

THE BOARD, THE QUESTIONS, THE PUBLIC RECORD

MUNICIPAL CHESS

Welcome to the municipal chessboard.
Click a name to reveal its questions.

Meet the players, follow the moves, and examine the decisions that affect landowners. Each numbered entry sets out the reported actions, supporting records and questions still waiting for an answer.

THE TEST: What did you know? What did you do?
What did that accomplish for landowners?

Review draft | Proposed numbering and roles | October 13, 2026

No.	Name	Proposed chess or court role
01	Mike Burkett 	The King
02	Alison Gray 	The Queen of Records
03	Katie Mandeville 	The Planning Bishop
04	Judith Cox 	The Oversight Rook
05	Mark Taylor 	The Liaison Bishop
06	Dan Janssen 	The Ward Knight
07	Philip Brennan 	The Ward Rook
08	Wanda Minnings 	The Ward Knight
09	Jim McIntyre 	The Ward Rook
10	Professor Lex 	The Court Jester
11	Landowners and Taxpayers 	The Pawns - or the People Who Choose the Board?

Chess and court labels are satire. They do not describe legal powers, reporting relationships or hidden motives. Repeated pieces serve the story; this is an accountability page. The jester is not a standard chess piece.

This edition develops the page content for review. It does not record a new mailing or website publication.

SHORT LIVE THE KING'S REIGN! LET THE VOTERS DECIDE.

CHARACTER REVIEW | ACTIONS, QUESTIONS AND EVIDENCE

01 | Mike Burkett



The King | Mayor, Severn [1]

Record: John reports that a requested neutral landowner notice was refused on January 27, 2026, and attributes the decision to the Mayor and Clerk. The reviewed September report calls for the original email, author, decision-maker and reasons to be confirmed. [3]

A. When did you learn of the Inquiry and potential property impacts, and what did you personally do to inform affected owners?

B. What part did you take in the notice decision, and what review of SSEA advice, owner costs or possible remedies did you request?

Records to attach: Original request and reply; Council briefings; referral records; notice and distribution records; any subsequent reconsideration.

Preliminary assessment: Reported decision; responsibility, reasons and landowner outcome remain to be established from the original record.

02 | Alison Gray



The Queen of Records | Director of Corporate Services / Clerk, as recorded May 20, 2026 [2]

Record: The Inquiry attributes the reported neutral-notice refusal to the Mayor and Clerk. That attribution does not yet identify who instructed, authorized or communicated each part of the decision. [3]

A. Were you communicating your own decision, a Council decision, or an instruction or recommendation from another office? Please identify the record.

B. Which councillors and staff received the Inquiry material, on what dates, and what records show their subsequent decisions or responses?

Records to attach: Complete email chain; routing and circulation records; any relevant policy, delegation, minutes and stated reasons.

Preliminary assessment: Reported involvement; the decision and circulation record are required before assigning personal responsibility.

CHARACTER REVIEW | ACTIONS, QUESTIONS AND EVIDENCE

03 | Katie Mandeville

The Planning Bishop | Senior Planner, as recorded May 20, 2026 [2]

Record: John recalls a June 2023 meeting at which the response to what he could do with his property was "Nothing." The reviewed Master flags the need for a written planning position tied to the actual instruments; the recollection alone does not establish all permitted uses. [5]

A. What uses were permitted at that time, and which exact provisions and parcel-specific evidence supported the advice given?

B. What correction, application or review routes were explained, with what study requirements, costs and available alternatives?

Records to attach: Meeting notes; written follow-up; applicable maps and by-laws; parcel studies; advice and review options supplied to the owner.

Preliminary assessment: Reported exchange; obtain context and the written planning basis before assessing the advice.

04 | Judith Cox

The Oversight Rook | Deputy Mayor, Severn [1]

Record: The official council page confirms the office. The materials reviewed for this edition do not establish her individual receipt, position or actions on the Inquiry notice request.

