

# AGENDA MINUTES

## RICHMOND VILLAGE PLAN STEERING COMMITTEE

**St. Paul's United Church**

**Meeting #3**

**Wednesday, May 7, 2008**

**7 p.m. start**

### **Steering Committee**

David George, Chair

Jennifer Cook, Vice-Chair

Elaine Morgan, Vice-Chair

Jonathan Allen

Brian Arbuckle

Councillor Brooks

Rob Ciraco

Bill Cook

Doug Featherstone

Graham Green

Barry Laffin

Robert Mazzolin

Ron Milligan

Gisele Moore

Sue Murphy

Michelle Perry

Ben Piercey

Rebecca Swedlove

Bruce Webster

Bill Walters

### **Staff**

Rose Kung

Don Morse

Charles Rousseau

Ian Semple

1. Welcome and Introduction– David George
2. Additions to Agenda – David George
  - a. Steering Committee Membership
  - b. Jock River berm
  - c. Budget for mailing (flyers, workbook)
  - d. E-news status
  - e. Funding model
3. Review of Minutes

It was determined that the minutes were too cryptic for the general public. DG will modify them.
4. Project Work Plan – Don Morse

Don gave an overview of the Project Work Plan (aka Terms of Reference). Since most people had not had a chance to review it, a full discussion and review was scheduled for the next meeting.

[**Action Item** – All read Project Work Plan and prepare comments for next meeting]
5. Summary of Comments from Visioning Session - Rose Kung

Rose and Ian gave a summary of how they were processing the data gathered at the open houses and the visioning workshop. They are identifying themes and principles as the foundation for the workbook.

[**Action Item** – **All** read the Richmond Village Planning Project “As we heard it”, draft Community Vision, summary of resident input and compare to Second Draft of document entitled “Developing a Community Vision for the Village of Richmond” which will be available prior to the May 21 Steering Committee meeting.]

6. Design Workshop focusing on existing community – Charles Rousseau  
Charles tabled the Mattamy/LRK workshop proposal. Sue Murphy informed Members that the proposed date for the workshop was mid-June. A full discussion and vote was deferred until the next meeting to allow members to review the proposal.  
[**Action Item** – **All** read the LRK workshop proposal and be prepared to discuss it and vote at the next meeting, May 21]
7. Steering Committee Membership  
It was clarified that Barry Laffin, Ron Milliken and Sue Murphy were non-voting members with a development interest. It was decided and voted on to finalize the Steering Committee membership. A vote was taken to add one final member (Rob Ciraco). He was accepted as a voting member.  
[**Action Item** – **DG** to contact Robert Mazzolin to confirm membership]  
[**Action Item** – **GM** to contact Bill Cook to confirm membership]
8. Communications Protocol  
After discussion it was determined that the single e-mail point of contact for the Richmond SDP will be [richmond@ottawa.ca](mailto:richmond@ottawa.ca). City staff will manage distribution of received-emails. All agendas and minutes will be published on the web (City of Ottawa and RVA) and in hard copy in the Richmond Library.
9. Subcommittees  
David George proposed that sub-committees be formed to address the issues and themes that have been used at the open houses.  
[**Action Item** – **All** consider what sub-committees should be formed, and which sub-committees they would join]
10. Richmond Berm  
David read an email from a resident concerned about the recent modifications by Mattamy to a berm beside the Jock River (off Ottawa street close to the Legion). Bill Laffin explained that the berm had been approved by the RVCA when it was built by the former owners (Schoutens).
11. Budget for Mail  
Councillor Glen Brooks explained that his office had some funding available for mail of promotional flyers and the community workbooks.
12. E-news

Don announced that an e-news article about the Richmond Village Planning Project was published 6 May 2008.

### 13. Funding Model

The City still needs to confirm the funding model for this project. Discussions are on-going and the City will report to the Steering Committee when the model is finalized.

