

From: randall.s.becker
Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 7:18 PM
To: Clerks Richmondhill <clerks@richmondhill.ca>
Cc: David West <david.west@richmondhill.ca>
Subject: Regarding Feb 25th Agenda

Dear Clerks of the Town of Richmond Hill,

I wish to express my person view as a taxpayer and voter of Richmond Hill Ward 4 regarding item 13.1.10 of the Agenda raised by Councillor DiPaola. This view is not necessarily reflective of any group or organization, including the Richmond Hill Board of Trade, to which I am or may be associated and I make it entirely and completely on my own and for myself.

This motion, specifically to move to a 1pm time for the Committee of the Whole is at a time where residents who work for a living and business owners who have to conduct business at the time of meetings cannot participate without undue hardship. I find this move deeply concerning, short-sighted, and offensive to those who may wish to participate in the democratic process and hold our representatives to account. The move prevents awareness of positive support, and of criticisms and protest of items that may come up in future for which residents may wish to support or object. This motion restricts access and the ability to scrutinize the actions and decisions of our representatives, and as such, I am, in the strongest terms, against this time move, and do not think it serves the Town or its population in a positive way. I ask that this item be summarily and immediately withdrawn from consideration.

Sincerely,
Randall S. Becker
Resident, Richmond Hill Ward 4
56 Theobalds Circle

From: Sherry
Sent: Saturday, February 23, 2019 1:01 AM
To: Clerks Richmondhill <clerks@richmondhill.ca>
Subject: Change of meeting time for committee of the whole

To whom it may concern,

I was told that the city is planning to change the meeting time of committee of the whole to afternoon 1:00 instead of 4:30pm or 7:30pm.

As a resident in Richmond Hill, I would strongly against this proposal. Most people work during the day. If we want to express our concerns regarding the KDA or other developments which need change of existing Zoning, most neighbours will not be able to attend. This change of time means city or city councillors want to make decisions without the involvement of the residents, which I hope it was not the intention of the city.

Sherry

Sent from my iPhone
Sherry Zhang,

From: Wei Hua

Sent: Sunday, February 24, 2019 11:50 PM

To: Clerks Richmondhill <clerks@richmondhill.ca>

Cc: David Laliberte

Subject: Memo against the Change of timing for the community and council meetings

Dear Town Clerks,

I am writing as a resident and business owner in Richmond Hill that the community as a whole and council meetings should continue to be held in the evenings, rather than 1:00 in the afternoon. The town should do its best to consult ALL community members by holding such meetings in the evenings, otherwise most of the community members couldn't attend the afternoon meetings. The councillors are voted in by the people and should have people in mind when making decisions.

Thanks

Wei Hua

Resident of Richmond Hill

RE: AGENDA ITEM 13.1.10
Change of Council and COW meeting Times

Dear members of Richmond Hill Council;

At the Richmond Hill Committee of the Whole (COW) meeting on February 19, 2019, Regional Councillor DiPaola moved that the future COW & Council meetings be moved to 1 pm on Tuesdays instead of 4:30pm and 7:30pm respectively on alternate Mondays.

Why? Who does this serve? "Cui bono?" How does this impact accessibility for residents who work? What about delegations wishing to speak on an issue? It gives the appearance of limiting dissent and public. It doesn't appear to serve most residents. It doesn't serve public engagement. It would, however, appear to make it easier to push through unpopular motions undaunted by citizen dissent. It also gives the appearance of making it easier for councillors to systematically dampen opposition to a broader, unpopular agenda in the longer term. This ultimately serves to erode democratic process in our Town. At the very least, decrease a resident's ability to voice their dissent in person. This does not serve civic engagement in any way. In fact, it obstructs it by effectively closing the doors to council participation by a majority of concerned taxpayers. Again, "Cui bono?" Knowing that council is aware that this excludes residents from participating in democratic process, why advance a motion that undermines it? One might be given the impression that this motion is moved with a specific intent: that of impeding civic engagement.

It was stated by one member of council that "sacrifices must be made" by at least **some** people, the suggestion being that no matter what time meetings are held, at least a few residents may be working and may not be able to attend. Extrapolating from that line of reasoning, it's baffling how it's being used to support **any** changes to meeting times at all as it becomes clear that the only ones being served would be the councillors supporting this motion and the only ones making the sacrifice are the majority of residents who are currently able to attend meetings. Are the councillors not in the service of Richmond Hill residents? In Cllr. DiPaola's motion, he notes that the new time is advantageous for council, committee, and staff...but no mention of residents? Who has failed to comprehend their mandate and their full responsibility of governance *for the people?*

The preamble to the **Town of Richmond Hill Council Code of Conduct** states the following:

"The Council of the Town of Richmond Hill is committed to achieving the highest standards of conduct in its actions which is essential to maintaining and ensuring public trust and confidence in the Town's decision making and operations."

The principles of the Code include the statement that “***Members shall serve and be seen to serve their constituents in a conscientious and diligent manner.***” I advance the argument, therefore, that entire motion, of which not a single statement mentions the best interest of residents, runs in direct conflict with the best interests of the constituents and should be treated as such.

I also find it ironic that several councillors selectively use policies and protocols from neighbouring communities as comparators only when it suits their narrative in the moment. Where was the comparison to Vaughan and Markham’s position when they took away our voice to speak as a community about opening up development on the Greenbelt and Oak Ridges Moraine?

I offer this correspondence as a statement of my unreserved opposition to changing the current scheduled times for Committee of the Whole (4:30pm) and Council (7:30pm) meetings as it would produce an obstruction to civic engagement in its most basic form – the ability to voice, in person, a resident’s opinion about how their community is being governed. We already offer both afternoon and evening meeting times. There is no need to alter these.

I encourage all members of council who were prepared to support this change to reconsider their position and vote to continue with the current schedule of council and COW meetings.

Sincerely,

Adriana Pisano Beaumont
62 Wicker Drive