A. When did you receive the landowner concerns, and what action did you take within Township or County discussions?

B. Did you seek an explanation or reconsideration of the reported notice refusal? Please identify any motion, referral, correspondence or result.

Records to attach: Receipt and briefing records; Township or County agenda items; correspondence; recorded position and follow-up.

Preliminary assessment: Individual conduct is unassessed pending records. Council membership alone does not establish knowledge or agreement.

CHARACTER REVIEW | ACTIONS, QUESTIONS AND EVIDENCE

05 | Mark Taylor

The Liaison Bishop | Ward 1 Councillor, Severn [1]

Record: The September accountability report identifies his SSEA liaison role and records the Inquiry's allegation that its concerns were supplied to him. The underlying receipt, referral and response records remain to be attached to this assessment. [3]

A. What landowner concerns did you raise with Council or SSEA, and what answers or changes resulted?

B. What attention was given to owner notification, property-use impacts and costs, and where is that work recorded?

Records to attach: Messages received; SSEA and Council agendas/minutes; referrals; owner communications; handover records.

Preliminary assessment: An institutional link is identified. His individual actions and the benefit to landowners require the supporting record.

06 | Dan Janssen

The Ward Knight | Ward 2 Councillor, Severn [1]

Record: John and Donna report delivering a package at Hurlwood. John separately recalls a September 21 recess exchange in which Janssen said he had read it and had not explained it to landowners. These are two distinct events in the reviewed report. [3]

A. Do you confirm that account, and what action, referral or landowner communication followed your reading of the package?

B. Was any advice or instruction given about circulating or responding to it? If so, by whom, when, and in what record?

Records to attach: Delivery details; dated notes or recording and transcript; correspondence; his response; subsequent action records.

Preliminary assessment: A specific reported exchange warrants a direct answer. It does not establish who else knew or directed his response.

CHARACTER REVIEW | ACTIONS, QUESTIONS AND EVIDENCE

07 | Philip Brennan

The Ward Rook | Ward 3 Councillor, Severn [1]

Record: The official council page confirms the office. This review has not established an individual decision, refusal or response by him concerning the Inquiry.

A. What information did you receive about the Inquiry and when, and what did you do after receiving it?

B. What is your position on neutral landowner notice, and what action have you taken or would you propose within your role?

Records to attach: Verified receipt; personal reply; relevant agenda items, motions and referrals; any notice or follow-up.

Preliminary assessment: Evidence pending. A place on the board is an invitation to answer, not a negative performance score.

08 | Wanda Minnings

The Ward Knight | Ward 4 Councillor, Severn [1]

Record: The official council page confirms the office. The reviewed material does not establish her individual knowledge, decisions or communications on these questions.

A. When did these concerns reach you, and what steps did you take to check the evidence or obtain an explanation?

B. What did you communicate to residents about the concerns, the Township's position and any available review process?

Records to attach: Receipt and reply; inquiries to staff; meeting records; resident communications; documented outcomes.

Preliminary assessment: Evidence pending. Record her actual answer and work before reaching a conclusion.

CHARACTER REVIEW | ACTIONS, QUESTIONS AND EVIDENCE

09 | Jim McIntyre

The Ward Rook | Ward 5 Councillor, Severn [1]

Record: John has reported a Hurlwood encounter in which McIntyre indicated that he did not want to hear about a lawsuit. This edition has not reviewed a contemporaneous note, recording or his response. The precise wording, date and context remain open.

A. What do you recall of the Hurlwood encounter, and will you confirm, correct or explain John's account?

B. What subsequent consideration did you give to the underlying landowner concerns, including notice and access to information?

Records to attach: Dated first-hand account; any witness or recording; package receipt; his response and subsequent correspondence.

Preliminary assessment: Reported encounter awaiting corroboration and response; it does not by itself establish a wider municipal policy.