### 14. Next Meeting – Wednesday, May 21. Location to be determined

### 15. Adjournment at 9:20 p.m.

## SUMMARY OF EMAILS

To and from 'Richmond@ottawa.ca' between May 7 and May 15.

---

Received May 8, 2008

There is still clarity required as to who are the members of the steering committee. Is Barry Laffin a member? What happened to the "new members" Giselle Moore and Jonathan Allen? They are not on your list. Who is Tony Sroka? *Giselle Moore and Jonathan Allen are voting members.(Staff reply)*

Clarify the role and status of developers' representatives. Sue Murphy had an awful lot to say at last night's meeting. *Those members who have primarily a development interest (Barry Laffin, Ron Milligan and Sue Murphy) are non-voting members.*

Speaking of developers, last night provided a classic example for why they should not be represented on this steering committee. Mattamy has offered a "free" service in order to advise the neophyte steering committee and nudge the process toward a conclusion favorable to their interests. Not an uncommon practise. But with Sue Murphy at the table, how do you have a frank, honest, perhaps brutally honest debate on the advisability of accepting such an offer. Even now Mattamy knows who supports acceptance of their offer and who they have yet to convince. As well, the Mattamy rep's hinting that this may be a limited time offer smells of high pressure salesmanship.

Accepting the offer of LRK services at the developer's expense would be a grave error. It would put the committee in a compromised position and give the developer undue control. To do it next month is all of the above plus plain dumb. You are right - if you are going to do it, do it next Fall when it is less likely to hijack the process.

The meeting venue was not the best, as it is difficult to hear speakers with their backs to the observers.

Harvey Snyder  
Past President and current Director  
the Richmond Village Association Inc.

---

Received May 8, 2008

Harvey's thoughts are very similar to ones I received on asking my Richmond contacts the LRK question. I've included them below with the names removed as they were submitted to me personally.

I agree about the meeting venue - I didn't like having my back to people. Would there be possibility of using one of the schools? Doesn't the city have a reciprocal agreement with the Boards of Education?

Mattamy has offered to pay for them. That in itself says it all. Mattamy will get what they want and it will not be in the best interest of Richmond residents. An independent local architect should be engaged by the City of Ottawa. Mattamy is agreeing to pay because it will speed up the process.

Some immediate and off the top of my head comments: 1) if Mattamy is paying them, is it not in their best interest to please/satisfy Mattamy. Screams conflict of interest to me. 2) Is this or is it not an American company? Could a Canadian/Ottawa company not be found? A firm that has a better grip on local concerns and conditions?

Why are we even at the stage of looking/talking to architects? I could understand urban planners with experience in rural issues but architects? And this type of detail at this point seems like putting the cart before the horse. I do agree that any developer paying for any portion of the planning process (or needs) is a conflict and would void all results anyway.

---

Received May 8, 2008

Whether or not to accept this offer from LRK and Mattamy is our most controversial piece of business, so let's continue the discussion. I have the following questions I would like each of you to consider. For expediency and stimulate discussion I included my opinion for each question.

1. Need - do we need these architectural services? We may not need architects, but experienced professionals would likely help us develop a better vision and plan.
2. Budget - do we have any budget to hire architectural services? I do not think we have any budget specifically. As I recall we will have difficulty covering postage for the workbooks.
3. Strings - what, if any, strings are attached to this offer by Mattamy? Altruism is rare in the corporate world. Many questions could be answered if Mattamy publicly explained why there are willing to fund this workshop for Richmond.
4. Suspicion - why are so many people so suspicious? Mattamy did not have to make this offer to fund this workshop. Mattamy did not have to have a representative on the Richmond SDP. Would it be better to have developers that were not involved or interested in our opinions? Today we can ask questions directly to Sue Murphy (Mattamy), Ron Milligan, and Bill Laffin.

