

To whom it may concern
re: 3L amendment process

Lisa Christensen
baddog777@shaw.ca

Before you is a potential amendment to our RGS. Brought forth by a development company that claims to have our best interests in mind but has demonstrated very difficult behaviors. An amendment that would go against the very core of the document that is supposed to protect the character and infrastructure needs of our beautiful home.

Should 3L be allowed to repeatedly change the rules? This supposedly responsible development team who has all of our best interests in mind has been playing the game like a toddler. Every time something shows a hint of going south the rules have been questioned and/or changed, over and over again.

The multiple votes over the summer each with its own little flaw found and exploited. The standard amendment process being pared down to a fraction of the time it should really take to be fulsome at their request, only to have a last minute plea for an extension before the key first reading vote.

Sickeningly sweet offers are repeatedly alternated with dire threats of litigation and a literal razing of the earth beneath the contentious piece of property. 'We could give you a park.. We could scorch the earth. We could charge you a toll. We could generously allow the public in for free.

How can the people of the valley, and the CVRD board members ever trust the promises of such a company?

To agree to further this amendment is to tell developers that our valley is ok with threats and poor behaviour as a way to get what you want. That holding a park hostage or threatening legal action (which is not even warranted in the situation, the board has fulfilled their obligations to consider 3L's amendment) will get you what you seek.

I have been continuously appalled by the actions of a company which claims to have the best interests of our people and our environment in mind. The blatant threats towards directors before a supposedly unbiased, democratic voting process. The seemingly empty threats to withdraw the proposal or to pursue legal actions as a way to sway a vote. How can we ever know the truths behind their statements when they have repeatedly demonstrated such behaviours?

They claim to have our best interests in mind, wanting to work to make an environmentally sound development and yet at every turn they are quick to switch tact and use dire threats of mass destruction. Of clear cutting the trees (seemingly already accomplished) and of pillaging the contents of the earth beneath the land.

This development is in a place that would be no easy feat to make environmentally sound. 1000+ units would equal double or more bodies. A grand number of cars in an area not set up for the infrastructure to handle such an amount. Children to fill up schools that are already overflowing on the west side. A settlement node far from existing public transit. A wildlife corridor under threat of dismantling.

This sensitive area is already being overwhelmed by the outside visitors brought to the falls by the viral infamy of this process.

We have areas slated for development within our core. Areas that are more than adequate to handle the projected influx of population. Areas that will not require amendments to the RGS and will uphold the spirit of that document and protect our valley from urban sprawl. To create a new development node before those areas are filled would put stresses on infrastructure that feeds our outer limits when we need to focus on enhancing the infrastructure of our core.

The need for affordable housing does not come into play with this development. We have areas that maintain our

RGS to focus on, that can be filled with cheaper and more suitable multi family units. Places that are closer to our core and cheaper to live in due to decreased transportation needs. Places that would bring much needed influx to our existing core businesses.

Overwhelming public response urges the board to support our RGS and protect the character and integrity of our valley and its infrastructure.

This process would be long and costly and facing continuous scrutiny and public unrest.

The speed at which the developers have been insisting it get rammed through is an enormous red flag. Don't think too deeply about how promises will be fulfilled, don't look for potential causes for concern, just get it done before the election. Oh, wait, we can't make that deadline with a standard amendment? Well then lets pare down the standard process to its bare bones and in the least get it done in a minimal number of months.

3L begged for the tight timeline. Now suddenly they are begging for extension?

Enough games.

The board was tasked to start the amendment process. The process quickly uncovered public unrest and just how much this amendment could damage our RGS. Affordable housing can happen in many other places that do not require an amendment. This settlement node is not needed to fulfill our projected needs as our current potential within our core area exceeds projected growth. This is NOT the only way to get a park, and even if it was, it is not worth selling our souls by stripping our RGS of its teeth.

Please listen to your staff recommendations and to the public outcry. Vote down this potential amendment to our RGS.

Sincerely, Lisa Christensen