10 | Professor Lex

The Court Jester | Editorial character and AI-assisted research aid

Record: The jester's job in this page is to ask awkward questions, keep the record understandable and check the Inquiry's own conclusions. The title is playful; it confers no municipal, legal or investigative authority.

A. Can every material assertion be traced to a source, and have recollections, documents and open questions been clearly distinguished?

B. Have corrections, contrary evidence and constructive replies been given the same care as evidence supporting the Inquiry?

Records to attach: Source links and exhibit references; dated review notes; correction history; evidence that could change each assessment.

Preliminary assessment: Judge this work by accuracy, clarity and willingness to correct it. John retains editorial responsibility.

LANDOWNERS, THE CENTRAL QUESTION AND THE NEXT MOVE

11 | Landowners and Taxpayers

The Pawns - or the People Who Choose the Board? | The "serfs" in John's royal-court metaphor

Record: The purpose of this inquiry is to make owner experiences and the public decision record easier to examine. Individual restrictions, losses and notification experiences need their own evidence.

A. What changed for your property, when did you learn of it, and what documents show the effect on permitted use, value or expense?

B. Who answered your concerns, what action followed, and what remedy or explanation are you still seeking?

Records to attach: Applicable instruments and maps; correspondence; dates; costs; independent valuation where relevant.

Preliminary assessment: Owners contribute evidence, request corrections and assess representatives through democratic participation.

WERE YOU TOLD TO DISREGARD US?

Were you advised to disregard, withhold circulation of, or decline a response to the Inquiry? If so, by whom, when, and on what recorded basis? If no, please explain your own decision and identify the action you took.

How each assessment will be completed

Record the request and delivery date; attach the original response and relevant action records; invite an explanation; then assess the result for landowners. Use clear labels: **documented, reported, disputed, or not yet established**. Record positive action and corrections. Silence and mailing-list removal requests do not, by themselves, prove a refusal to provide service or coordinated instructions. [4]

Sources and scope

[1] Township of Severn, Council: current 2022-2026 roster, checked October 13, 2026. [Official council page](#).

[2] Township of Severn, Council minutes, May 20, 2026: staff titles as recorded on that date. [Official minutes](#).

[3] Inquiry, Candidate Post-Meeting Accountability Report, produced September 26, 2026, reviewed PDF version 3, pp. 2-7. This is an Inquiry compilation; underlying exhibits still govern.

[4] Inquiry, H.R. Landowner Advisory, October 7, 2026, reviewed DOCX version 12, pp. 1-4: evidence review and correction standards.

[5] Master Litigation Record, v2.4 Working Integration Edition, reviewed DOCX version 1, p. 8: written planning position required. John's reported accounts and the October 13 discussion also inform this draft.

OUR NEXT MOVE: LANDOWNERS HELPING LANDOWNERS

We are seeking cooperation with, and will offer assistance to, other municipal Taxpayer H.R. review teams so that decisions put forward by our elected representatives and municipal staff receive meaningful public scrutiny. We will seek a clear legal requirement for simple, plain-language landowner notices, placed **front and centre with municipal tax notices**. This is the same straightforward notification requested by the Watershed Debacle Inquiry and, according to the Inquiry's record, denied.

NOTICE: WHERE WE ARE GOING - TWO MATTERS UNDER REVIEW

1. Land transactions and inside information

We are reviewing reports concerning the possible use of non-public information in land transactions. At a later stage, we will call for clear disclosure of relevant property interests and transactions, together with any associated conflict-of-interest declarations.

2. Independent planning advice

We are also reviewing a reported written submission to a landowner suggesting that an independent planner could do nothing without Severn Planning's approval or cooperation.

What exactly was the planner unable to do, who imposed that restriction, and what authority supported it?

These are serious allegations requiring careful examination. We will seek the original records, invite explanations from those involved, and distinguish what the evidence establishes from what remains unanswered.

Did these matters have any bearing on the refusal to notify landowners? That question deserves an answer.