



UNIVERSITY DRIVE BRIDGE PUBLIC INFORMATION CENTRE NO.2: QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction..... 1

Executive Summary of Responses 2

Question & Response Log 4

INTRODUCTION

Western thanks all those who attended the University Drive (UD) Bridge Public Information Centre No. 2 (PIC 2) held May 13 2026, and appreciates the interest in this very important project.

The existing bridge is nearing the end of its service life as a vehicular bridge and will be unable to accommodate all transportation modalities safely in its current form. A Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (Class EA) is underway to develop a multi-modal crossing of the Thames River at UD.

The work completed to date focused on Phase 1 & Phase 2 of the Class EA, including preliminary work to gather information, identify problems and opportunities, and develop alternative planning solutions. The next steps will include additional information gathering to facilitate detailed planning and decision making for a solution that balances the key considerations and regulatory requirements.

The “Big Moves” from Western’s Open Space Strategy 2018 (OSS) were key considerations (design drivers) for this project, and include:

- Prioritize Pedestrians
- Accommodate Transit
- Reduce Cut-Through Traffic
- Position Parking on the Perimeter
- Maintain Vehicle Access
- Allow for Service and Emergency Access
- Improve Accessibility
- Complete Bicycle Network
- Emphasize Landscape
- Engage the River

Building on these design drivers, the project will also integrate the principles of Western’s updated Open Space Strategy, approved in June 2026.

Public Information Centre No. 2 (PIC 2) invited participation from members of the campus and broader community, including students, faculty, staff, the London community, Indigenous stakeholders (as identified by the Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) and Western’s Office of Indigenous Initiatives), and regulatory authorities.

This report summarizes the feedback received during the PIC 2 public consultation period. Compared to the first Public Information Centre (PIC 1), there was a noticeable shift in the nature and progression of questions and comments. While PIC 1 feedback primarily focused on concerns related to bisecting the campus, discussions during PIC 2 largely assumed the need to maintain access across the river, with less direct opposition to this premise.

The comments and questions gathered across both PIC sessions reflect a wide range of perspectives, underscoring the complexity of the project and the sensitivity required in developing a solution that addresses Western’s short- and long-term needs.

Information on the project is available on the Western University Facilities Management website at the following link: https://uwo.ca/fm/projects/capital_projects/ud_bridge.html

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF RESPONSES

The comments and questions received during the PIC 2 public consultation period are categorized into the following themes and listed alphabetically:

1. Constructability
2. Environment
3. General
4. Indigenous Partners
5. Parking
6. Transportation

This Executive Summary provides general responses to topics in these categories. These responses have been used to reply directly to each of the questions and comments received during PIC 2, as shown in pages 5 through 20 below.

Constructability

The constructability responses highlight a range of physical, structural, and regulatory constraints that limited feasible design options. Strict hydraulic criteria played a decisive role, eliminating alternatives like the steel “V” pier despite only minor impacts on water levels, as compliance could not be achieved through further refinement. Similarly, structural limitations constrained modifications to the existing bridge. For example, sidewalk and roadway elevations could not be reconciled because lowering the sidewalks would conflict with the bridge’s integrated structural design, while raising the bridge deck would exceed acceptable loading and geometric constraints. Aesthetic considerations also influenced constructability, with solutions like highly visible cable-supported bridge concepts deemed too visually prominent and inconsistent with the existing site context.

Additional responses highlight spatial and planning constraints shaping the design, including fixed infrastructure elements (e.g., unchanged exit configurations and property considerations) and variable clearances between bridge alignments. While detailed design is still underway, preliminary information indicates conventional but substantial substructures; such as large, mostly buried arch spring foundations and full height abutments, suggesting that constructability must balance subsurface complexity, clearance requirements, and incomplete design certainty.

Constructability overview:

- Strict design constraints: Hydraulic criteria and structural load limits prevent even minor design adjustments.
- Integration with existing infrastructure: Existing bridge elements and site features restrict feasible modifications.
- Balancing function and aesthetics: Visually prominent structural systems were avoided to maintain site character.
- Evolving design: Ongoing design development introduces unknowns in sizing and constructability details.

Environment

The environmental responses focus on balancing roadway safety requirements with efforts to reduce ecological impacts on the river system. While the use of road salt remains a standard and necessary practice for winter safety, the project incorporates mitigation measures such as preventing direct drainage into the river and designing systems to collect and manage stormwater runoff before release. Western is also committed to exploring alternative de-icing strategies, including sand mixtures and emerging eco-friendly products, supported by research initiatives and pilot projects on campus.

More broadly, the environmental approach is tied to reducing overall transportation-related impacts through operational and planning strategies. By limiting unnecessary vehicular traffic across campus and promoting multimodal transportation options, the project aligns with long-term sustainability goals outlined in institutional strategies. Although not all elements of the long term vision—such as full cycling network expansion—are included in this phase, future improvements are anticipated. Environmental considerations will continue to be documented and refined through the formal assessment and reporting process (Class EA and ESR), ensuring ongoing evaluation and accountability.

Environment overview:

- Balancing safety and environmental protection: Continued salt use with efforts to reduce ecological harm.
- Stormwater and runoff management: Design measures to control and treat bridge drainage before entering the river.
- Commitment to innovation: Exploring environmentally friendly de-icing materials through ongoing research and pilot initiatives.
- Long-term sustainability: Reducing vehicle use and planning for future active transportation expansions.

General

The general responses emphasize the project's ongoing, iterative planning process and the importance of continued engagement with interested parties. The University continues to lead the project and conduct consultation through the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment process, including PIC sessions and public feedback opportunities. Input from the community is collected, documented, and considered throughout the planning process, helping to inform project decisions where appropriate. Coordination with interested parties, such as the City of London, is also ongoing to ensure alignment with broader planning and design objectives.

At the same time, the project remains in the planning and design stage, with aspects of the detailed design and construction approach still under development. Preliminary schedules anticipate construction beginning in 2027 and extending into 2028, although more precise scheduling will depend on contractor involvement and further design development. Key design decisions, including bridge alignment and geometry, are informed by technical, environmental, and contextual considerations, such as minimizing impacts to mature tree while integrating with the existing campus. Overall, the planning process emphasizes transparency, consultation, and the continued refinement of the preferred solution.

General overview:

- Ongoing consultation and transparency: Active engagement with interested parties, with public feedback informing the planning process.
- Evolving design and uncertainty: Details still being refined, particularly for construction methods and timelines.
- Coordination with agencies and partners: Collaboration with municipal departments and alignment with broader planning frameworks.
- Balancing multiple considerations: Design decisions reflect environmental, spatial, and campus integration priorities.

Indigenous Communities

Responses indicate a commitment to continued engagement with Indigenous communities throughout the project, including during detailed design. The Environmental Study Report (ESR) includes a "Statement of Flexibility" that provides opportunities for collaboration on commemorative and cultural elements, such as naming, interpretive features, and recognition of Indigenous stewardship of the land and waterway.

This approach recognizes that opportunities for Indigenous input will continue beyond the Municipal Class EA and into the detailed design phase.

Indigenous Partners overview:

- Ongoing engagement: Continued involvement of Indigenous communities throughout detailed design.
- Cultural recognition: Inclusion of naming, interpretive, and commemorative elements.
- Design flexibility: Opportunities to incorporate Indigenous perspectives as the project evolves

Parking

The parking-related responses emphasize minimizing impacts to existing parking supply while improving layout efficiency and accessibility. Although some parking loss at the Talbot lot is unavoidable, redesign efforts have reduced this to a relatively small net loss of approximately 10–14 spaces by optimizing the layout. Changes to the lot configuration, including shifting the entrance south, aim to improve circulation while providing safer, more accessible pedestrian connections. These changes support compliance with Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) requirements and create a clearer route to nearby building entrances. The plan also retains key features such as the drop-off zone at Talbot College, which is being expanded to better accommodate demand.

During construction, the project seeks to maintain parking availability and access, with only temporary and localized

disruptions anticipated. Coordination with transit services and careful staging of construction activities are intended to minimize impacts on users. Overall, the approach balances parking functionality with improvements to safety, accessibility, and integration with broader campus planning objectives.

