

Feedback on proposed redevelopment of the Steveston High site, and Polygon's open house:

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 one.

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.