

March 18/2013

Your Worship & Members of Council,

Re: Agenda item 8.1 Development Cost Charges (DCC's) – Amending Bylaw

I come before you tonight to express my concerns about the proposed Development Cost Charge (DCC) bylaw. Development cost charges are meant to ensure that new development (growth) pays its own way and is **not** subsidized by our existing residents. The new Official Community Plan was largely based on this crucial premise.

Years ago the district sold public land to fund capital and operating expenses. Realizing that this practice was unsustainable – that sooner or later you run out of public land to sell – councils since the 1990's stopped this unsustainable practice.

Upon reviewing the staff report and recommendations relating to this bylaw it became abundantly clear the DNV would be provisioning the park space for new growth through an unsustainable practice of cannibalizing the existing surplus public park space. That is, new growth would not pay for the additional park space it would require. Instead, new growth **would** be subsidized by our existing residents. It is noteworthy that this new growth will be largely housed in facilities that will have little green space of their own. **Parks charges for a typical apartment are proposed to be slashed, despite land values having tripled.** The 1998 rates of \$4,090/unit are to be reduced to \$1,325, the lowest in the lower mainland.

Based on my estimates, for the planned new growth of 20,000 residents in the next 20 years, this would amount to an approximate subsidy of \$500,000,000. This is not what our residents bargained for when they approved the new Official Community Plan. A plan, by the way, which I personally supported since it intelligently concentrated up to 90% of this growth into the designated town centres. Now I find that in order to pay for the infrastructure (park space being normally the most costly component) our residents would subsidize this growth to the tune of about half a billion dollars. To me this is not acceptable – as I am sure it would not be by many of our residents.

I thus urge council to sent this proposal back to a public forum for further discussion by the community – especially, since as noted in the staff report – only 9 residents from the public were involved with this report.

Yours truly,

Corrie Kost, 2851 Colwood Dr., North Vancouver, BC