Parking overview:

- Minimizing parking loss: Efficient redesign reduces the net loss of spaces.
- Improved safety and accessibility: Upgraded entrances, crossings, and pathways aligned with AODA standards.
- Maintaining functionality during construction: Continued parking access with limited temporary disruptions.
- Integration with broader planning goals: Coordination with pedestrian flow, transit, and campus development strategies.

Transportation

The transportation-focused responses emphasize a design approach that prioritizes maintaining mobility while improving safety, accessibility, and long-term campus traffic management. The preferred south bridge alignment was influenced by roadway constraints, such as insufficient space near Delaware Hall and utility conflicts, as well as broader environmental and ecological considerations. The project is structured to maintain traffic flow during construction by keeping the existing bridge operational until the new one is complete, with only temporary and localized disruptions. At the same time, the design introduces roadway features such as raised, signalized intersections and traffic calming measures intended to reduce through traffic on campus and encourage drivers to use surrounding routes.

A key feature of the transportation strategy is the separation and enhancement of travel modes. Vehicular traffic will primarily use the new bridge, while the existing bridge and surrounding pathways will support active transportation, with multiple route options maintained or improved for pedestrians and cyclists. The plan emphasizes safety and accessibility through improved crossings, accessible design standards, and route options that reduce interactions between pedestrians, cyclists, and vehicles. While some aspects of construction staging and future network expansion remain subject to refinement, the transportation strategy aims to preserve existing connections, accommodate future growth, and integrate with municipal infrastructure and policies while minimizing disruptions and maintaining multimodal accessibility.

Transportation overview:

- Minimizing disruption to traffic: Maintain existing bridge use during construction and limit closures where possible.
- Prioritizing active transportation: Enhanced pedestrian and cyclist safety, routing, and accessibility.
- Traffic calming and demand management: Use of design features to reduce through-traffic and improve campus circulation.
- Integration with broader transportation systems: Coordination with existing infrastructure, municipal planning, and future network development.

QUESTION & RESPONSE LOG

The log below includes all comments and questions received during the PIC 2 process. All personally identifiable details have been redacted, as have salutations and signoffs received in written submission. Public submissions received as part of the PIC 2 process are shown in bold typeface, with Western's responses shown in normal typeface. Horizontal lines delineate the start and end of distinct submissions.

What is the size of the base/foundation on each side of the bridge? Where is the exact location?

We have not completed detailed design yet, but this does give a good sense of where and the approximate sizing of the piers and abutments. The spring for the arch is a substantial concrete component, but it is largely underground. Abutments are normal, reasonably tall, full height to provide good clearance underneath them. I do not think that we can be more specific at this time as we have not completed our detailed design. All the spans are open until you get to the abutments on the two sides.

What is the new width of the bridge down the river, meaning how much further down the river south... what does the Sunset exit look like? Will the last home on the Parkway Riverside be taken down?

The offset between the proposed and existing bridges ranges from approximately 13 m at the east abutment to 25 m at the west abutment, measured edge-to-edge. The Sunset St. intersection remains generally unchanged. There are currently no definitive plans for 1129 The Parkway.

Just wondering why you've chosen to keep the general surface structure of the existing bridge (original roadway and curbs with separation between pedestrian and cycling uses) rather than creating a cobbled walkway for mixed use designed something like the Dundas Place multi-use roadway?

The current sidewalks that are on the bridge are at a higher elevation than the roadway. The outboard sidewalks on the existing bridge were added at a later stage and are part of a new integrated steel structure that is at a higher elevation, therefore it is not feasible to lower those sidewalks to the deck of the bridge.

The alternative of that, which we have explored, is then raising up the center portion of the bridge to match the existing sidewalk elevations. However, the design of the bridge does not allow us to introduce that additional dead load to get us up to that sidewalk level.

Why are there no other construction methods (e.g. hanging traffic surface) considered?

A hanging traffic surface, entails either an extradosed bridge, cable stayed bridge, or an earth bridge, where you have superstructure above the deck. That structure will become quite prominent in the environment. The design team and Western wanted the bridge to integrate with the existing aesthetic on the site.

Why are certain issues assessed "poor" for the steel construction but then mentioned by the speaker to be the same to the concrete construction?

The hydraulics review had very strict and exact criteria that had to be met. Even though the difference in water levels caused by the Steel 'V' Pier bridge alternative was very small, it did not meet the criteria. As such, there was no way that we could improve it to reduce the increase to meet the criteria it became a poor solution to the river.

What will happen to the salt runoff on the new vehicle bridge? And will you be salting both bridges, doubling runoff to the river?

Salt usage is a common maintenance strategy for all roads and bridges, but in detail design, we will be taking a look at water quality measures so we have an ability to direct run off from the bridge deck and collect stormwater on the two sides of the new bridge before release into the river, but salt is something that is a common approach for liability and safety on the road.

Additionally, there will be no deck drains releasing directly into the river. The reliance on salt as a primary use is

certainly something that, we would be considering as a university, to potentially reduce the amount of salt used in these areas and along the river, however safety is always our primary concern. Western remains open to looking at products that can reduce the environmental impacts of salt on our roadways and sidewalks.

Many thanks for the information in your email regarding the bridge... so happy people are on top of this very important bridge for Western... I did have three females come up June 2025 to lay eggs and in September we had 32 baby turtles fight their way out of a tiny hole ... truly amazing. Many thanks, ... I would like to be on your email list...

Mitigation measures intended to protect turtles will be included in the Environmental Study Report, including exclusion fencing and timing. Your comments will be considered by the technical study team and recorded as part of the Public Record. Public comments will be documented in the Environmental Study Report (ESR).

PART 1: I strongly recommend against the PIC-2 proposal (the second bridge for vehicular traffic). This is a dangerously backwards step on Western's part. It is embarrassing and shameful that Western continues to prioritize vehicular traffic and private vehicles on campus. Considering that Western claims to pride itself on its alleged sustainability and greenness, it is shocking that it is clinging to the notion that motorized vehicles must drive through campus. We are at a point in time when Western should be restricting vehicular traffic on campus and curtailing private vehicles from cutting through campus. Instead, in building a second bridge and (judging from the diagrams and drawings) widening the roads, Western would appear to be prioritizing the desires of drivers, not of its community. On page 6, there is the comment that the present bridge has "insufficient width to suitably accommodate the number of vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists." This is a false premise, as there is no need to increase the number of vehicles; instead of building a second bridge to accommodate this supposed need for additional vehicles, you should be making attempts to reduce vehicular traffic. Why is this not being considered by senior leadership? You do say that "alternatives have been considered," though the only alternatives that I see mentioned are different plans for the bridge itself in terms of location and structure (and those alternatives are then dismissed in any case). I do not see any alternatives that do not include a second bridge, nor do I see alternatives aimed at reducing or eliminating traffic. On page 12, we see results of a study outlining the extremely high amount of traffic passing over the existing bridge onto campus. It is noted that 75% of motorists turn to/from Lambton Drive. This should be a frightening statistic, in this era of trying to reduce our carbon footprint. However, instead of searching for solutions to reduce the amount of vehicular traffic, Western appears to embrace this and simply proposes a plan to redirect traffic slightly down the road. Again, this is embarrassing. I have heard arguments in the past from senior leaders at Western that it is not feasible to reduce or restrict vehicular traffic on campus. You are surely aware, I imagine, that in Europe, it is commonplace for vehicular traffic to be restricted in many areas of cities. This can include core areas, bridges, public and pedestrian areas, etc. Why has Western not studied solutions that would make campus a pedestrian and cyclist-friendly community? Instead, this proposal makes it seem as if vehicular traffic is only going to increase and we can expect even more traffic on the newly widened campus roads. Thank you for your time.

