



Facilitating Workplace Solutions

[HOME](#) [SEARCH](#) [SITE MAP](#)

*Partners
& Projects*

Riverview

■ Riverview Lands Development Project - Comments

While the City of Coquitlam does not require a public consultation process for a building permit to be issued, BCBC and FH were committed to sharing information and hearing what attendees at the February 4th open house had to say. Project team members have reviewed and considered these comments as they have moved forward in planning and implementing their specific area of expertise.

■ Summary of Written Comments

1. It appears that BCBC seems interested in having public input to help "guide" its decision making, however all information indicates the new development will be going ahead regardless - so what's the point of consultation?
2. As a participant on the Mayor's Task Force my initial approach is I would be interested to know expected process/interaction of various groups and stakeholders. Thanks for the evening, information.
3. I'm not impressed by this Open House - there's very little real information and the representatives at each station don't appear to have any information beyond what is in the handout. Make sure that the public is involved in decisions regarding the future of Riverview! It's ours, after all.
4. I also deeply resent the fact that this very same public process (which was done previously and delivered a very clear message from the public voice) is being repeated. Isn't anybody at BCBC listening?
5. We have already gone through a public process and the public said VERY LOUDLY that existing open space should remain public land and heritage buildings should be redeveloped and use as community space/conference space.
6. Consulting the public - a must! Taking what they have to suggest seriously. Do not go through the public consulting process then get on with a predetermined plan.
7. This is the most poorly planned meeting I have ever attended. I am writing these comments on the wall because there is nowhere to write comments. The 6:00pm starting time is very inconvenient. Then I discovered it was just a "stand around" and read the boards meeting. In this day and age, there are many better ways to present information. My reason for being here is that I don't want to see any future development of Riverview lands. Why is BCBC even considering it when the public have said over and over again that they do not want any commercial development.
8. I thought this was going to be a "meeting" not just pictures. Would have liked to have more information about future of patient programs. Why wasn't anyone from PHSA at the "open house" to answer questions? On the first board sign the phrase...Patients will remain at Riverview until they can be transferred to one of the new

facilities where they will receive the same level of care, or better, I take great exception to. It sounds as though the care provided at RVH is substandard!

9. Comment forms had to be requested - missed some people. Felt presenters were unprepared and "passed the buck" when questioned. The presentation boards were very small, maps also. Too close together.
10. We found this meeting very informative. We would like to be informed of any future meetings. Thank you all.
11. I would hope that you consult with EVERYONE - as this building is new to me. It certainly isn't that I don't want facilities for patients - but certainly feel amazing things could have been done with what exists. Perhaps a referendum?
12. Aside from Fraser Health and BC Buildings, who might be the other stakeholders, if any? What other "government use requirements" are being considered? Would they require development of the Riverview lands? The public must be kept informed and involved in decisions regarding changes to these lands.
13. Re: OPEN PUBLIC INPUT. Can we rely on this being truly PUBLIC?
14. Very informative, perhaps forward handouts to worksite at Riverview Hospital.
15. Wednesday night's open house was interesting and somewhat informative. Parking for some was a problem incidently, as the venue's parking area in front was congested, lacked signage to direct traffic to an alternate lot, featured an out-of-order ticket machine and a clerk who insisted that fees would be enforced till 9pm. I don't know how many people drove away frustrated, or left early due to parking time restrictions. The brochure handed out at registration gave a good presentation. Of course, it would have been nice to have received a hard copy of the materials presented on the display panels as well - for thoroughness sake.
16. What concerns most people is the future of the Riverview lands and opportunities to express concerns and preferences. Your literature states "through an open public process, the community and key stakeholders will be invited to share their visions, and work toward objectives and possible frameworks for approaching alternate uses of the lands..." "Key stakeholders" is an interesting phrase that needs to be defined, as its inclusion and exclusion could become a matter of contention. Your commitment to "full public planning processes supporting any land planning initiatives" and "committed to respecting the site's key features, including the mature trees" and so on sounds promising.

Facilitating workplace solutions

[Robson Square](#) | [Whistler](#) | [Woodlands](#)

[Home](#) | [Search](#) | [Site Map](#)