

Subject: [Fwd: RE: SLP Prelim Applications]

Date: Tue, 27 Sep 2005 22:30:10 -0700

From: Brian Platts <bplatts@shaw.ca>

To: Corrie Kost <kost@triumf.ca>

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

Subject: RE: SLP Prelim Applications

Date: Tue, 27 Sep 2005 22:21:40 -0700

From: Ernie Crist <ernie_crist@dnv.org>

To: Bill Maurer <billm@millsoft.ca>

CC: Mayor and Council - DNV <Council@dnv.org>, Senior Management Committee <managecomm@dnv.org>, James Ridge <James_Ridge@dnv.org>, mbragg@shaw.ca, fonvca@fonvca.org

Hello Bill:

I understood perfectly well. To use your own words below "The development process starts with the Preliminary Application. The applicant then has to pass through a number of gates en route to preparing a Detailed Application" etc.

This is exactly what in my opinion needs to be avoided. It is the thin edge of the wedge and prejudices the outcome of the next round. Just close the door - sorry we will not accept any application until the reviewing process for the next round is opened. This is my opinion.

Ernie

--Original Message-----

From: Bill Maurer [<mailto:billm@millsoft.ca>]

Sent: Tuesday, September 27, 2005 8:59 PM

To: Ernie Crist

Cc: Mayor and Council - DNV; Senior Management Committee; James Ridge; mbragg@shaw.ca; fonvca@fonvca.org

Subject: Re: SLP Prelim Applications

Oh, Ernie. You don't understand.

The motion that passed is to leave everything as it is.

The development process starts with the Preliminary Application. The applicant then has to pass through a number of gates en route to preparing a Detailed Application. This includes planning, environmental, density, permits & licensing, traffic, advisory design panel, ocp, ... Once they feel ready, they submit a detailed application. This is submitted by planning to council at the time of rezoning along with a report which shows where they have met and where they do not meet existing requirements.

Does this not sound better than the original motion which would have made a special case of Seymour by requiring that every Preliminary Application be reviewed by council without any prior review or which would have seen the SLP changed from its original intent?

The system is working Ernie and it is community driven. The previous motion as written had no community input. It was altered by Jim and supported by council in response to public input and letters from the community as well as a letter from the SLP Monitoring Committee which was included in your council packet.

Regards,

Bill

Ernie Crist writes:

> Hello Bill:
>
> No, I did not speak in favour of it. I spoke in favour of making a
> clear statement not a Jim Cuthbert half baked motion geared to confuse
>
> everybody, weaken the process and play into the hands of the enemies
> of community planning.
>
> When I gave chess lessons the very first thing I told the new class is
> "the first thing you have to know when you play an opponent is that he
> is out to beat you". Well, they are out to beat you.
>
> The issue is clear I stated. The Seymour plan is sacred and is not
> subject to change every time somebody wants to revise the numbers. The
> time to do that is during the public review process.
>
> What was required last night was a clear statement to that effect not
> a Jim Cuthbert, I don't want to be pregnant except maybe just a little
>
> bit effort. You may not be aware, but Jim's amendment opens the door
> to continued testing and questioning of the plan by every would-be
> developer and real estate Tom, Dick and Harry.
>
> It weakens and undermines the credibility of the whole community
> planning process. That is the whole purpose why the pro developer and
> the real-estate interests got that issue on the floor in the first
> place. It is also the reason why Council deals with DVP applications
> instead of the Board of Variance as is done in other municipalities -
> "it stimulates the market". If your people don't understand that they
> will pay a heavy price. The way to deal with that is NO, THE PLAN IS
> NOT DEBATABLE - SORRY BUT IT IS NOT ON THE TABLE. If something
> extraordinary comes up we can deal with it without going through any
> phoney hooplas.
>
> Ernie Crist
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Bill Maurer [<mailto:billm@millsoft.ca>]
> Sent: Tuesday, September 27, 2005 1:58 PM
> To: Ernie Crist
> Subject: SLP Prelim Applications
>
> I'm curious why you voted against Jim Cuthbert's ammendment motion of
> item 3 on last night's agenda? You spoke in favour of it.
>
>
> Regards,
>
> Bill
>
>