

FONVCA

Minutes July 18, 2002

Attendees:

Maureen Bragg (chair)	Save Lynn Canyon Park
Corrie Kost	Edgemont C. A.
Tom Hodson	Panorama Drive R.A..
Cathy Adams	Lion's Gate N. A.
Val Moller	Lion's Gate N. A.
Eric Andersen (notes)	Blueridge C. A.
Hugh Murray	Lower Capilano R. A..
John Miller	Lower Capilano R. A.
Dan Ellis	Lynn Valley C. A.
Al Price	Pemberton Heights C. A.

1. ORDER/CONTENT OF AGENDA

Additions:

- 3.4 Raising awareness of upcoming election
- 3.5 Lower Capilano Community Center tender

2. ADOPTION OF MINUTES OF JUNE 20, 2002

Moved by John Miller and seconded by Tom Hodson - the minutes were carried unanimously.

3. OLD BUSINESS

3.1 Budget Review Process - a meeting was held on June 27 in which the focus was trying to get a format established and how to improve the budget process. The intent was not to focus on individual budget issues, but strictly on the budget format. What constitutes a legitimate lease is it to be resolved by a full Council by October 2002. Members of Council attending the meeting on June 27 were Don Bell, Doug Mackay-Dunn, Bill Denault and Heather Dunsford (till 7.15 only). Speakers from the public were: Corrie Kost, David Dunbar (a CGA), Hugh Creighton (of the Citizens' Budget Advisory Committee), and Allan Orr.

3.2 FONVCA's letters requesting a Community Charter Symposium were sent out to the various North Shore municipalities, but no responses have been received thus far.

3.3 FONVCA's letter was sent to Council regarding the Seymour Local Plan.

It was noted that no such discussion was held by any previous Council other than for the Maplewood Local Plan.

3.4 The role of FONVCA at the upcoming election was discussed. The importance of raising

the awareness was stressed. FONVCA's role has been and continues to be - the sharing of information among its members.

It was suggested that FONVCA would need money to raise its awareness and that each association would be requested to respond. The possibility of a free ad in the 'District Dialogue' is another venue for raising FONVCA's profile – for example:

Become a player

Wanting to play a larger role in your community, but unsure of how you can contribute? You may want to start by contacting the Federation of North Vancouver Community Associations (FONVCA). Formed in 1993, FONVCA is an umbrella organization that represents community associations throughout the District. It encourages residents to become involved in their local community association and provides a forum so that member associations can discuss common concerns. By sharing information and experiences, FONVCA gives strength to each community association, and gives others a benchmark to follow.

Consider FONVCA your one-stop source for information on your local community association!

To find out more about the Federation, or about the community association in your area, call Brian Platts at 604-985-5104, e-mail fonvca@fonvca.org, or visit the web site at www.fonvca.org.

The Panorama Ratepayers' Association wanted to know what the money for FONVCA would be spent on. Examples given included an upgrade of our website, and ads encouraging enrolment in local community associations.

It was agreed that increased public involvement would be a good thing, but it was felt by some that there is a danger, should FONVCA be perceived as being political. In the past FONVCA has asked and posted questions put to the candidates (who have always responded). A discussion circled around how political FONVCA is/has become. A suggestion was also made for a published article about FONVCA instead of just newspaper ads. All agreed that we want to maintain our usefulness. Regarding the FONVCA questions it was decided to start with the 20 questions from the 1999 elections. The (proposed 10) questions are to be prepared for our next (August) FONVCA meeting. Any proposed questions should go to Corrie Kost before the next meeting (**but be presented without the senders' names**).

The question regarding the FONVCA questions should be sent to the executive, and if time allowed, the members of the various community associations in order to get feed-back.

The deadline for the publication of the responses to the FONVCA questions is the first all-candidates meeting.

It was announced that the Blueridge Community Association and the Seymour Community Association will jointly host an all-candidates meeting on Wednesday, November 6 at 7 PM, i.e. 10 days prior to the municipal election.