PART 2 (CONT): This note on page 22 is simply unacceptable: "Southbound cyclists shall dismount and cross Lambton Drive to access existing sharrow-marked lane." In other words, vehicular traffic is being prioritized over cyclists. This is so tone-deaf that I do think it's a fair question to ask if any of the senior leaders who are behind this proposal ever actually walk or cycle to campus. Or do they all drive to campus? I note that the document already outlines that Phase 5 is "Implementation: Proceed to detail design, tendering and construction." This strongly indicates that this decision has already been made and that this consultation is not genuine or serious. I do hope that I'm wrong and that Western is open to alternatives, but that does not come across in the document. I would also like to voice my strong disapproval of the timing of this consultation, which seems to have been chosen strategically so that it coincides with a period when much of the campus community (most students certainly, and many faculty) is no longer present on campus or actively reading emails. In speaking to many groups on campus, I have the firm impression that much of the campus community feels as I do about this proposal. That is, they feel that it is contrary to what Western should be doing at this time of climate crisis. I have heard many students, in particular, express grave reservations about the proposal. My impression is that the majority of students feel that the administration should be restricting vehicular access to campus, not catering to it, or encouraging it. I do know that optics are extremely important to the current administration—I would go so far as to suggest that it's the main thing that they are concerned about—so if nothing else, I do hope that Western will consider the optics of this proposal, and how it will harm Western's view of itself as a champion of sustainability. Instead, Western will be seen, rightfully, as

backwards-looking and as an institution with its head in the sand with regard to the climate crisis. Thank you for your time.

Restricting non-campus traffic is an operational choice that can be made by the University. It is something that the University can employ for future generations of leadership of Western to choose how to operate the new bridge. The need for vehicles to cross the bridge exists with our campus being on both sides of the river to connect, again, for Western operational purposes as well as the access for the university hospital remains important.

It is one of the goals outlined in the Campus Development Strategy (CDS) and Open Space Strategy (OSS) to reduce vehicular traffic cutting through the campus.

The PIC2 exhibits have only illustrated the portion of this cycle track that would be completed as part of this project. The continuation of the path southerly would be considered a future project.

Rumor has it that the University purchased the home at 1129 The Parkway, presumably for demolition to make room for the new bridge 'twin', as it has since been kept vacant. Is this true? Has the University considered the potential impact of this plan on the adjoining neighborhood or consulted with the community, especially now that the active roadway will be much closer to nearby residences?

1129 The Parkway has been purchased by the University. The future use of the property is to be determined by Western. As part of the bridge environmental assessment process, the university has reached out to all adjoining neighborhood associations to all comment for impact and understanding of the proposed plans, that has been the intention of both the PIC 1 and PIC 2 sessions.

Is the goal to have an operational new bridge by the end of 2027/early 2028?

We cannot commit with a high degree of specificity in terms of the construction timeline. The current projection is to start construction in 2027, it is reasonable that this could see the construction going through the 2028 construction season. The construction schedule is much better informed once we have a contractor in place.

Are there any decisions yet to be finalized for which comments will be meaningfully considered, or is this purely an information session telling us what is going to happen?

This process is a part of the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment process. Comments will be reviewed as we progress into detailed design over the next several months. We will be looking towards feedback from today's session, collected via email, some that we have already received in advance of today, and subsequently over the next few weeks we will be looking at where we can practically and meaningfully incorporate feedback as the design is finalized and we certainly want to encourage everyone to continue to share their perspectives and feedback.

Some pics show the bridges close together and some quite far apart. Is there a planned spacing yet?

The bridge widens from east to west, from University Drive towards Talbot College and the music faculty buildings. That is to land at the intersection on the other side and to reduce the impact on the mature trees that are south of the existing bridge as you cross the river.

Can you describe the consultation that's been done with the City, if any?

Consultation with the City of London, mainly the Parks Long Range Planning & Design department has been initiated and will be ongoing as this plan develops. City of London representatives and the local councilor have been invited to both PIC1 and PIC2 sessions.

Hello, I have reviewed the slideshow of the proposed plan for a second bridge for University Drive and am excited and supportive of the project. As a cyclist I find it a dangerous place at present.

Thank you for your comments regarding the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (Class EA). They will be considered by the technical study team and recorded as part of the Public Record. Public comments will be documented in the Environmental Study Report (ESR). We appreciate your support for this project.

Hello, Could we please get a copy of the PowerPoint presentation? We had trouble joining the meeting because we thought the Zoom meeting link was the one posted here:

https://www.uwo.ca/fm/projects/capital_projects/ud_bridge.html

When we tried accessing it, we kept receiving this message: "The page you are looking for may have been removed, had its name changed, has no access rights, or is temporarily unavailable." If possible, could you also share any meeting notes or a recap along with the PowerPoint? That would be greatly appreciated. Thank you very much.

You can access the presentation PDF at the direct link below: <https://www.uwo.ca/fm/pdf/9M5173---PIC-2-Presentation-2026-05-01.pdf> Comments will be accepted until end of the day on May 27th. Following this, all questions and answers will be posted along the right-hand side of the following website:

https://www.uwo.ca/fm/projects/capital_projects/ud_bridge.html

ACO London recently received a copy of the Notice for the PIC held regarding the University Bridge project on May 13th, 2026. It would be appreciated if any presentation such as a slide deck shown as this Zoom meeting be circulated to us. It is our understanding from the Notice that the current stone bridge is to be retained for non-vehicular traffic. Also, if in future, you could please add ACO London to your circulation list for any further notice regarding the Municipal EA or other related approvals at this email address: info@acolondon.ca Thanks!

You can access the presentation PDF at the direct link: <https://www.uwo.ca/fm/pdf/9M5173---PIC-2-Presentation-2026-05-01.pdf>. In addition, we have added you to our contact list.

Dear Project Team, On behalf of Western University's Office of Indigenous Initiatives (OII), I am writing to provide a formal submission in response to the University Drive Bridge Class Environmental Assessment (EA) process, following Public Information Centre No. 2. The OII wishes to signal its strong interest in this project as a meaningful opportunity to advance Western's commitments to reconciliation with local Indigenous communities, as articulated in Towards Western at 150. Given the bridge's location over Deshkan Ziibing (a.k.a. the Thames River) and its significance as a central point of connection within campus, we see this project as uniquely positioned to reflect relationships to land, water, and the local Nations whose territories Western occupies. This perspective builds on earlier discussions I held with President Alan Shepard in 2022, and subsequently with Vice-President (Operations and Finance) Lynn Logan, regarding the opportunity to Indigenize the anticipated bridge project. At that time, there was shared interest in the general premise, including the potential for Indigenous-language naming and the inclusion of ceremony and acknowledgement of the local Nations connected to Deshkan Ziibing as part of the bridge's opening. We are now bringing this forward more formally at a stage where there is greater clarity regarding the project's direction. At the same time, we recognize that the EA process is currently focused on technical planning, design alternatives, and environmental considerations. As such, OII is not proposing that decisions regarding naming or specific cultural design elements be made within the EA phase. Rather, we recommend that Western use this stage of the project to: Embed a clear institutional commitment acknowledging the cultural and territorial significance of the land and waterway, and Western's responsibility to advance reconciliation with local Indigenous communities; and

Intentionally reserve space within the project—both conceptually and within the design—for future Indigenous-led co-development of naming, cultural elements, and interpretive features. This approach would allow the project to proceed within its current timelines, while ensuring that Indigenous engagement related to naming, ceremony, language, and cultural expression is undertaken in a meaningful, community-led way following the EA phase. It also aligns with the principles of respectful engagement, avoids the risk of premature or tokenistic decisions, and creates a clear pathway for collaboration with local Nations, Knowledge Holders, and community partners. We further note that the EA process already identifies Indigenous stakeholder engagement as an important component of the project. Building on this foundation, the approach outlined above would strengthen Western's ability to carry this work forward in a manner that reflects both institutional commitments and Indigenous protocols. We would welcome the opportunity to work collaboratively with Facilities Management and project partners to help shape next steps following the EA, including the development of an appropriate engagement and co-development process with local Indigenous communities.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input. We appreciate the care being taken in the planning of this important project and look forward to supporting its continued development in a good way.

