

McMullen, Mark

From: Jason M [jskma@hotmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, 16 December 2014 01:00
To: McMullen, Mark
Cc: Steve May; Winston Melder; Ronen Zilberman; Paul; Michael Louvet; Melody Pan; Kathleen; Jason M; Jan Weber; Gary Stevens; Dody Sison; Derek Chen; Barbara Allan
Subject: RE: Polygon Steveston Development Being Considered at December 16 Planning Committee

Hi, Mark;

An injury has prevented me from writing sooner to provide general feedback and feedback to Polygon's open house on the redevelopment of the Steveston High site.

We have a number of comments and concerns:

- 1) Property belongs to future generations.
We should directly or indirectly do all we can to preserve land in the Public Trust. While the Ministry, led astray by politics, has erred by permitting sale of schools, we are given an affirmative opportunity to preserve Common land. The City must be aggressive with the School Board, to insist that Steveston-London High school, instead of usurping park use for its curricula, needs to have its own fields. It is not right that the school is at liberty to take over vast sections of the park and relegate its use by Richmond residents who pay for its care. A land swap plus part payment would be a good idea to procure the site from the School Board. This way the City is working quicker towards adding an additional 133 ha (330 ac.) of parkland as required by 2041 per the OCP. We urge Council to champion this for the common good.
- 2) Effective Consultation.
Regarding Official Community Plan Bylaw 9000, proposed Amendment Bylaw 9156, we appreciate the City's display board of the "City Development Review Process". We interpret the "Public Consultation" step, noted on the display board, as pursuant to Section 879 of the Local Government Act on amendment of the OCP. While the Act in part states, "... *the proposing local government must provide one or more opportunities... for consultation...*", it appears varied in practice; this event is hosted by Polygon, not by the proposing local government, and named as an "Open House", not "Public Consultation". Had the event been presented as "Public Consultation" hosted by the City, the terms of reference - implicit understanding, relationship, and interactions with/by attendants - would be completely different. As an open house by the developer, it connotes passivity of presentation to a guest audience; while as a public consultation by the local government, it empowers the participants and facilitates ideas. (*Aside: Authoritative governance persuades consent by showcase, while democratic social-design harnesses empowered participation towards consensus.*) We believe this section of the Act makes clear that it must be a consultation, not an open house.
- 3) As part of the consultative stage, we were hoping to contribute ideas and feedback during the design process to the layout of options A and B, rather than voicing afterwards. Voicing afterwards, during the open house, does not change the drawings, and one either relents or is compelled to confront those plans at the Committee. The experience becomes less meaningful and less effective. At a stage when it ought to be inclusive and collaborative, feelings give confrontation a creep-in.

- 4) In presenting Options A and B, the developer is assured that only A or B is the outcome. Validating one or the other is to the advantage of the developer. This would not be a problem if item 2) above, effective consultation, was adopted.
- 5) More than 2 options exist.
A third may be a variant of option A - to add a walkway on the southern greenway to enable additional access. (The northern greenway should remain wider than the south, as on the current drawing, because there is shadowing (none south), and also, most of the park is to the north with greater pedestrian, pet, and bicycling traffic.) Please also note that the previous design has a 40ft central greenway, 20ft buffer north and south, giving a total of **80ft** for these corridors. Now we have **70ft** total. The 10ft gain is now used to create townhouse walkways between yards. Walkways between townhouse yards are not necessary. Perhaps Polygon is amenable to giving back 10 feet, as it can actually save money by not building a walkway between yards. Reclaiming the 10 feet to create a 40ft northern greenway would keep the width same as the originally proposed central greenway.

The process may have taken on irreversible momentum. At this juncture, point 5) is a compromise that may be the most actionable, and we urge the Committee to consider.

We hope to voice some of these concerns at the meeting.

Regards,

Jason

From: MMcMullen@richmond.ca
To: jskma@hotmail.com
Subject: RE: Polygon Steveston Development Being Considered at December 16 Planning Committee
Date: Tue, 16 Dec 2014 01:10:42 +0000

Hello Jason:

Thank you for your email.

The Planning Committee agenda was not published until after 5pm on Friday and I was not in a position to send this informal email notice until Sunday evening.

At such time that a Public Hearing date is set by Council, the formal Public Hearing Notice will be mailed to owners and occupiers of properties within 50m of the development site at least 10 days prior to the Public Hearing.

Regarding Option A, I can provide the following further comments:

- The northern 30 ft. wide greenway/park strip widens to about 100 ft to the east to increase the width of the greenway as you approach the park.
- The southern building setback is 30 ft. to the south property line and there is proposed a 10 ft. wide walkway connecting the existing walkway in the neighbourhood to the south to No. 2 Road.
- While the previous 40ft. wide central greenway has been removed, there is a need to have an adequate separation (with yards) between the building blocks near the centre of the site.

I look forward to your forthcoming feedback email and seeing you at Planning Committee at 4pm tomorrow.

Thank you for your on-going comments and ideas.

