

Chamberlain, Lisa

From: Lakewood Beach Community Council
Sent: April 29, 2019 10:02 AM
To: Chamberlain, Lisa
Cc: Pearson, Maria; Clark, Brad; Whitehead, Terry; Partridge, Judi; JP Danko; Collins, Chad; Farr, Jason; Wilson, Maureen; Johnson, Brenda
Subject: 310 Frances Avenue

Good Morning Lisa, would you please be able to add this to tomorrow agenda as Communications to the Planning Committee?

Dear Madam Chair & Committee Members,

We are seeking your clarification on questions that have been raised by the residents since the meeting of April 16th; substantive and procedural. Some of these queries you might wish to address prior to approving the Minutes of the April 16th meeting.

Substantive:

Can you please advise when Staff will be reporting back to Committee?

We had thought going forward, documents/information/updates would be more public and easily available in order to provide the residents with information and possibly an opportunity for input.

Since the meeting, we asked again for electronic copies of the Studies. We were again told NO, they will not be made available to the public electronically until an Agenda is online for the unknown Tuesday Planning Committee meeting. (the documents are public, but according to Staff the process isn't. Hence, unlike opa/zba planning applications, won't electronically release on a usb stick)

We also asked for minutes and what the outcome was of the April 24th, Development Review Team meeting. We were told the applicant was asked to make revisions, but we have to wait for the details. We can read about the outcome when Staff provide Committee with a 'high level summary' of that meeting and it is on some future agenda.

Can you please clarify the intent of the Motion?

Procedural:

Can you please advise why the Report to Council (and minutes) excluded the addition of the Staff Presentation to the Agenda. The presentation by Staff is showing as a Public Hearing/Delegation rather than a walk on presentation. As well, our slide presentation is not reflected in the reports/minutes. Those exclusions result in no accessible copies on the city's website and we believe, a legal public record that isn't complete.

Can you also please advise why the Motion appeared as a Direction contained in the Information Section of the meeting Report to Council on April 24? Shouldn't Council have been advised a Motion was made, that there was a seconder, it was electronically voted upon, and carried during the April 16th Planning Committee meeting? Those details are indicated in the Minutes, but were not in the Report to Council. Are some Motions ratified at Council and others aren't?

We also believe Clr Partridge provided some directions to Staff that were omitted in the Report - direction to bump up our area in the planning process with a potential report back by the Fall; as well as a report back on other properties zoned RM5 (no height restriction). We're not positive on this, but we had always thought Directions to Staff form part of the public record for addition to the Outstanding Business List to ensure follow through.

We have also always thought Motions and Directions were different so we're confused by the Report/Minutes of the 16th.

It's quite possible we are unnecessarily worried & do not fully grasp the stages of a Site Plan process (or that we misinterpreted Committee's intent). Our understanding is that issues/concerns have already been identified and shared with the applicant as conditions of approval. (ie we read about sewer upgrades in a recent CBC article) It is also rumoured a follow up DRT meeting has been scheduled. We can't help but question if this is even fair to the applicant when Committee (once they receive information) may choose to exercise Council's authority and amend any issues/concerns/conditions/revisions.

Lastly, out of courtesy to the residents who had planned on speaking but were unable to. On behalf of the residents who provided other delegates with parts of their presentations; we would like to ask that rather than the public record reflecting "did not attend", those 2 individuals be afforded the same respectful wording another delegate who also wasn't present received. Specifically, "were unable to attend but ..." Those particular residents made an effort. As a courtesy, we would ask that the record reflect their efforts instead of leaving one to believe they were 'no shows'.

We look forward to any clarifications Committee can provide.

Thank you!

Respectfully,

Lakewood Beach Community Council