We have included in the Environmental Study Report a 'Statement of Flexibility' which states the Recommended Plan may include refinements during detail design including engaging with Indigenous Communities participation in commemorating indigenous past and present stewardship of the lands and the waterway, and vital contributors of our society through co-development of naming, cultural elements, and interpretive features.

Your comments will be considered by the technical study team and recorded as part of the Public Record. Public comments will be documented in the Environmental Study Report (ESR).

Hello, I have serious concerns about the health and welfare of the Faculty of Music under the proposed construction plans, mainly as it impacts parking. Nearby parking is essential for our Faculty. Some of us (both faculty and students) have to carry large instruments to the buildings. Secondly, and perhaps most importantly, it is part of our mandate to contribute to the cultural life of the city. Our audiences are often seniors with limited mobility. I cannot imagine that they will continue to attend events if parking is not within a reasonable distance. If the upcoming plans include limiting parking in Talbot and the South Valley lot then this will have serious consequences for the health of our faculty.

The existing Talbot parking lot will be maintained and any loss of spaces will be reviewed to minimize the loss. Final construction will see the entrance be changed to allow AODA accessibility cross Lambton Drive with pedestrian crossover (PXO) and a raised crosswalk. A drop-off zone in front of Talbot College will remain and has been extended. Your comments will be considered by the technical study team and recorded as part of the Public Record. Public comments will be documented in the Environmental Study Report (ESR).

Hello,

My name is XXXXXX, and I am a tenured professor in the Faculty of Music. I hold a core parking permit and typically use the Talbot and South Valley lots due to their proximity to the Music Building. However, throughout this year I have frequently been unable to find parking in either location, particularly when snow removal reduces available spaces. I am increasingly concerned about the impact of the upcoming bridge construction and the potential loss of parking in the Talbot lot. Parking in this area is already strained due to the high volume of public traffic around the Music Building. This issue has begun to affect the start of my instruction times. On multiple occasions, I have had to circle these closer lots to find a spot in order to reduce my musical instrument's cold exposure on the walk. I often carry a wooden and expensive instrument needed for teaching and needed at home and one that should be outdoors minimally. To put this in context, every year I have multiple students with instruments that crack over the winter. They are forever altered, require immediate temporary replacement and need a \$200-800 ""repair"" to prevent further cracking. As faculty, I must prevent cracking of my instruments because they are needed for my work and research activity. To reduce cold exposure, sometimes I have had to temporarily park in the traffic circle, quickly drop off my instrument in my office and come back to the car to park further away. At times this has caused me to be late for teaching and one time, I received a parking ticket for the 3 minutes needed. (although I pay for a core permit, I should have used Honk for those 3 minutes.) On another occasion, after being unable to find a space, I parked at the end of a row in South Valley. Despite coming out and checking again during my only break, no spaces became available, and I ultimately received a ticket upon arrival to my car after a full day of teaching. Not only did I get a significant ticket, but it was troubling to know that when I couldn't find parking, I saw people coming out of their cars with gym bags and heading to the recreation center. Parking is challenging for any large institution, but faculty and staff should have priority since they are providing the services needed for the campus to operate. And there are added complexities for the music faculty with professors who are required to carry sensitive, expensive instruments to and from parking lots in order to teach and the music buildings having relatively heavy public traffic compared to many other faculties. I understand accommodation for construction is necessary but on the recognition that parking is a real challenge, I encourage administration to arrange some type of accommodation for its employees, who not only pay for parking but face consequences with more distant parking.

The existing parking lot will be maintained and any loss of spaces will be reviewed to minimize the loss. Final construction will see the entrance be changed to allow AODA accessibility cross Lambton Drive with pedestrian crossover (PXO) and a raised crosswalk. A drop-off zone in front of the Talbot College will remain and has been extended. Please direct any existing parking operations concerns to Western Parking Services. Your comments will be considered by the technical study team and recorded as part of the Public Record. Public comments will be documented in the Environmental Study Report (ESR).

Hello,

I would like to know the extent to which the proposed University Drive bridge project will block my access to my campus parking lot (Middlesex) from my home (in the old north). If the car passage through the bridge is blocked, to drive to campus from home I would have to go through the Richmond-Windermere intersection, which is likely to be terribly jammed (as during the strike a while ago). While walking from home to campus is sometime feasible, my duties (teaching, administrative meetings, hosting seminar guests, etc.) often requires me to come to campus with a car within a short time. I am afraid that the blockage of car access through the bridge would significantly undermine my daily work and life. Thank you for the considerations. Attached is the email from Vice-President Logan that calls for feedback on this project.

The University Drive bridge project should have minimal impact with respect to Middlesex Parking lot access. The current bridge will remain open until the new bridge is completed. Your comments will be considered by the technical study team and recorded as part of the Public Record. Public comments will be documented in the Environmental Study Report (ESR).

I am writing to let you know that I am concerned about the reduction in parking in the Talbot parking lot once the new bridge building project begins. There is already limited parking for concerts and other events at Western, and further reductions may reduce our audience numbers and make it harder for us to obtain revenues from tickets sales and also create barriers to our ability to share the projects and performances from our talented students and faculty with the community at large. Please consider these factors when you embark on further planning for this project.

The existing Talbot parking lot will be maintained and any loss of spaces will be reviewed to minimize the loss. Final construction will see the entrance changed to allow AODA accessibility across Lambton Drive with pedestrian crossover (PXO) and a raised crosswalk. A drop-off zone in front of Talbot College will remain and has been extended. Your comments will be considered by the technical study team and recorded as part of the Public Record. Public comments will be documented in the Environmental Study Report (ESR).

To whom it may concern

Thanks for the recent Faculty of Music presentation. My comments and concerns:

Parking is needed: concert attendees/students with disabilities students with large, heavy, cumbersome, and expensive instruments (euphoniums, tuba, string bass, etc.) students with multiple instruments (principal instrument and guitar/secondary instrument or multiple primary instruments)

Community outreach/ recruitment activities. OBA Intermediate Honour Band pick-up/drop off by parents (2-day event) approximately 200 children (grades 8-12) We have students attending from over 5 hours away

It's an important recruitment activity for the faculty. Western Young Winds (10 Saturday mornings) approximately 90 children (grades 6-9). These are young children with large instruments. Western Youth Wind Ensemble (10 Saturday mornings) approximately 75 children (grades 10-12) Recruitment campus visits (these students come with instruments). During the campus strike closure, staff/faculty couldn't drop off large items I couldn't return my Interprovincial Music Camp Supplies (box of music) for MONTHS. Library music borrowed for this recruitment activity. Supplies drop off for outreach events. Commute changed from 20 minutes to 1 hour (I had to park past Ivy)

Not enough staff spots if you arrive mid-day even if you have paid extra for reserved parking. If we relocate the tennis bubble and the skating rink, then our parking could be shifted. This seems like a possible solution. Thanks for listening,

The existing parking lot will be maintained and any loss of spaces will be reviewed to minimize the loss. Final construction will see the entrance be changed to allow AODA accessibility cross Lambton Drive with pedestrian crossover (PXO) and a raised crosswalk. A drop-off zone in front of Talbot College will remain and has been extended. Your comments will be considered by the technical study team and recorded as part of the Public Record. Public comments will be documented in the Environmental Study Report (ESR).

Good morning,

My feedback for the project comes as a Western employee in the Music Faculty who takes the bus regularly via Richmond to campus. While the construction will add time to my commute to work and home, I am writing on the broader impact this will have on visitors to the Talbot College and Music Building facilities. The Talbot Lot serves as parking for audience members (including senior members of the community with limited mobility) to the 400+ events we have each year. In addition, there are several community groups who rent halls/rooms in both buildings who rely on this lot. If community groups are dissuaded due to the construction, the lack of rentals will have an impact on the earnings of the Faculty. As a result, I am keen to better understand the plan to accommodate the significant volume of external visitors unique to the Music Faculty during the construction period and beyond should there be the removal of the Talbot Lot. This comment is in no way associated with the needs of current students, faculty, and/or staff accessing campus/the Talbot Lot.