Sincerely,

Mark McMullen

From: Jason M [mailto:jskma@hotmail.com]

Sent: Monday, 15 December 2014 16:10

To: McMullen, Mark

Subject: RE: Polygon Steveston Development Being Considered at December 16 Planning Committee

Hi Mark,

Thank you for letting us know, but this is short notice!! We will try to let members in our group know. Given that the open house was at short notice (received Friday afternoon for Tuesday), we are surprised that this is happening again (Sunday night for Tuesday). Why is there this rush to include it in the upcoming Committee meeting during this busy holiday season?

Unfortunately, I have suffered an injury and have not even been able to finish writing some feedback to the last open house less than 2 weeks ago. I will try to complete it today and send it to you tonight. I intend to attend tomorrow to speak on it.

For now briefly;

Given 2 options, one thing that comes to mind is, and I think Polygon would expect such an outcome: why can't we have option A also include a walkway on the south side? (The north should stay 10 ft wider than the south, as on the current drawing (Option A), because there is shadowing (none South), and also, most of the park is to the north with greater pedestrian traffic.) Please also note that the previous design has a 40ft central greenway, 20ft buffer N and S, giving a total of **80ft** for these corridors. Now we have **70ft** total. They taken 10ft for themselves to partition the blocks. I think Polygon realize this, in advance of future concession to add back 10ft. Polygon can actually save more money by not partitioning the blocks, and give back 10ft.

Not sure if it's too late to suggest, but nevertheless I will mention tomorrow. Mainly, we hope that the City can be more aggressive with the Ministry, to insist that the Steveston-London High school needs to have its own fields, thereby do a land swap plus part payment, instead of usurping the park for their curricular use. That way the City can contribute towards the need of additional 133 ha (330 ac.) of parkland as required by 2041 per the OCP. Its not right that the school takes over the use of the park from residents and the residents pays for its care.

I'll send you more comments later.

See you tomorrow.

Jason

From: MMcMullen@richmond.ca
To: jskma@hotmail.com
Subject: Polygon Steveston Development Being Considered at December 16 Planning Committee
Date: Mon, 15 Dec 2014 02:19:35 +0000

Hello Jason:

It was good to see you at the Polygon Open House on December 2 along with a number of your neighbours.

Further to our discussion at the Open House, I just wanted to let you know that the revised Polygon rezoning application is being brought forward to the Tuesday, December 16 Planning Committee meeting.

The revised application is under item no.4 of the meeting agenda that was published this past Friday evening at:
http://www.richmond.ca/agendafiles/Open_Planning_12-16-2014.pdf

The December 16 Planning Committee meeting will be held at 4pm in the Anderson Room at City Hall at 6911 No.#3 Road.

If Planning Committee, and then Council, recommends proceeding further with the revised rezoning application, the rezoning application would be taken to a Public Hearing in January.

Please email or call me if you should have any further questions.

Thank you,

Mark

Mark McMullen | Senior Coordinator - Major Projects | Planning & Development

City of Richmond | 6911 No. 3 Road, Richmond, BC, V6Y 2C1 | www.richmond.ca

604-276-4173 mmcmullen@richmond.ca

MayorandCouncillors

TO: MAYOR & EACH
COUNCILLOR
FROM: CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

From: MayorandCouncillors
Sent: Wednesday, 17 December 2014 09:53
To: 'Jason M'
Subject: RE: Polygon Steveston Development - December 16 Planning Committee

*re Wayne Craig
Joe Craig*

This is to acknowledge and thank you for your email of December 16, 2014 to the Mayor and Councillors, in connection with the above matter, a copy of which has been forwarded to the Mayor and each Councillor for their information.

In addition, your email has been referred to Wayne Craig, Director of Development. If you have any questions or further concerns at this time, please call Mr. Craig at 604.276.4000.

Thank you again for taking the time to make your views known.

Yours truly,

Hanieh Berg | Acting Manager, Legislative Services City of Richmond · 6911 No. 3 Road, Richmond, BC V6Y 2C1
Direct (604) 276-4163 · Fax (604) 278-5139

-----Original Message-----

From: Jason M [<mailto:jskma@hotmail.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, 16 December 2014 19:27
To: MayorandCouncillors
Cc: Jason M
Subject: Polygon Steveston Development - December 16 Planning Committee

Hello;

Please forward to Councillors, especially members of the Planning Committee.

At the Planning Committee today, City staff did not make the distinction between a 40 feet setback vs. a 40 feet greenway. We tried at the end, but was not availed an opportunity.

The Planning Committee passed a motion for 40 feet wide greenways north and south of the development, which is great!

I hope the motion for a 40 feet wide greenway will be actualized, but we believe they will only build 30 feet wide, as 10 feet becomes fenced-in sideyards of the townhouses.

Thank you to all Committee Councillors for actively listening and supporting our efforts at the meeting today!

Sincerely,

Jason Ma
(for Goldsmith Dr. neighbours)

PHOTOCOPIED

DEC 17.

& DISTRIBUTED ^{Aw}

