Lookout from David Goodfellow dated September 17, 2013.
- Ex J – An aerial photo with lot lines overlaid of Sturgeon Meadows Road, Tower Hill Road and the south part of Pelto Subdivision.
- Ex K – Letter from David Goodfellow to Mr. Lawrence dated October 7, 2014.

The Municipality of Sioux Lookout's documents included:

- Report to Council – Petition for Drainage Works by Road Authority, February 17, 2016
- Notice of Council's Decision on Petition January 22, 2016
- Letter to Mr. Bob David, as required under the Act, as the MNRF District Manager – Notice of Council's Decision on Petition & Sioux Lookout Road Authority February 19, 2016.
- Special Meeting of Council: Appoint Engineering Under the Drainage Act April 6, 2016
- Email between Mary MacKenzie, Clerk & Joel Miller – General Property Details May 9, 2016.
- Email between Mary MacKenzie, Clerk & Jody Brinkman – Confirming Meeting between Drainage Engineer & Property Owner June 1, 2016.
- Sioux Lookout Petition – John Kuntze, P. Eng. K. Smart Associates Limited for Evaluation of Route Options for Discussion with Mr. Goodfellow (On-site Meeting #2) March 22, 2017.
- Engineering report May 29, 2017, for Sturgeon Meadows Drain from K. Smart Associates Limited.
- Minutes of July 19, 2017 of a Special Meeting of Council held to discuss the Surgeon Meadow Drain, Engineering Report from K.Smart Associates Limited. Included in minutes to this meeting are reports from Staff and questions and comments from David Goodfellow, Shawn Burke, MNRF, John Kuntze, P.Eng. K. Smart Associates Limited, Yvonne Oulette, and Jason Suprovich, MNRF Planner.
- Minutes of August 15, 2017 of the Court of Revision for the Sturgeon Meadows Municipal Drain.
- Decision of August 15, 2017 of the Court of Revision Appeal # 1 – Appellant - Mr. David Goodfellow.
- Ontario Court of Justice, Court Documents 2009: David Warren Goodfellow, Plaintiff and the Municipality of Sioux Lookout, Defendant.
- Letter from Public Works Manager, Municipality of Sioux Lookout to Mr. David Goodfellow Re: Final Notice – Action Required to Deal with Obstruction of Drainage on Lands Described as Plan M885, Lot 5, PT PCL 39313, #4 Pelto Road (“your Property”) and Consequential Impacts.
- Ontario Superior Court of Justice, Court documents 2010: David Warren Goodfellow, Plaintiff and the Municipality of Sioux Lookout, Defendant
- Ontario Superior Court of Justice, Court Documents October 2014: the Municipality of Sioux Lookout, Defendant and David Warren Goodfellow, Defendant.

## 5. THE COMPLAINT

### WHAT IS AT THE HEART OF THIS COMPLAINT

At the heart of this complaint is the action of the Municipality of Sioux Lookout's Sturgeon Meadows Road improvements in the fall of 2007 and whether or not those improvements caused the current drainage problems. The Municipality is following the Ontario Drainage Act to correct the drainage problems they are now experiencing on Sturgeon Meadows Road. This matter reached the Superior Court of Justice on October 17, 2014, Mr. Justice J.S. Fregeau presiding. With this action Municipality, plaintiff/defendant by counterclaim sought relief in both the main action (heard April 9, 2014) and in the counterclaim (heard May 30, 2014).

The Counterclaim was dismissed August 22, 2014 but the main action – Sioux Lookout’s claim for a declaration that Goodfellow is obstructing a “natural drainage watercourse” on or about Lots 5 and 6 of the Pelto Subdivision in close proximity to the eastern side of Sturgeon Meadows Road – is the subject of Mr. Justice J.S. Fregeau’s summary judgement on October 17, 2014.

In order to better understand Mr. Justice J.S. Fregeau’s summary judgement, I sought the meaning of “summary judgement” as it pertains to court actions in Ontario. I found the following explanation:

**“A summary judgement is a motion brought by one party against another to have a case decided summarily, without going to trial. The motions judge may be asked to decide on specific issues of a case or the merits of the entire case. In either situation, the party bringing the motion must persuade the judge that there is no genuine issue requiring a trial. Either a plaintiff or defendant in a civil suit may make a motion for summary judgement. This process is governed by Rule 20 of the *Rules of Civil Procedure*.”**