Just an FYI about buses:

Each time construction/protests re-route the Richmond buses, there is a resulting increase in wait times for the LTC buses in addition to a longer commute. During the last construction period for the new residence I was consistently waiting 30-40 minutes at the stop on campus for any of the 6, 13, or 13a buses to show up (according to their usual schedule at least two should have been there in that time), often when they did arrive, they were heading the opposite direction (since all have to go to one stop). It is worth noting that the LTC has not met the needs of commuters during construction re-routes in the past; I am concerned about the service during a longer-term project like the University Drive Bridge.

Many thanks for offering feedback on the project

The existing Talbot parking lot will be maintained and any loss of spaces will be reviewed to minimize the loss. The number of stalls available during construction will be determined once a contractor is in place. The entrance will be changed to allow AODA accessibility across Lambton Drive with a pedestrian crossover (PXO) and a raised crosswalk. A drop-off zone in front of Talbot College will remain and has been extended. Your comments will be considered by the technical study team and recorded as part of the Public Record. Public comments will be documented in the Environmental Study Report (ESR). The university will coordinate construction activities with the London Transit Commission to minimize disruptions in service. Your comments will be considered by the technical study team and recorded as part of the Public Record. Public comments will be documented in the Environmental Study Report (ESR).

Has this been worked out with the proposed changes to proposed campus development strategy? Will parking be lost in the Talbot lots? I would like to see the before and after schematics for that lot and how the new traffic pattern is going to impact the turn in/out.

The design of the bridge and the traffic flow or pedestrian flow is considered and forms part of the coordinated planning with the Open Space Strategy (2026). Our goal during design is to minimize the loss of parking in the Talbot lot post construction. Through some redesign, our consultants were able to redesign the lot to be more efficient. While we are losing some parking; we are able to optimize parking within that existing space and are looking at likely a net loss at the end of the project of 10 to 14 stalls.

Additionally, with the redesign of the parking lot the driveway shifts a little further south in the Talbot parking lot. This will allow for a improved pedestrian crossings from the Talbot lot to the Music/Talbot building.

Currently, the driveway slope does not meet the building code from an accessibility perspective. The new driveway design does meet that requirement. The proposed pedestrian crossover (PXO) aligns with the accessible entrance that exists between the newer music building to the older Talbot College building.

I believe I heard that there will be reconstruction of the Talbot College parking lot. Can you elaborate on this a bit. I didn't see the Tennis Bubble in any of the diagrams that were shown

PIC2 Slide 23 shows the reconfiguration of the Talbot parking lot with a more efficient layout, which allows us to retain the maximum amount of parking stalls. Ingress/egress is now on the south end of the parking lot, and then below that, the two existing tennis bubbles remain in place.

In regards to slide 23. Will the talbot parking be fully closed down? and secondly, where will the laydown areas be

located during construction of the new bridge on each side of the river? Thanks!

Talbot Parking lot should not be fully closed, though during construction there may be requirements for temporary closures of the parking lot. The laydown areas during construction have not been defined yet and short term impacts to access and parking will need to be determined with the contractor at the start of the work.

Page 12: Bullets points 1 & 2: The motorists traffic volume was recorded on only one specific day (Nov 18, 2025) and based on that it was assumed that 75% of the motorists traffic went to/from Lambton Drive. Shouldn't there be more recent recordings to have a less biased estimate? In particular, the traffic to/from Perth was significantly discouraged by the years-long construction therein. So 75% estimate might be quite biased. And deciding on the southern route might have been influenced by this bias.

Several design principles that provided guidance to the preferred option being the south alignment of the bridge. One of the issues was not around traffic necessarily. The north alignment was ruled out because there was not enough road width between the north side of the bridge and the student residence Delaware Hall.

There were also conflicts with the existing infrastructure and water mains. Another of our priorities in designing the project and selecting the location was to minimize the ecological impact on the river. There are also species at risk on the northwest abutments of the existing bridge that would be impacted by having an alignment north of the bridge.

The river widens to the north, and the abutments would have potentially been further into the river or into the floodplain to accept the span that was needed. With the exhibit in PIC 2 only showing traffic volumes on a single date, there are historical traffic counts that we have compared to which align with numbers that are very consistent over time.

Page 30: Does the last bullet point ("Construction...") mean that the motor vehicle access (for cars at least) on the existing bridge is still maintained during the construction of the new one? If the answer is No, what are the solutions to preempt/mitigate the potential traffic jams at Western-Windermere and at Western-Sarnia?

The intent is to keep traffic on the existing bridge until the new bridge is in service. At that point, we will move all vehicle traffic onto the new bridge. There may be times, during the intersection improvements in particular, where there may be closures that are needed. The construction will have some impacts, but we are certainly looking to minimize those impacts through the design and construction of the project.

The existing traffic demand slide was interesting, showing 1700 vehicles turning north and 5600 turning south versus 4600 pedestrians traversing the bridge per day. However, what are the future projections, given the University's goal of reducing cut-through traffic? It has been reported previously that up to 50% of traffic across the bridge (i.e., 3650 vehicles) came in the form of cut-through personal motor vehicles... so, if the University manages its goal of eliminating cut-through traffic, how might that influence this project? Has this been considered?

There is growth forecast for the University and a recommended plan includes traffic calming features, such as raised intersections, could lead to a diversion around the campus as opposed to going through the campus. Traffic management is considered in present, ongoing and future operational practices and if they need to change over time, they will remain flexible to do so. Even with reduced cut-through traffic the university requires a two-lane span to service the campus on the east side of the river and to provide LTC access.

P 23: It looks like cyclists travelling south in front of Talbot will have to cross and rejoin vehicle traffic on the road just before going around the big curve. Wouldn't it be safer to put the bike path behind Talbot (on its west side), then rejoin the road after the curve?

The location of the bi-directional pathway on Lambton Drive illustrates only what would be included in this project at this time. Further development of the bike path is under consideration via other project means and will be explored in collaboration with the bridge project and a continuous plan will be implemented over time.

p 26: Why put the bike lanes on the new bridge over to one side with pedestrians down on the same level, rather than centering the bike lanes and widening the sidewalks ("bridge lookout") on either side?

This solution was considered in the design phase in between PIC 1 and PIC 2. What ruled that out was partially due to

snow clearing equipment clearance requirements, additionally the wider sidewalk shown on the south meets the accessibility requirements following the best practices of the City of London. The introduction of physical lane delineators or other controls between the cycle path and the pedestrian sidewalk width it inhibits snow clearing equipment to move across the bridge effectively as well.

Page 27 (Vissim Simulation): Through the new bridge, can cars still turn north from the bridge to Perth thereby accessing the Middlesex Parking Lot?

Westbound vehicles can turn right to continue north on Perth Drive on green light only, there will be no-right turn on red at this intersection. Access to the Middlesex parking lot will be unchanged by this project.

From slide 23 of today's presentation: On the east side of the river, the shared pathway currently connects The Parkway with University Bridge for pedestrians and cyclists. It looks like this connection will disappear in the new configuration. Many pedestrians and cyclists approach the bridge not from Sunset Street but from The Parkway, which serves as a connection from the Thames Valley Parkway and Gibbons Park. How will this be addressed under the proposed reconfiguration?

The Thames Valley Parkway (TVP) walkways remain as they are today. The multi-use path (TVP) under the bridge remains as existing with a new sidewalk connection up to the existing bridge. It will continue along the river under both bridges and to cross you would either go up to the new Sunset Street intersection which has been pulled closer to the existing bridge or travel under the bridge and loop up to the existing bridge. This is shown via the tan lines on slide 23, they connect at the intersection on the north and south side of the new bridges. The beige line is the existing TVP connections that are there now. You have that choice as a cyclist/ pedestrian to take Sunset Street to the pedestrian crossing or to cross under the bridge and loop back and not engage with vehicles at all, and cross back on to the existing bridge. All pedestrians and cyclists would have two choices. The same condition for pedestrians and cyclists exists as the intersection and pathway functions currently.

P. 7: Naive Q perhaps, but why was Philip Aziz - Huron not considered as a location, to bring the through traffic across without entering the campus? The span would likely be at a slight angle (NW-SE) relative to Philip Aziz, landing in Baldwin Flats and bringing traffic up to Huron.