3.5 Lower Capilano Community Center

It was questioned how staff are dealing with contracts. It was pointed out that some staff had allegedly thrown all notes out about this Community Center, and the point was also raised about how staff can be reporting on itself. Procedures ought to be well set up for the selection of contracts for community projects - including short-lists.

The discussion ended on a down note regarding whether the Lower Capilano Community Center will ever be built.

4. CORRESPONDENCE ISSUES

4.1 Business arising from extensive email sent to FONVCA

- As usual much correspondence has been received to our web site. Among the issues discussed was the debate about the voting on the 'Berlin Wall' at the GVWD level.

5. NEW BUSINESS

5.1 Encroachment Bylaw 7272-After having spent two years and solicited lots of public input before preparing the new bylaw on encroachments it was decided by Council that this was a 'hardship' for the parties affected and, consequently, there would be no changes to the existing bylaw.

5.2 PRO & other "PARK" designations bylaw discussion - All urban parks will now go into one of the four categories. Due to some discrepancy with some parks (and its use) the public hearing was adjourned till September 19.

Generally it was felt that the parks proposal looks good, but no proper advertising, clearly distinguishing between the various designations, had been done prior to the public hearing in July.

An interesting comparison was made by Corrie Kost (attached below) showing the LGA regulations for (un)dedication of parks versus the proposed draft Community Charter. This led to a

discussion on the future vulnerability of parkland under this new Charter.

A unanimously adopted **motion** was made that a letter be sent to Minister Ted Nebbeling - with copy to Council - stating that **park undedication should be made as stringent under the Community Charter as it presently is covered under the LGA and that the 5% of registered voter requirement for counter-petitions be retained.**

5.3 Greater Vancouver Sustainable Region Initiative. During a recent presentation to Council Johnny Carline, the CEO of the GVRD, stressed the importance of community input for the above initiative.

The intended GVRD process sees the community associations possibly bypass Council and provide their input straight to the GVRD (especially if council does not solicit such input).

Consideration was given to arranging a townhall meeting about the above GVSR Initiative for all interested residents with Johnny Carline - possibly in connection with the upcoming Seymour and Maplewood Local Plans.

6. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

- a meeting/rally will be held on 07/27 regarding the skateboard in the North Vancouver City.
- a case about billboards Ontario was summarized www.ontariocourts.on.ca/decisions/2002/june/vannC36773.pdf

7. CHAIR & DATE OF NEXT MEETING

**Chair: Dan Ellis, Lynn Valley
Community Association
Tel: 604-985-7880**

DATE/PLACE:

**7:00PM Thursday August 15th 2002
District Hall**

**Comparison of Park Protection / Counter Petition process
provided by the current (Local Government Act) legislation
and the proposed Draft Community Charter
(prepared by Corrie Kost)**

	LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT	DRAFT COMMUNITY CHARTER
PARK DEDICATION	Majority of Council + Referendum (#303)	2/3 of Council – no referendum required (ie. none allowed, opinions allowed)
PARK UNDEDICATION	Majority of Council + Referendum (implied by #303)	Majority of Council + (Referendum(#30-3) OR Counter-Petition Process #71-73)
COUNTER- PETITION %	5%	10%
COUNTER- PETITION PERIOD	30 DAYS (#172)	30 DAYS
PARK RESERVATION	Majority of Council	Same as for Dedication
PARK UN- RESERVATION	2/3 of Council + Counter-Petition Process #302	Same as for Undedication

Note: The above “interpretation” is the opinion of the author who feels it is in line with what a reasonably knowledgeable person would conclude about the current and proposed acts. The suggested improvements to the Community Charter which would redress the weakening of park protection are:

- a) Require that Park undedications have support of 2/3 of Council and MUST go through a referendum process – not just approval by the electorate - which allows for a counter-petition process.
- b) That the current counter-petition threshold of 5% be maintained. The 5% is supported by the UBCM.