

In one sense the use of local advisory committees is an attempt to anticipate the public hearing process and produce a plan that reflects some measure of local views on the preferred development for the neighbourhood.

Committee appointments are likely made with the hope that the self-interest of individuals will be converted through the process of debate to an enlightened view that represents not merely what is best for the individual but what is in the best interest of the neighbourhood. The planners must then take from the pool of opinions the suggestions that contribute to a plan that best serves the entire municipality. The appointment of the Hastings Street Advisory Committee contained the limitation that it would "assist staff in the preparation of a revised land use plan....".

Speaking specifically to the first allegation, the committee member in question, like others on the committee, was appointed by Council with full knowledge that she was a property owner. That was, indeed, one reason she was chosen. No evidence was offered to support the suggestion that she or her family will gain a financial benefit as a result of her participation on the Hastings Street Advisory Committee. Her opinions throughout the proceedings of the committee are reported by the staff planner to have consistently favoured low density residential rather than a higher density that would normally be expected to raise property values.

An earlier plan for the area produced by the planners in 1987 recommended that the block of property in question be zoned RM3, Multiple Family Residential, which is essentially the zoning adopted by the Hastings Street Plan June 3, 1991.

2. In his second complaint the resident is concerned that large portions of the Hastings Street Area are to be rezoned in a "blanket rezoning" in the future; but this application is being considered in advance of that blanket rezoning.

Council adopted the Area Plan for Hastings after an extensive community consultation process. All residents and property owners in the Area were notified of meetings and given opportunity to participate.

The rezoning now being considered is consistent with the approved Plan. The Public Hearing accorded this rezoning is not different from the hearing that must precede any other rezoning including a wide scope rezoning of the entire area.

If the Plan is later implemented by adopting a Rezoning Amendment of the entire area, one public hearing will be held for all properties. The procedure will not be different from the procedure at this hearing.

CONCLUSION


Planners view the involvement of members of the community as an essential element in the development of neighbourhood plans. Individuals who participate always bring their own expertise and sensitivity to the discussions and, because they live and work in the area, there may be an appearance of conflict. However, the plan that results should reflect not only neighbourhood concerns but must also recognize broader municipal policies and objectives.

A proposal advanced by any committee member would be subject to the scrutiny of the entire Committee, the professional

ITEM SUPPL 21
MANAGER'S REPORT NO. 14
COUNCIL MEETING 92/02/24

planners, the neighbourhood review process, the municipal council, and finally the rezoning with a public hearing. There is no evidence that any member of the Hastings Street Advisory Committee enjoyed a financial benefit as a result of participation in the Committee proceedings.

Normal procedures have been followed in treating the application to rezone the 3700 block Albert from R5 to CD.


Patricia W. Piieger
Municipal Solicitor

PWF:jr

C.C. Director Administrative & Community Services
Director Planning & Building Inspection