P. 8: UT River CA

P. 12: No blue line for historic traffic straight across University Drive to Middlesex Drive?

P. 26: lose the conifers - not at all real and LOOKS UNPROFESSIONAL, seriously calls to question the consultants paid as part of this project.

General: WHERE will the arch be formed and how will it move into place? I applaud the lack of construction activity IN the river.

Philip Aziz Avenue and Huron Street are City owned , these would not be the purview of Western's ability to place a bridge there. The contractor's lay-down areas are something that will be set in detailed design to minimize interference with existing parking and buildings. If the concrete arch bridge is carried forward it may be pre-cast off-site and brought to the site by truck in pieces and assembled. That is the work of the detailed design, so we cannot provide exact details of the implementation, but it is very likely that the arch will not be installed in a single piece.

With respect to new bridge construction, the road approaches on either side would typically be built to create an area for the contractor to access the bridge, and if there are precast pieces for the bridge, they will have the two road approaches in place for them to use.

Was there a slide showing detailed traffic flow on the east side of the bridge, e.g. how cyclists coming north on the TVP will cross all the vehicle and pedestrian traffic to get onto the bike lane on the renovated old bridge, and how traffic flow is supposed to work around the new drop-off area?

Cyclist do not have to go through the Sunset Street intersection if they choose to go under the bridges. If they had a destination that was going to head off to the east (i.e., residences) and they were coming from the south then they could cross the intersection or get on the existing bike lanes to go under both bridges. All movements are still available. This is the same condition that exists for all pedestrians and cyclists using the TVP currently.

I note that the new bridge includes a narrow shoulder. Will pedestrians be prevented from using the new bridge?

Pedestrians would not be on the new bridge unless there were other circumstances where a temporary closure of the existing bridge is in place, but in normal operations it would be vehicles and cyclists only.

Page 27 (Vissim Simulation): Could you please elaborate on how a pedestrian would need to walk through from Parkway to the walk bridge?

You can get from The Parkway to the existing bridge via two routes; the TVP trail under the bridge, or the walkway to the intersection at Sunset Drive.

Appreciate the inclusion of a passenger drop off area on the east side of the bridge. Recognizing we are not making operational decisions about the bridge yet, would this area be sufficient in scale to accommodate future changes such as closure of the new bridge to personal vehicles?

The drop off on the east side of the bridge, along Sunset Drive, is maximized on Western owned land. The design of this area will be finalized in the detailed design phase.

There is a cut through path for bikes that will be lost with the new road

Travel paths for cyclists and pedestrians will be developed using best practices to direct users to one of the two safe crossings of University Drive. There is no cut through for bike traffic that will be lost that we are aware of.

p23, shows the trails on the east side of the river, but not on the west side. How will the trail on the west side be impacted? Will the trees between the existing bridge and Talbot parking lot be protected?

The naturalized trails that run along the river are not formalized trails, but they should not be impacted by this project. You would be able to pass under the new bridge along the river the same way you do now with the existing bridge.

There will be a phase during construction where directly below the bridge would be closed for safety. There will be some tree loss in the developed plan for the construction of the new bridge in this location, however, all efforts will be made to mitigate the impact.

Cyclists arriving from the south will need to double back to Sunset St. or travel under the bridge, but the path under the bridge is often flooded. So, this plan prioritizes traffic flow over ease of travel for cyclists and pedestrians

The plan expands on the existing pedestrian and cyclist, improving the condition that exists now. The existing TVP, which is a City of London amenity, is in the floodplain and does incur some closures from time to time, depending on the levels of the river and for safety. There will be another option to go to the raised pedestrian crosswalk and to take either that crosswalk to continue heading north through the parking lot or crossing over the existing University Drive Bridge and taking Perth Drive or Middlesex Drive. Options that are there now exist into the future, we believe safety is improved at the intersections in this concept. There is no loss of pathway options with this project.

Pedestrians aren't going to loop back or go all the way to Sunset Street.

For those pedestrians that are dropped off at the Sunset drop-off area it is expected that they will walk to the raised intersection at Sunset Drive. They would then walk across the new active transportation route on the existing bridge to continue to main campus.

You mention that Philip Aziz is not owned by Western and they would have purview overextending it across the river. Why, then, should Western foot the bill with this bridge project to maintain cut-through traffic for London citizens who aren't coming to/from the University? Couldn't we instead eliminate PMV traffic across the river on University Drive, pressuring the city to fund their own solution, if they so value that cut-through option?

Restricting non-campus traffic is an operational choice that can be made by the University. It is something that the University can employ for future generations of leadership of Western to choose how to operate the new bridge. The

need for vehicles to cross the bridge exists with our campus being on both sides of the river to connect, again, for Western purposes, in terms of accessibility, our Western special constable services, service vehicles, maintenance vehicles, as well as the access for the university hospital is important.

Western and technical team representatives ...responded to my question about pedestrian access from The Parkway by suggesting that the new configuration will be an improvement because pedestrians and cyclists coming from The Parkway will be able to go under the bridges and “loop back” to the existing University Bridge or go to the Sunset Street intersection. Neither is realistic or likely for the dozens of students who take this route from The Parkway. They will cut across the road on the east side of the new bridge.

The detailed design phase will investigate and include features to discourage j-walking and unsafe crossings to the extent possible. The pathways provided will be well designed to prioritize pedestrian and cyclist safety.

How is traffic flow supposed to work around the proposed drop-off zone on Sunset Drive? I would have loved to see the Sunset/University Drive intersection modelled in a video as well.

The drop off area at the Sunset Drive intersection allow drivers coming from Richmond Street to turn left from University Drive to the drop off area and then continue through city streets to get back to Richmond. This intersection will operate more efficiently than it does today with more green light time dedicated to pedestrians and cyclists.

Sunset may be getting more traffic which routes back to Huron St to access Richmond - has this been modelled?

It is possible that additional traffic will be using Sunset Street but anyone that is using the drop-off zone will be using public streets under the jurisdiction of the City. We will document that change as part of the project in the ESR.

Given the discussion about ease of access for cyclists/pedestrians approaching from the south on the TVP (flooding under the bridge, doubling back to Sunset), will there be any consideration/prevention of those who choose to cut across the grass and new roadway (following the existing connection) to reach the pedestrianized bridge?

The detailed design phase will investigate and include features to discourage j-walking and unsafe crossings to the extent possible. The pathways provided will be well designed to prioritize pedestrian and cyclist safety.

Can we retain the bus parking in front of Talbot. Many high school students are bussed into our shows, and this is important recruitment for the music faculty.

The existing drop off area in front of the music building is expanded in this plan. The new pedestrian crossing from the Talbot Lot across Lambton Drive will be an improvement over the current state.

Page 23: Do I understand it correctly that if a pedestrian is walking to campus from Parkway, he needs to do a crossing/intersection in order to get on the walk bridge, unless he takes the path under the bridge? If Yes, my concern is that the latter route would be unavailable when the riverbank is flooded, thereby forcing pedestrians to negotiate with bikes/cars.

If flooding prevents the use of crossing under the bridge then the Sunset Drive intersection would be the only route. It would be a safer route for all movement modalities through a signalized pedestrian crossing and a raised intersection with slow speeds, improving upon the current condition.

Are LTC stops being relocated in this plan? Like the LTC stop outside of Talbot?

The bus stop outside the Talbot parking will shift slightly south, along the same side of the road. Further consultation with the LTC will be had as the plan develops.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback. Keeping the current bridge for pedestrians and cyclist use only is an excellent plan to provide safe access for those walking from the East residences & parking lots, promote active transportation for students, faculty & staff and preserve historical campus features. I think it would be great if

smaller, electric vehicles such as golf carts, e-cargo bikes, etc. could be cleared for use on the pedestrian bridge for FM, food service and other staff purposes to ideally eliminate the need for a twinned bridge.

The University Drive bridge project will safely and reliably accommodate all modes of transportation. Vehicles, and cyclists who choose that route, are able to use the new bridge which will improve safety for cyclists and pedestrians on the active transportation bridge. Thank you for your comments regarding the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (Class EA). They will be considered by the technical study team and recorded as part of the Public Record. Public comments will be documented in the Environmental Study Report (ESR).

