

**Subject: [Fwd: Seymour Local Plan]**

**Date:** Sat, 03 Aug 2002 13:59:10 -0700

**From:** Brian Platts <brian\_platts@telus.net>

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

---

**Subject: Seymour Local Plan**

**Date:** Fri, 2 Aug 2002 23:00:11 -0700

**From:** "Bill Maurer" <billm@millsoft.ca>

**To:** "Eric Andersen" <eric@seatrade.ca>

**CC:** "Ernie Crist" <CristE@district.north-van.bc.ca>, "Charlene Grant" <Charlene\_Grant@dnv.org>, "FONVCA" <fonvca@fonvca.org>, <directors@seymourvalley.ca>

I've set up an OCP page on our web site at <http://seymourvalley.ca/ocp> which contains our view of the OCP. The more I study this the more I get annoyed. We have not been very well represented by the SLP planning group and I find it appalling that people from other community associations (Blueridge, Seymour, Roche Point) think it is appropriate to do community planning for the Seymour Valley when there is a clearly established community association here.

I have studied the Public Meetings about the Maplewood split and it seems that people were forced to vote "In Favour", Opposed, and Impartial to the split. If this occurs with the SLP then we will be forced to Oppose it. This is NOT A LOW GROWTH PLAN for the Seymour Valley. I also do not feel that leading the current owners of Riverside Terrace to think that there is any possibility of high density development with access from Riverside Drive is a very honorable way to do planning.

These guys are paying \$21,000 per year in property taxes and for what? They've owned the property for 10 years now which means they've already paid \$210,000 in property taxes for an undeveloped property? The property is zoned rs1 with 1 acre lots. This zoning does not justify leaving the land undeveloped for such a long period of time. The only way they would continue doing that is if they think there is a rezoning possibility in the future. Are they being encouraged by district planners, council, or bogus community plans? Forcing them to hold the property another 20 years would mean a further expenditure on their part of at least \$400,000. Don't you feel there is something dishonest in that?

Someone's getting screwed here. It's either our community or it's the owners. Both scenarios are bad and highlight an extremely poor planning process. Both our community and the owners deserve a clear understanding of what they can expect in the future. **I employ you to immediately include SVCA representatives in the SLP planning process** so that we can get this resolved to our satisfaction. Failure to do this will result in a) our complete opposition to the SLP and b) an immediate effort to withdraw our community from its boundaries when council reconvenes in September.

I have been unable to reach any owners of this property for comment.

Regards,

Bill