**“Rule 20 was amended in 2010 to ‘improve access to justice’ by allowing judges greater discretion to decide cases and thus avoid protracted trials and the associated expenses and delays of such trials. The summary judgement process is intended not only to filter out claims that lack merit, but also permits judges to adjudicate a greater number of cases, for cases that be fairly decided on the balance of the evidence presented. Essentially, a judge may dismiss a case summarily if they are provided with the requisite evidence to fairly and justly resolve the dispute.”**

In Paragraph [35], Justice Fregeau stated that *“Whether there was or was not a “natural drainage watercourse” within the Pelto Subdivision Lands is a technical question of fact. In my opinion, based on the quality of the conflicting evidence presented on this issue, this is a genuine issue requiring a trial”*. He went on to say in Paragraph [37]: *“In my opinion, in order to determine this technical issue the court requires quality expert evidence.”* Then in Paragraph [40] stated: *“This portion of Sioux Lookout’s motion for summary judgement is dismissed. This issue remains to be determined at trial.”*

Item: Reference Paragraph [46] & [47]- Sioux Lookout submits that the drainage plans for all three subdivisions – Pelto Subdivision already in existence and Phases I and II of the Dairy Cow subdivisions demand that Mr. Goodfillow provide a drainage easement over the “subject drainage course” within the Pelto Subdivision.

Item: Reference Paragraph [48] & [49] & [50]- Mr. Goodfellow submits that the Dairy Cow Subdivision Agreement is irrelevant to any issue concerning the Pelto Subdivision Lands as evidenced by the express contents of both agreements. Mr. Goodfellow submits that the existing drainage systems through the Pelto and Dairy Cow Subdivision lands were fully adequate prior to Sioux Lookout’s 2007 Sturgeon Meadows Road improvement work which increased the volume and rate of flow of run-off water along the road and into the Pelto Subdivision and submits that this work rendered any pre-existing drainage system inadequate.

## WHAT WAS THE RESULT OF JUSTICE FREGEAU'S RULING?

**Paragraph [56]:** The contractual drainage obligations contained in the Dairy Cow Subdivision Agreements can only apply to and affect lands specifically affected by the agreements. The Pelto Subdivision lands are not included in those lands as set out in Schedule "A" to each of the agreements. I accept the submission of the defendant that the parties to these agreements could not have intended and contemplated that the Dedication of Easements clause could be employed by Sioux Lookout to contractually require the defendant to provide a drainage easement through a separate and distinct subdivision. If this was the joint intention of the contracting parties it should have been specifically referred to in the agreements.

**Paragraph [57]:** I also accept the submission of the defendant that the evidence support the findings that the drainage systems in place in the Pelto and Dairy Cow Subdivisions were adequate and functioning prior to Sioux Lookout's Sturgeon Meadows Road improvement work in the fall of 2007. Increase run-off as a result of the road work rendered any pre-existing drainage system inadequate.

## SUBSEQUENT ACTION AFTER THE SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE RULING?

Subsequent to the rulings of the Superior Court of Justice, the Municipality of Sioux Lookout proceeded to correct the drainage problems on the Sturgeon Meadows Road by way of the Ontario Drainage Act. The Ontario Drainage Act exists to provide mutual agreement regarding drainage works and may petition for the drainage works to the Clerk of the Municipality. The Municipality of Sioux Lookout Engineering Department submitted such petition and an engineering firm by the name of K. Smart Associates Limited, Kitchener, Ontario was hired. Mr. John Kuntze, P. Eng. Of K. Smart & Associates met with Mr. Goodfellow and developed an engineering report for the "Sturgeon Meadows Drain". This report provided two options as to where the drain could go:  
Option #1 outlet route starts at the east side of Sturgeon Meadows Road, south along the west boundary of Lot #2 to the north boundary of Lots 5 & 21, then south on the west side of Pelto Road then diagonally to the north side of Tower Hill road and east to Abrams Lake.

Option #2 outlet route starts at the east side of Sturgeon Meadows Road, south along the north boundary of Lot #2, then east across Pelto Road and diagonally across Lots #5 & #7 to Abrams Lake.

K. Smart & Associates are recommending Option #2 while Mr. Goodfellow prefers Option #1. Council has accepted the recommendation of K. Smart & Associates and have adopted Option #2.

Costs associated with the construction of Option #2 are confirmed (after appeal by Mr. Goodfellow) to be estimated at \$100,940 (\$59,155 cost borne by the Municipality and \$41,785 to be borne by Mr. Goodfellow).

Mr. Goodfellow is extremely upset if the Sturgeon Meadows Drain is constructed based on the Option #2 as it cuts through the middle of the Pelto Subdivision and he fears it will contaminate wells by flooding septic fields. In addition, Mr. Goodfellow has plans to plant crops/fruit trees in the vicinity of the Sturgeon Meadows Drainage line and he feels this will prevent this from happening.