I am an associate professor in the Dept. of Clinical Neurological Sciences at Western. I just wanted to say that I really like the idea of having a second bridge, parallel to the existing bridge, and that I really like the idea of keeping the old bridge for pedestrian and cycling traffic. I often cycle on the existing bridge, and it is a bit of a menace at the moment. I also like the concrete arch design over the steel V design. It looks much nicer than the gross steel V design, and blends in with aesthetic of the campus much better. I would note that a replacement road bridge doesn't fix the overall difficulty with getting onto campus though. There are really only 3-4 ways in: Perth Dr., University Bridge, Philip Aziz Dr., and Lambton Rd. It's like the campus is on an island with only a few ways off it. Hopefully people can consider constructing other entrances/exits onto the campus in the future.

It is one of the goals outlined in the Campus Development Strategy (CDS) and Open Space Strategy (OSS) to reduce vehicular traffic and trips not required to travel through the campus. Thank you for your comments regarding the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (Class EA). They will be considered by the technical study team and recorded as part of the Public Record. Public comments will be documented in the Environmental Study Report (ESR).

Thank you for sharing this update on the University Drive Bridge project. Given the significant construction already planned for May '26 at Philip Aziz, Sarnia Road, and Western Road, could you please provide some clarity on the anticipated timeline for this project? Specifically, will this work overlap with those other projects, and if so, has there been any coordination to minimize the cumulative impact on traffic flow and campus access? This would be helpful for Ivey staff and commuters who will be already navigating considerable disruptions in the area. Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback.

Currently there may be pre-construction activities planned for Fall 2026, with major construction planned to begin in Spring 2027. Western will work to coordinate work in the context of other projects by the City of London. Your comments will be recorded as part of the Public Record. Public comments will be documented in the Environmental Study Report (ESR).

Hi there, I use the current bridge as a walker, as a cyclist and as a driver, as I live in Old North. I'm quite familiar with the various problems related to the multi-modal use of this old and aging bridge. I have seen that the current proposal is for restricting vehicular traffic on the current bridge and building a new bridge just to the south. While I think restricting vehicular traffic on the current bridge is long overdue, I do not like this 'twinning' solution. It will still result in a dangerous intersection on campus with most vehicles having to make a left turn. It will still mean lots of traffic on University Drive where there is an increasing number of students. It would ruin the view of the Thames River from the current bridge. There would be no benefit aside from getting vehicles from one side to the other. I would like to suggest a better alternative. Huron Street, main thoroughfare through eastern London, should be extended across the Thames River to connect with Sarnia Road. And this bridge should be multimodal – allowing not only vehicle traffic but proper cycling and pedestrian capacity.

Benefits of this approach:

It would eliminate cut-through vehicular traffic along University Drive and improve safety there

It would eliminate the dangerous left turn onto Huron Drive (I have found even the right turn there to be dangerous)

It would provide a much-needed alternative for cyclists and pedestrians coming from the Richmond / Oxford area

It would take advantage of the new widening of Philip Aziz Ave that the City is undertaking

It would not ruin the view of the river from the current bridge, and at the same time provide a new view of the river and the current historic bridge.

It would provide better connectivity with the Thames Valley Parkway. Buses and ambulances would be able to use

this new bridge to quickly access campus via Western Rd, without having to go through the heart of the campus.

Drawbacks

The one drawback I see is that given the orientation of the river at that location, the bridge would need to be somewhat longer and affect more of the river and its vegetation. I'm sure a bridge could be designed to minimize the impact. I sincerely hope you will consider this alternative.

Huron Street and Philip Aziz Avenue are under the jurisdiction of the City of London. This is not identified by the City's Transportation Master Plan or Official Plan and as such is not a project in the foreseeable future. Western requires vehicular connection to both sides of its campus over the river.

Your comments will be recorded as part of the Public Record. Public comments will be documented in the Environmental Study Report (ESR).

Dear Western Bridge Organizers,

I'm a cyclist who uses the current bridge for daily commuting, while I support the plan to turn the current bridge into a ped/active transport dedicated route. One aspect missing from the proposed design is better integration with the shared pathways that connect to the TVP. Many cyclists use that path and the current connection to university drive is separate from the intersection with Sunset and at sharp angles & steep hills (and is poorly marked / visible to motorists) making it risky/physically difficult to transition from the TVP to the current bridge. Improving these connections would make it safer for cyclist and could be potentially be designed to provide a by-pass route for cyclists (and pedestrians) around the intersection during high traffic times.

The future connection from the TVP (City of London owned infrastructure) to the existing bridge will be reviewed to provide ease for users to transition from the TVP to the active transportation bridge. Western will share your comments with the City of London's Parks Long Range Planning & Design Department. Your comments will be considered by the technical study team and recorded as part of the Public Record. Public comments will be documented in the Environmental Study Report (ESR).

Thank you for requesting comments on plans for the University Bridge. This represents an opportunity to restrict vehicular traffic onto the main campus from Richmond, keeping the existing bridge for pedestrians and cyclists, with access for emergency vehicles only. As Western Road evolves to become the University's primary access, including for transit, vehicular access through the campus from Richmond will become increasingly unimportant. Setting aside the impacts on the river, could the resources associated with the new bridge not be put to better use?

The University Drive bridge project will safely and reliably accommodate all modes of transportation. Separating vehicular and active transportation over the two bridges will improve safety for cyclists and pedestrians on the existing bridge. The proposed intersection and design with a series of raised intersections is intended to reduce trips travelling through the campus by increasing the time and travel and lower operating speeds.

It is one of the goals outlined in the Campus Development Strategy (CDS) and Open Space Strategy (OSS) to reduce vehicular traffic and trips not required to travel through the campus. Thank you for your comments regarding the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (Class EA). They will be considered by the technical study team and recorded as part of the Public Record. Public comments will be documented in the Environmental Study Report (ESR)."

Hello, I'm a community member, alumnus, part-time lecturer and a former administrator and member of the Board and Senate.

Setting aside the plans for the reimagined University Drive bridge itself, I wanted to raise safety and functional concerns with the plan for the proposed bike path along Lambton Drive that states:

SOUTHBOUND CYCLISTS SHALL DISMOUNT AND CROSS LAMBTON DRIVE TO ACCESS EXISTING SHARROW-MARKED LANE

These dedicated north-south bike paths appear to only exist for a short block, with much of that distance crossing multiple lanes of traffic and a parking lot entrance before requiring bicyclists to then dismount and walk their bike. This is something that will almost never happen. Cyclists will almost universally take one of three alternative actions:

1. Disregard any instruction or infrastructure and cross traffic on Lambton without dismounting, causing safety and

liability issues to themselves, others, and the university.

2. Simply take the lane, as is their right, and proceed without having to cross lanes of traffic or dismount (probably the safest and simplest option).

3. Cut through the grass or pedestrian paths to the west side of the Faculty of Music buildings.

Additionally, this path appears to exist in place of sidewalks missing on the east side of Lambton Drive (unclear from the drawings). If so, I expect these paths may see more unintended pedestrian use than bicycle use, particularly given the location of the bus stop and parking amenities on the east side, which further increases my safety concern. In the interest of safety and function, I would suggest revisiting this design with at least one of the following options (not mutually exclusive, and may be staged):

1. Remove the north-south bike paths entirely, for continuity with the low-speed shared infrastructure to the north and south of this block.

2. Replace this route with north-south dedicated or multi-use paths to the west of the music buildings that reconnect with Lambton at Huron Drive.

3. Keep the paths but extend the route to the south along the athletic fields to provide continuity without the need to dismount.

I believe that any combination of these options would not only increase safety, but also reduce the cost, road width, and complexity of the overall design

(something I expect others to comment on). It seems that some of the cost and complexity exists only to accommodate this very short stretch of impractical two-way bike paths.

Normally I would not argue against a dedicated bike path, but in this case, I believe a improved implementation would also lead to stronger and safer adoption of cycling on campus.