I realize that this would likely defer the currently proposed workshop date beyond mid-June, but I think whether or not to accept the LRK proposal, and if accepted when it should be held, would be good questions to place in the workbook and thus get a vote from the Richmond community at large. The apparent controversy on the workshop should raise awareness and generate interest in the Secondary Development Plan process, and hopefully residents will look beyond this one issue and express their opinions on other topics as well. If the workshop was approved by a vote in the workbook, attendance and participation would likely be greater than if it were held next month.

---

Received May 9, 2008

Having spoken to Councillor Brooks, the issue of the Steering Committee having discussions or continuing a discussion, as a group, on an item up for discussion on a Committee agenda, is that it may appear to some individuals that discussions and decisions are being made outside of the public process. This may serve to undermine confidence in the Steering Committee and the process, and it may lead to rumours and misinformation. The ultimate purpose of the Steering Committee, with the voting members being residents of the Village of Richmond, is to allow for a full discussion and decisions of the issues in public, so that the process is open and transparent.

My understanding of LRK is that they are an American multi-disciplinary architecture and planning firm. Jim is a trained planner (who can also design) and Gonzalo has a Masters degree in Architecture (who can plan). Regarding this e-mail trail. I would hate to cut this off. The e-mails received to date are thoughtful, honest, fluid and helpful. What if we continued these e-mail discussions and agreed that staff (me) would make a summary of them public at the beginning of each meeting so the public can hear what the Steering Committee is discussing?

Clarification of a few facts:

- A- LRK are a firm of planners and architects specializing in community planning - they are not an architectural firm;
- B- Susan Murphy, representing Mattamy, as been at every meeting and will presumably continue to be. Therefore, I would suggest that any questions or concerns about Mattamy's offer be posed directly to Mattamy at the next meeting.

C- It would be best to put the discussion of this item on hold until your next meeting. Discussing matters in public at scheduled meetings is the best way to ensure due process and transparency, and to instill public confidence in the Richmond Village Community Design Plan Project.

---

Received May 12, 2008

I attended the Richmond Village Planning project meetings on April 12 and April 19, 2008. They were excellent. I was extremely impressed with the presentations, knowledgeable staff, and the super attendance (especially for the April 12 meeting).

The momentum has to continue in order for the planning sessions to be a success. The only way that momentum can be maintained is if the public gets involved. It is crucial that the citizens of Richmond and area rise to their responsibility and participate in the making of their destiny by getting involved with the planning. How can the organizers of the Richmond Village Planning project create an environment that encourages citizen participation? There are many things that can be done. Here are a couple of things that come to mind: It is important to communicate what is happening with the planning by publishing regular reports on the status of the planning: what's happening at the meetings, what's happening at City Hall, what is coming up next, what are the really big issues, etc.?

The organizers need to **MARKET** the Richmond Village Planning project effectively: Get people talking, get people involved; make it a big deal in Richmond to attend the meetings, to voice an opinion, to make individual concerns be known. Make posters; have public service announcements; put flyers in the mail, in the Force advertising package, and in stores; create a buzz! Communication must be timely. My wife and I missed the May 7 meeting because we were not provided with adequate lead-time to prepare for the meeting. We were advised of the meeting by email on May 5 - not enough notification time. People are busy. Most of us have schedules. We have to work our busy lifestyles into the schedules. All in all you folks are doing a great job. Our family feels that we are lucky to be able to have a say in the way that the community of Richmond is to be developed. Keep up the good work.

---

Received May 13, 2008

As a new committee member I have a few questions.

- 1) With regards to LRK offering the 3-4 day session to discuss what can be improved upon in the village Core, etc. Is there funding from the City to pay for these improvements or modifications?
- 2) During the Vision meeting at one of the Tables, we were informed the the village boundary, that is delineated in Red on the aerial photos, can be moved to expand or reduce the boundary. Is this correct? What would be the advantages or disadvantages?
- 3) With regards to the acres of private farmland around the village. Is there way that the City can partner with the land owners to develop a Greenbelt around the village of Richmond? This would be used to create a visual break from the expanding portions of Kanata South. I am aware of some Tax Incentive programs through the province, but they are dedicated to forested lands already established.