



January 27, 2014 First Place Liaison Committee

Meeting Notes

Bulyea Heights Community League Hall

Attending:

City staff & Consultant: Tim McCargar, Cory Segin, David Holehouse, Prabhat Dahal, Jacqueline Tessier

Liaison Volunteers: Bearspaw (Mike Sczesny), Blue Quill (Neil Dunwald, Richard Hughes), Bulyea Heights (Elmar Klapstein, Elmar Klapstein, Harold Hornig), Dechene (Fred Loeffler, Perry Konyonenbelt), Haddow (Mathew Babey, Barry Kossowan, Jim Bradshaw, Peter Kunkel), Larkspur (Kelley Peeling, Tara Madden), Skyrattler (Tim Battle), Twin Brooks (Rob Agostinis, Don Edgecombe, Ida Richards)

Regrets: Representatives of Belle Rive, Caernarvon, Canon Ridge, Casselman, Dunluce, Greenview, Kernohan, Kirkness, Micheals Park, Sifton Park, and Tawa

Background

City provided a presentation to explain re-siting principles and public involvement process for First Place building sites, and sought input from the volunteers to assist in finalizing these elements.

As referenced in our Liaison update dated January 16, 2014, Twenty/20 Communication (Jacqueline Tessier) has been retained as the public engagement consultant to support an engagement process that includes re-siting discussions for the First Place Sites (2014 and beyond).

The following are comments received:

- Resiting principles
 - Participants asked for clarity around the financial feasibility principle—and require this to be clearly defined. Does builder have input into this principle? Is tax revenue factored in?
 - More explanation and detail on the development and approval process is required.
 - Does technical feasibility cover safety issues like roadway entrances to site? Can community challenge the re-siting principles?



- We need to develop what blends with the neighbourhood.
- Re-siting public involvement process
 - Start process with leadership (may be different in each community)
 - Ensure those residents who are closest to the building site are appropriately engaged in the process.
 - In some communities, a low percentage of residents actually hold community league memberships—getting information to all residents is difficult
 - The community leagues should not be speaking on behalf of the residents on this issue.
 - Broader consideration and net impact has to be assessed before implementing process or included in the discussion (for example, recreational plan, property values, park re-development plan).
 - Privacy will be a concern to residents living next to the building site.
 - Will rezoning be an issue if an alternate site is preferred by the community?
 - Input from entire community is required.
 - Some properties are rental and residents of these units need to be engaged.
 - Needs to consider broader park redevelopment plan
 - The public will ask the same questions as the liaison committee members—what is positive for the City, the community, etc.
 - Concerns about past processes and the lack of engagement will need to be addressed in future engagements.
 - Re-siting process must be driven by community and those most impacted.
 - If we are going to consult, let's go back to point one.
 - Does rezoning allow us to deal with the courts and rinks that have been in a holding pattern for two years? We will lose access to casino funds if we wait much longer
- Role of community leagues
 - Remove community league from the equation,
 - Do not rely on the community league to drive this or make a decision on behalf of the community
 - Don't put onus on community league—don't need their permission or approval
 - Community league may not be driver in all areas.
 - The role of community league in re-siting process needs to be revisited.

- Impacts on property values
 - We need independent property value assessments—individual assessments in each community.
 - Concern about the potentially negative impact on the property values of homes located adjacent to First Place sites.
 - There will be irreversible damage to the neighbourhood with the First Place program.
 - We are concerned about our property values.

- Past Council decisions
 - Is there any way out or are we committed?
 - The 2006 process was flawed.
 - Why can't we explore other options? Are contracts in place with builders?
 - What is the impact for City to revisit what is proposed for each site?
 - Participants questioned what process they had to stop/change the program including petition.
 - Concern on City adherence of Public Involvement Policy (Policy C513) in approval of First Place Program
 - Twin Brooks suggested meeting with the Office of Public Engagement to discuss City policy on public engagement and meeting with Sustainable Development to discuss concern that existing statute or legislation were broken when approving the First Place Program.
 - Participant suggested that the program is not being carried out within the context of the vision of Municipal Affairs.

- Liaison requests arising
 - Ensure November liaison meeting notes are placed on website
 - January notes to be shared with liaison group for review by February 15, 2013
 - Request for RFP information regarding builders selection for First Place program
 - Request for copy of sales agreement between City and the builder