

Subject: Alert - Item 1 and item 6 of the Council Agenda, June 17-2002

Date: Sat, 15 Jun 2002 23:09:25 -0700

From: Ernie Crist <ernie_crist@dnv.org>

To: "FONVCA (E-mail)" <fonvca@fonvca.org>

A MESSAGE FROM ERNIE CRIST:

A WORD OF CAUTION:

Item 1 of the Council Agenda for Monday June 17 -

The Seymour Local Plan 2.3.7 -

Implementation of the Waterfront Task Force Report is the key to the Seymour Community Plan. It is mentioned on page 5 of the Introduction as well as, among others, on Page 16 of the Report. During the Council debate one of the CCA endorsed Councillors stated that the Waterfront Task Force Report must not be discussed as part of the Seymour Plan. That is to say he advised the people of Seymour what they may discuss and what not - what they can incorporate into their plan and what they can't.

Take note of this. If the Waterfront Task Force Report does not become one of the cornerstones of the Seymour Plan, if not THE cornerstone itself, then the Plan itself will be fatally crippled. Notwithstanding other points - EXTREME VIGILANCE IS IN ORDER.

Some sections of the Report especially those dealing with population growth, are defensive in nature and they should not be. Page 18, "Furthermore, community sentiment is that the acceptability of any rate of growth is dependent upon improvements to transportation and traffic systems" While true, this is not the point. The point is that development should be based on one criteria and one criteria only and that is community and neighborhood needs. Here too, extreme caution is in order. While everyone recognizes that transportation (Page 18) is linked to transportation infrastructure outside of Seymour, there is no reason why the Plan should emphasize that if traffic problems at the entrance of Seymour are resolved, (according to whom?) that this should be interpreted as a green light to massive development in Seymour. ONCE AGAIN PROCEED WITH EXTREME CAUTION.


Remember that when, IN CONNECTION WITH THE DEBATE ON THE SEYMOUR PLAN I mentioned the Lynn Valley Community Plan as an example OF PROMISES MADE AND PROMISES BROKEN it became clear once again that this present Council does not understand the difference between a developer, outside or bureaucracy driven community plan and a neighborhood driven plan. The comments by several members of Council can only mean that they do not understand the difference between a Car Mall or Car oriented town center and a truly Pedestrian Oriented Town Center, which was promised to the people of Lynn Valley.

One of the most pro developer members of Council even suggested that I was maligning the Lynn Valley Community Plan when I stated that what was promised and what materialized are two different things.

The bottom line is BEWARE AND TRUST ONLY YOURSELF - THE SEYMOUR PLAN IS A GOOD PLAN BUT SO WAS THE LYNN VALLEY PLAN.

Also of enormous interest is item 6 of the Monday Night Agenda. It deals with Bylaw 7272 "Authorized Occupations and Trespasses of District Owned Land and Unopened Road Allowances" I suggest that everyone read the staff report by Hazel Baxter very very carefully and make sure you make your findings public on Monday during the public input period.

You may wish to remember that 6 of the present members of Council were endorsed by the CCA and that every time you state so in public, notwithstanding the advise of some, your are striking a blow against a special interest group.

 Part 1.2	Type: application/ms-tnef Encoding: base64
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------