The PIC 2 exhibits have only illustrated the portion of this cycle track that would be completed as part of this project. The continuation of the path past the Lambton curve would be considered a future project. Your comments will be considered by the technical study team and recorded as part of the Public Record. Public comments will be documented in the Environmental Study Report (ESR).

Will the entrance to this trail on the west side of the river be relocated?

The trail system on the west side of the Thames River is an informal and non-maintained trail system, but access will remain following construction. The entrance and the location of the informal trail under the proposed bridge will be closed during construction as required to ensure safety. Your comments will be considered by the technical study team and recorded as part of the Public Record. Public comments will be documented in the Environmental Study Report (ESR).

Thank you for circulating this notice and for providing Parks Long Range Planning & Design (PLRPD) the opportunity to comment. The Thames Valley Parkway (TVP) currently runs beneath the University Drive Bridge, and it is an essential linkage within our pathway network. It is important that this connection be maintained; therefore, adequate pathway width and head clearance under the bridge will be required. If any damage or repairs are required to the TVP please contact our Parks Long Range Planning & Design team to coordinate construction impacts.

The existing TVP pathway connection east of the bridge is also an important link and should be retained.

PLRPD should be consulted once a construction decision has been made regarding the rehabilitation or replacement of the bridge, so that appropriate TVP detours can be coordinated during the construction period.

Please let us know if further clarification is needed.

The trail will be maintained with a detour during construction. The future connection from the TVP to the existing bridge will be designed in accordance with City of London standards. In addition, an alternate route under the bridges will be maintained and implemented with the input from the City of London's Parks Long Range Planning & Design Department. Access will be maintained during construction to allow crossing of University Drive at a signalized intersection at Sunset Drive. Your comments will be considered by the technical study team and recorded as part of the Public Record. Public comments will be documented in the Environmental Study Report (ESR).

Hello,

I'm writing to express my concerns about the proposed reconfiguration of University Bridge as part of the construction of a new bridge for vehicular traffic. I attended the public information session as part of PIC No. 2 on Wednesday 13 May 2026. I work on campus and walk, bicycle or take the bus to campus on a near-daily basis, crossing the old University Bridge twice a day.

Before outlining my concerns, I should state that the overall plan appears sound; the bridge design seems well-considered; the reasoning for recommending the southern alignment for the new bridge makes sense; and the decision to separate vehicular traffic from pedestrian/cyclist traffic is excellent.

However, I have some concerns that the proposed reconfiguration on the east side of the river will not realize the goals set out in Western's Open Space Strategy to prioritize pedestrian safety and encourage active transportation.

My concerns are threefold:

1. The reconfigured old University Bridge includes no physical separator between the bike lines and enlarged sidewalk. This is dangerous. Pedestrians will walk on the bike lines, meaning that cyclists travelling at 20 km/hour will be negotiating the same space as pedestrians travelling at 5 km/hour. Incidents are inevitable. I appreciate the explanation that snow clearance prevents a permanent physical separator. I encourage you to consider a seasonal physical separator that could be installed between April-November each year, when there's almost no snow and bike usage is much greater.
2. The reconfigured east side of the bridge will have cyclist traffic from the old University Bridge rejoining University Drive and engaging with vehicular traffic at the intersection of Sunset Street and University Drive. I'm concerned about the safety of cyclists travelling southbound turning right onto Sunset Street. It isn't clear from the map included in the presentation how this safety issue will be mitigated.
3. As I mentioned at the public meeting, the reconfigured east side of the bridge will eliminate existing direct pedestrian access from the Parkway onto the old University Bridge. Asking pedestrians to loop under the two bridges or double back by walking to Sunset Street, waiting at the intersection and then walking back in the direction from whence they came may look fine on a map, but won't work on the ground. Pedestrians will seek to continue taking the same route they have taken for years. Adding a barrier on the south side of the realigned University Drive is a poor solution that doesn't encourage active transportation – it will add time to pedestrians' commute to campus. I encourage you to consider adding a pedestrian crosswalk over the realigned University Drive immediately to the east of the new bridge.

Thank you for considering my concerns.

The intersections have been designed to be raised and signalized to encourage pedestrian and cycling traffic. Improved efficiencies with active transportation opportunities will help compensate and reduce the number of vehicles in use overall throughout the university.

We will be reviewing the pedestrian connection layout of the east side to detail if there can be any refinements and mitigation measures to curb midblock crossing of University Drive from the south to the existing active transportation bridge.

Both permanent and seasonal options to separate pedestrians and cyclists on the existing bridge will be considered by the design team. Thank you for your comments regarding the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (Class EA)

Dear Bridge Team,

I went through your plan --- looks good, exciting project. The concrete arch bridge will definitely go better beside the existing one. Overall foot/ bike access should be improved on that side of campus.

I recall seeing that one alternative was build a traffic bridge at the end of Huron Street across to Sarnia --- does the current project moving forward mean that the Huron bridge is no longer going to be developed

Thank you for your positive comments on the aesthetics of the new bridge and the overall improvements to pedestrian and cycling safety through this project.

Huron Street and Philip Aziz Avenue are under the jurisdiction of the City of London. A bridge in this location is not identified by the City's Transportation Master Plan or Official Plan and as such is not a project in the foreseeable future. Western requires vehicular connection to both sides of its campus over the river.

Your comments will be considered by the technical study team and recorded as part of the Public Record. Public comments will be documented in the Environmental Study Report (ESR).

As I further inform myself in regards to the bridge, and other, upcoming projects, I have serious concerns as to accessible and practical parking options for the Faculty of Music. Our outreach is as pivotal for recruitment as it is crucial for community support and engagement. We host literally 100s of events in the academic year, and we require Talbot Lot (plus more) for parking for these events. If patrons lack easy, close and accessible parking, they will truly rethink their attendance.

As a part-time lecturer, as so many of us are at the DWFOM, I often struggle to find parking in lots any time after 10, as I often arrive at noon and am on campus till after 10pm. We already seem to have a parking shortage and profs are frustrated by the lack of secure parking when we're already commuting in for part time work.

Please consider that parking around and for the faculty of music has specific outreach and community impacts. Please allow us to continue to share our music with campus, with London, and beyond.

The existing Talbot parking lot will be maintained and any loss of spaces will be reviewed to minimize the loss. Final construction will see the entrance be changed to allow AODA accessibility cross Lambton Drive with pedestrian crossover (PXO) and a raised crosswalk. A drop-off zone in front of the Talbot College will remain and has been extended. Your comments will be considered by the technical study team and recorded as part of the Public Record. Public comments will be documented in the Environmental Study Report (ESR).

I attended the recent information session and my feedback is the following:

1. I am strongly concerned that the cut-through traffic on campus will be facilitated by the new twinned bridge, rather than discouraged. Further lane narrowing, raised intersections, and enforced speed limits should be imposed all along the corridor from Richmond St. through to Sarnia/Western Rd. to compensate for the added ""convenience"" of the new bridge.

2. I am concerned about the high flow of bicycle and pedestrian traffic that approaches along the Thames Valley Parkway from the south and heads west into campus. This is a major artery for both walking and cycling commuters to campus. To access the existing bridge, these pedestrians and bikes will need to cross the vehicular traffic flow between Richmond St. and the new bridge. Consistent with Western's long-term goals to reduce vehicular traffic and promote walking/cycling, the intersection of these two streams should be designed in a way that slows/inconveniences the vehicular traffic, not slows/inconveniences the bikes and pedestrians.

Thank you.

The University Drive bridge will safely and reliably accommodate all modes of transportation. The proposed design with a series of raised intersections is intended to reduce trips travelling through the campus by increasing the time and travel and lower operating speeds. This supports other improvements on campus to reduce traffic speeds and improve safety for all transportation modalities.

It is one of the goals outlined in the Campus Development Strategy (CDS) and Open Space Strategy (OSS) to reduce cut-through vehicular traffic. Thank you for your comments regarding the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (Class EA). They will be considered by the technical study team and recorded as part of the Public Record. Public comments will be documented in the Environmental Study Report (ESR)."