## 6. INTERVIEWS

### Mr. David Goodfellow:

Allegations of Conflict of Interest:

Mr. Goodfellow outlined why he thought that Mayor Lawrence, Councillor Southall, Councillor Bath, Councillor Forbes and Board Member Robert Durante had a Conflict of Interest. His contention is that:

Mayor Lawrence: was an owner of Keewatin Aski Engineering in 2007 at the time the Municipality performed road works on Sturgeon Meadows Road.

Councillor Southall: is a “direct competitor” because he owns a subdivision and would benefit if Goodfellow's subdivision was off the market.

Councillor Bath: is a landlord and owner of apartment units and therefore a competitor.

Councillor Forbes: is hostile toward me because Councillor Forbes' brother once owed Mr. Goodfellow money. Court of Revision Chairperson, Robert Durante: owned mobile home subdivision and is therefore a competitor.

Allegation of persecution, harassment and extortion:

I asked Mr. Goodfellow about his claims that the Municipality has a “vendetta of persecution, harassment and extortion” and he provided the following details:

- He has a letter from the previous road superintendent saying he would not get the Dairy Cow Subdivision approved.
- In 2007 the Municipality installed new culverts and replaced one old culvert and did some ditching that redirected water onto the Pelto Subdivision.
- The Municipality is invoking the Municipal Drainage Act to correct the drainage problems that the Municipality caused in 2007.
- The cost of the drainage works will split his subdivision and drain water into the middle of the bay on Abrams Lake beach.
- The cost of Option 2 approved by the Municipality is over inflated at \$100,000 in order to force him to pay most of the costs.
- He wants Option 1 and offered a solution to the Engineer's claim that Option 1 would cost more. His solution is to participate in the excavation of the drainage for Option 1 with the Municipality paying for the material.
- The Municipality will not allow him to do the construction on his own property.
- In a “backroom manner” the Municipality sent letters to his tenants about the intense brushing that was over an intersection saying that he (Mr. Goodfellow) was responsible. It is a Municipal road and the Municipality finally did the clearing work.
- Mr. Goodfellow feels the Municipality is financially destroying him and his family. (Municipality: sued him in 2010; they will not issue building permits for the Dairy Cow Subdivision; every time he registers and easement the Municipality changes the requirements; no Sioux Lookout or Dryden surveyor will survey his easements – he must go to Thunder Bay and that is more expensive; Road Manager will not allow utilities in the Road Allowance – hydro is located on his property and to this day no Bell landlines exist to serve the subdivision [*Note: Hydro & Bell easements have been installed/granted*]; the Municipality will not allow Bell to get through to his subdivision; he is losing thousands of dollars in rent a month; the Municipality is supposed to take over Tower Hill Road and Dairy Cow Road and they have not; Municipality will not issue a certificate of completion.

**Mayor Lawrence, Councillor Southall, Councillor Bath, Councillor Forbes and Court of Revision Chairperson, Robert Durante**

The Mayor, Councillors and Court of Revision Chairperson, Robert Durante were interviewed by telephone. All five advised that they did not have a “Conflict of Interest”. All five said they were impartial in their deliberations concerning Mr. Goodfellow’s business that came before Council and the Court of Revision. *[Note: As noted in the Court of Revision Minutes, each took an oath stating “I {NAME}, solemnly affirm that I will act fairly and impartially to all those prepared to speak at today’s Court of Revision hearing to consider appeals regarding the Sturgeon Meadows Municipal Drain, specifically the revisions.]*

The Mayor, Councillors and Court of Revision Chairperson, Robert Durante all were emailed a copy of Mr. Goodfellow’s complaint.

Councillor Bath was the only one of the five that sent me a letter after reading the Complaint. Councillor Bath took umbrage with the “marks” I made beside certain sentences in the Complaint – concerned that “considerable consideration is being given to the ‘technical’ aspects of the complaint rather than those concerning the ethical conduct of Members”. Councillor Bath went on to say that it was up to Mr. Goodfellow to file Conflict of Interest charges within six (6) weeks of becoming aware of the Conflict. Councillor Bath feels that this complaint does not qualify for a “ruling” or even consideration under the terms that apply to the Office of the Integrity Commissioner.

