

**Subject: FW: SLP Comments**

**Date:** Tue, 13 Aug 2002 11:15:09 -0700

**From:** "john hunter" <hunterjohn@telus.net>

**To:** "Corrie Kost DNV" <kost@triumf.ca>

Welcome to post on FONVCA

John Hunter

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

From: john hunter [<mailto:hunterjohn@telus.net>]

Sent: August 12, 2002 8:04 PM

To: 'Richard Zerr DNV (zerrr@dnv.org)'

Cc: 'cgrant@dnv.org'

Subject: SLP Comments

Richard a few comments on the plan so as not to surprise anybody at the hearing:

Don't let negative comments about this being a silly plan discourage you - the polls clearly show that what you have produced is what the VAST MAJORITY want - over 84% (cumulative) wanted 1% or less growth, including Band lands development and Maplewood impacts.

I think it a well done document. I have my suggestions, but the basic thrust, I believe, is what the people strongly demanded.

However, I do have a significant concern with the fact that many or most goals are so loose that we cannot steward against them. My other major concern is transportation.

Please see below.

1) I see this as a long term document, not a "shelf it and forget it" type. Therefore, it is important to record key items as indeed you have done in

most cases.

HOWEVER, page 18 dramatically understates the results of the Marktrend surveys. Fifty-eight% of Seymour residents wanted zero growth and 84% cumulatively wanted 1% or less. These figures should be stated on page 18 - it sure was not 51/49! It was an OVERWHELMING majority. And it should state that this was a random survey, not the "self-selecting" type. These figures included Maplewood impacts because at that time Maplewood had not been carved out. There is only a vague hint at that fact in paragraph 4. People also in these surveys (as in the 1990 OCP statements) wanted TRANSPORTATION FIXED FIRST. Let's tell the story here - it supports your final product.

Eighty-four percent cumulative wanted one percent or less residential growth, including the effects of Maplewood and Band lands development, and wanted transportation fixed first. That is a stunning majority.

2) From para. one, page 19, it appears that Roche Point East does not "exhibit significant environmental value" and is not "in a natural state", as it IS included in plan phasing. The evidence of your own report from the mid-1990s that came to light a year or so ago, and reports from Dave Cook and his committee, and one's own eyesight, suggest this is incorrect. In light of the various reports, how can one possibly make this statement??

3) I cannot see any firm plans to fix transportation before or even in concert with development. Look at policy 3.1.5 page 20, which has lost the flavour of the 1990 OCP ("in anticipation of growth") and of the surveys for this plan. The clear message I thought we got again "fix transportation first" has been turned into a vague policy that we will never be held accountable to because it can mean anything you want it to. "Growth in Seymour should be managed concurrently with the timely and equitable provision of infrastructure, community services and facilities." Bafflegab. You can drive trucks through this.

Look also at para. 4, line 1, page 37. We do not want to "seek" transportation improvements (you will always meet that objective), but to FIND AND EXECUTE them. You may rightly accuse me of jumping on a word, but that is the flavour of many of the objectives - "try", not "succeed". Your goal is success, not effort.

I was taught that a good plan says how, why, where, when, what, who, and how much (cost). I see only fuzzy statements re transportation, but no firm commitments in time or even in principle. I see this as a major flaw. In my view, you need to state firmly that before development a,b,c takes place, transportation fix x,y,or z will take place OR at least state the problem and that it must be addressed first.

4) Should we not have something re looking at water ferries from Seymour and points east to downtown? I have toured most of Asia on business, and this is the most underutilized harbour I have ever seen for moving people to work. These mini-ferries would bypass the traffic jams. But watch the Wharves Bylaw which would ban commercial use of our various docks.

5) General concerns: no apparent priorities in general, or on the waterfront program. Tons of policies, but without priorities, or "musts" and "nice to haves", it gets impossible to execute. Lacks the "when", even as a recommendation. I appreciate that when ties into "how much (\$)" and council's wishes, but should there not be recommendations? Have no projects crucial dates?

6) Goals should be measurable, which means quantifiable with amounts and dates to the extent possible. If you look at the goals on page 11, I do not believe God himself, coming here in 20 years, could tell if we achieved our goals because they are too vague. They are not quantifiable. They are not measurable. You can't really steward to them. You can't measure success. But I grant you they are fairly high level goals, which by their nature tend to be fuzzified, so let's check the lower level ones.

7) Unfortunately, the same is true of too many of the segmented lower level goals starting page 20. See my example in 3 above. Unfortunately, **MANY OF THE GOALS ARE OF THIS TYPE** which means no accountability, lack of clarity, and different perceptions from different people. Compare 3.1.1 to policy 3.4.3, which latter one is a proper measurable objective to which we can be held accountable. With 3.1.1 ("Support and promote the protection of the Green Zone . . ."), you could lose the entire green zone, but if you tried, you pass the goal. This is a defective goal in my view. Goals generally should be results based, not effort based.

8) We need to start replanting blowdown like in the Roche Point Park and Cates Park and I am sure others. The park above our house is getting quite bare as those old trees blow down encouraging more blowdown.

9) Very little specific on the waterfront plan. What are the priorities from top to bottom?

10) What is to be done re encroachments 6.3.4?

Always happy to chat.

Please note new e mail address

regards


John Hunter

Phone : (604) 929-3415

Fax : (604) 929-7168

e-mail : hunterjohn@telus.net

---

 <a href="#">winmail.dat</a>	<b>Name:</b> winmail.dat <b>Type:</b> application/ms-tnef <b>Encoding:</b> base64
---	---