

---

**Subject:** Official Community Plan Amendment Application No. CP100169 (Bylaw No. 9184) and Rezoning Amendment Application No. RZ100694 (Bylaw No. 9185) (10 May 2021; Agenda Item: D5 – St. Lawrence Avenue (PID 005-287-391))

**From:** Emile Begin Redacted

**Date:** June 6, 2021 at 5:17:38 PM PDT

**To:** Mayor <[MAYOR@princegeorge.ca](mailto:MAYOR@princegeorge.ca)>, "Councillor Everitt, Frank" <[Frank.Everitt@princegeorge.ca](mailto:Frank.Everitt@princegeorge.ca)>, "Councillor Frizzell, Garth" <[Garth.Frizzell@princegeorge.ca](mailto:Garth.Frizzell@princegeorge.ca)>, "Councillor Krause, Murry" <[Murry.Krause@princegeorge.ca](mailto:Murry.Krause@princegeorge.ca)>, "Councillor McConnachie, Terri" <[Terri.McConnachie@princegeorge.ca](mailto:Terri.McConnachie@princegeorge.ca)>, "Councillor Ramsay, Cori" <[Cori.Ramsay@princegeorge.ca](mailto:Cori.Ramsay@princegeorge.ca)>, "Councillor Sampson, Kyle" <[Kyle.Sampson@princegeorge.ca](mailto:Kyle.Sampson@princegeorge.ca)>, "Councillor Scott, Susan" <[Susan.Scott@princegeorge.ca](mailto:Susan.Scott@princegeorge.ca)>, "Councillor Skakun, Brian" <[Brian.Skakun@princegeorge.ca](mailto:Brian.Skakun@princegeorge.ca)>, 311 <[311@princegeorge.ca](mailto:311@princegeorge.ca)>

**Cc:** Emile Begin Redacted

**Subject: RE: Official Community Plan Amendment Application No. CP100169 (Bylaw No. 9184) and Rezoning Amendment Application No. RZ100694 (Bylaw No. 9185) (10 May 2021; Agenda Item: D5 – St. Lawrence Avenue (PID 005-287-391))**

**This email originated from outside the organization. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize and trust the sender and know the content is safe.**

06 June 2021

Emile Begin, RPF

7490 Southridge Ave., Prince George BC, V2N4Y5

Corporation of the City of Prince George

Mayor and Council, City Administration

City of Prince George, 1100 Patricia Blvd. Prince George, British Columbia V2L 3V9

RE: Official Community Plan Amendment Application No. CP100169 (Bylaw No. 9184) and Rezoning Amendment Application No. RZ100694 (Bylaw No. 9185) (10 May 2021; Agenda Item: D5 – St. Lawrence Avenue (PID 005-287-391))

Good day to all. Please accept this letter of concern as a respectful re-start, a request for information and potential trust re-building opportunity.

No information of the proposal was provided to me by the City and proponents; only discovered after a chance meeting, "second-hand". Later reading a web-news-paper, searching for clues in Mayor and Council Agendas, accidentally stumbling upon a Zoom meeting opportunity with L&M Engineering Ltd. The Zoom call identified many and disturbing shortcomings.

My home and community will be impacted by City Administration supported opinions. City administration, Mayor and Council have chosen to keep residents uninformed. Might I ask why an open, transparent, due diligence governance model would forget affected residents?

Referring to the recent "REVIEW OF THE GEORGE STREET PARKADE PROJECT" (**the Report**); the contracted Barristers and Solicitors offered observations; *"the City did not do sufficient due diligence in*

*advance of moving forward to fully understand the costs it agreed to incur, and the risks associated with moving forward in the proposed manner.”*

One might shorten the rather lengthy report to one word “malfeasance”; defined as; *the wrongful or unjust doing of some act which the doer has no right to perform, or which he has stipulated by contract not to do.* (Source: The Law Dictionary, Blacks Law Dictionary).

*Due diligence* is identified as one of many learning opportunities including a failure to “*fully understand*”, apparently missing from City administration and elected decisions. Question: If the reported failings were not true, why would taxes be going up most years?

In light of the Report and identified due diligence failures, a request is made to be provided all related documentation, public records, exchanged emails and other related documentation leading the City of Prince George administration (Ian Wells, Walter Babbicz, other staffs, planners, proponent reports, submissions, Mayor and Councillors) to provide their support for the referenced proposal. Support provided without direct consultation of affected residents.

What is the City approval based on (besides a 15 year old, Community Plan, partly prepared by the submitter – L&M Engineering Ltd.)? How and what information did the City use / consider to conclude supporting the proposal without speaking with affected residents, was a good idea? Did anyone in the City read the Parkade Report our taxes paid for? What is learned? Previous City administration and elected people made the commitment below;

*“Neighbourhood and Area Plans provide land use vision for a particular area or neighbourhood, and bring together the broader needs of the community with the local knowledge to create a more livable neighbourhood.”* (A Guide to neighbourhood and area Plans. Source: City of Prince George). Why exclude “local knowledge”, ignoring community?

The 2006-Final - Ospika South Neighbourhood Plan stated; *“the majority of the neighbourhood remains undeveloped and unplanned beyond general policy directions set out in Prince George’s Official Community Plan (OCP).”* The Plan committed to notifying *“property owners within 100 metres (330 feet) of the plan area boundary”*. Commitments were made regarding *“analysis and planning of the major road network, water and sanitary sewer servicing, and stormwater management.”* Why ignore previous commitments in new community proposals?

City administration and elected people again, failed to notify affected property owners, before publicly expressing City administrative support. Another due-diligence failure?

The Zoom meeting hosted by L&M Engineering Ltd, was appreciated, discovering it by accident is another demonstration of a failure to apply due-diligence by the City.

During the rather short, singular meeting, considering all concerns being expressed, it became apparent and clear for many; L&M Engineering staff were “doing their job”. The short meeting, did not allow all people to ask questions, provide information and express concerns.

L&M Staffs confirmed they also had no information on resident concerns regarding traffic, sewer and water issues identified over the recent 3 years. Project planners-with no knowledge on critical infrastructure failures and incomplete infrastructure information, including the location of the water supply pump station, outside of their “planning area”.

A comment that “No, the City never informed us about that”, was heard more than once.

It became disturbingly apparent that City Planners and L&M Engineering staffs; are not exchanging development critical, community information, knowledge, experiences, truth and facts with community. Excluding surrounding and directly impacted property owners.

This development proposal could be a great opportunity to rebuild trust in the Corporation of the City of Prince George and elected peoples... or not. Would residents support "malfeasance" again? Defined as: "*Misconduct or wrongdoing, especially by a public official.*"

- *n. Evil-doing; the doing of that which ought not to be done; wrongful conduct, especially official misconduct; violation of a public trust or obligation; specifically, the doing of an act which is positively unlawful or wrongful, in contradistinction to misfeasance, or the doing of a lawful act in a wrongful manner."* (Source: Wordnik)

Looking forward to receiving the requested public information and records, proponent reports (Traffic Impact analysis and Servicing Brief, emails, records and other related documentation) long before any further discussions and any decisions are forced on uniformed residents.

Sincerely

Emile Begin

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10