

On Dec 3, 2009, **John McEwen** <johnmcewen@shaw.ca> wrote:
Editor of the Anmore Alternative,

It has been brought to my attention from several residents that follow the Anmore Alternative web site of some recent inaccuracies. As stated in the report from Council of the Dec 1st 2009 meeting;

- In reference to Councilor Piamonte open letter to council, letters from both Councilor Issak and myself were read that took exception to comments made, and offer clarity. " I have included mine in the attachment within." This was brought up during Business arising from the Minutes and not under Councilor reports as indicated under your report.
- In reference to Councilor McEwen's support for retaining the stop signs this too is not entirely true, as ALL of Council voted in favor of their erection to ensure safety and control speeds along the East Road Corridor. It should also be noted as commented at the recent Council Meeting of Dec 1st that All of Council voted that they be removed at the earliest convenience upon other means being available to ensure the safety for all the residences of the Village and negate any liability towards to the Village.

Myself and The Public Works, Parks, Transportation Committee have focused solely on the safety of this corridor and have spent a great deal of time discussing and debating this issue and coming forth with a decision that meets the needs of the Village as a whole.

Hopefully the comments above will assist you in making concise unbiased Council Meeting Reports

Councilor John McEwen

Response From the Editor:

Dear Councillor McEwen,

I wish to respond to each of your points.

1. I made reference in my report that both you and Councillor Issak read a prepared speech in response to Councillor Piamonte's Open Letter. This is a true statement. Since I was not given a copy of your prepared response, I was not able to include it in my report. However, since you have now supplied me with one, I will now post it.

2. I apologize that I included this information under Councillor Reports rather than Business Arising from the Minutes. However, since the information was accurate, having mentioned it under the wrong heading seems of minor significance.
3. In reference to your statement of your support for retaining the stop signs, I was only reporting the facts and not talking about previous reasons for erecting the stop signs. I was simply stating what you said during of the meeting of December 1, 2009: i.e., that you still supported the maintenance of the stop signs.
4. I realize that all of Council voted to remove the stop signs at the earliest convenience to ensure the safety for all the residents of the Village. However, this does not still negate the fact that no Councillor seconded Councillor Piamonte's motion to remove the contentious stop signs by January 15, 2010, even though at least 20-residents in the audience were clearly in support of this motion being passed.
5. I realize that the Public Works, Parks, Transportation Committee has focused solely on the safety of the Corridor and have spent a great deal of time discussing and debating this issue. For this, as a resident of Anmore, I thank-you. However, again, it still does not negate the fact that during public discussion period over this debate, the public have overwhelmingly been in favour of removing the stop signs.
6. I take pride in writing concise, articulate, unbiased Council Meeting Reports. I can only report the facts as they are stated and presented during the meetings.

Sincerely,

Camille Tribe, Editor
December 3, 2009

Councillor McEwen's Response to Councillor Piamonte's Open Letter - [Click Here](#)