**Mr. John Kuntze, P. Eng. – K. Smart Associates Limited**

I interviewed Mr. Kuntze by telephone in Kitchener, Ontario on December 14<sup>th</sup>, 2017 to gain his opinion on the two Options for the drain under the Drainage Act. Mr. Kuntze advised that he has extensive involvement with the Drainage Act (40years) and there are two avenues of appeal to Mr. Goodfellow: 1) the Court of Revision that has already taken place and 2) the Ontario Drainage Tribunal which is yet to take place. During of the Ontario Drainage Tribunal Mr. Goodfellow has an opportunity to put forth his arguments for Option 1.

I asked Mr. Kuntze if Option 1 was actually a viable Option for the drainage to this area. He advised that Option 1 is way out of the natural drainage path is more expensive and will have adverse effect if there is a large storm and it surcharges or blocks the Option 1 path as the water will revert back to where the Option 2 drain is proposed to go. Mr. Kuntze advised that Option 2 does not actually interfere with the operation of the property and will not interfere with the planting of ‘fruit trees’, etc. as the area is well treed and would have to be cleared before planting can happen. He advised that Option 2 is not going to have a long term impact on the beach.

## **7. CONCLUSIONS**

Mr. Goodfellow’s complaint focus’ on the way the Municipality is treating him in his attempt to solve the water drainage on his Pelto Subdivision and his attempts at completing two new subdivisions – Dariy Cow Phase I & II. His is frustrated with the easement requirements and frustrated with the Municipality invoking the Ontario Drainage Act to solve the drainage problems on Sturgeon Meadows Road.

I find that the accusations by Mr. Goodfellow that the Mayor, Councillors and Board Member Robert Durante have a conflict is **unfounded**. Mayor Lawrence is no longer connected with Keewatin Aski; Councillor Southall, Councillor Bath being landlords and landowners do not automatically make them in conflict and Councillor Forbes brother having owed Mr. Goodfellow money in the past is irrelevant. Robert Durante brought engineering expertise to the Court of Revision and is quite capable of being impartial. Any conflict of Interest charges can be brought by Mr. Goodfellow and he does not need to use this Code of Conduct to do so. Any elector may, within six weeks after the fact, it comes to his knowledge that a member may have contravened subsection 5 (1), (2) or (3), apply to the judge (Superior Court of Justice) for a determination of the question of whether the member has contravened subsection 5 (1), (2) or (3) of the Ontario Conflict of Interest Act.

I agree with Councillor Bath in his letter to me that states that the issues raised by Mr. Goodfellow are “technical” in nature but I disagree with his premise that this complaint does not qualify for a “ruling” or even consideration under the terms that apply to the Office of the Integrity Commissioner. The Municipality’s Council Code of Conduct states that Council shall treat the public without abuse, bullying, intimidation, discrimination and harassment - some of the accusations made by Mr. Goodfellow.

Since Municipal Governments exist for the sole purpose of service to the inhabitants, I find it improbable that the Municipality is actually hindering Mr. Goodfellow’s attempts at developing his lands and therefore curtailing his business and consequently his livelihood as he seems to feel.

I believe there is a willingness on Mr. Goodfellow’s part to adhere to the laws, rules and regulations as long as he can see that they are fair and will help him advance his business of developing his property. On the other side, the Municipality will always have the interests of the community in mind when assisting Mr. Goodfellow in advancing his business endeavours that will, in the end, be beneficial to the future tenants that occupy the subdivisions and result in higher assessments and more taxation.

## **8. RECOMMENDATIONS**

I can see that both Mr. Goodfellow and the Municipality of Sioux Lookout have some common ground. It will take some communication to expose the common ground. Sioux Lookout is acting in their best interest as is Mr. Goodfellow his. Both sides need each other to advance their business – present and future.

With regard to the present, the procedures under the Ontario Drainage Act will allow Mr. Goodfellow to advance his arguments for Option 1.

As for the future business endeavours, I believe it would be helpful if Mr. Goodfellow submits to the Town, in writing, what he wants to do to develop his lands in the next few months (say, within this term of Council) so everything is laid out on paper.

With this being done, the Municipality should provide a list of their requirements in order facilitate Mr. Goodfellow’s goals. Neither party wants any surprises.

## **9. SUMMARY**

I would like to thank David Goodfellow for his candid explanation of his complaint.

I would also like to thank Mayor Lawrence, Councillor Southall, Councillor Forbes and Court of Revision Chairperson, Robert Durante for taking my phone calls and speaking to me about this matter. I would especially like to thank Councillor Bath for his letter outlining his views on the complaint.

Thank you to Clerk, Brian MacKinnon for the documents covering the background concerning this complaint; John Kuntze of K. Smart Associates Limited for his explanation of the drainage aspects of Pelto Subdivision; and, Andrew Jewell, Public Works Manager for clarification on some of the aspects of this complaint.