



## THURSDAY March 15/2001

**Place:** DNV Hall 355 W. Queens Rd V7N 2K6

**Time:** 7:00-9:00pm

**Chair:** Eric Andersen - Blueridge Community Assoc.  
Tel: 929-6849

### 1) Order/content of Agenda

2) Adoption of Minutes of Jan 18/2001  
(attachment #1)

### 3) Old Business

3.1 "Smart Growth" presentation for Mar15 - Eric

3.2 Eldon Park Tree Management Plan. Information meeting was held at District Hall on Jan 25th - Kitty Castle to report

3.3 Council Workshop 4pm-9pm Feb 1 - Report on Council workshop held at Holiday Inn. See also <http://www.fonvca.org/agendas/mar2001/feb28fax.pdf> for COMMENTS ON STRATEGIC DIRECTIONS of Council by March 30/2001

3.4 Tourism Workshop - 7pm-10pm Feb 7 - District Hall

3.5 For those with a leaning to the legal side- Whistler battles home "rentals" - see BC Supreme Court Docket: A992588 or URL <http://www.courts.gov.bc.ca/jdb%2Dtxt/sc/01/01/2001bcsc0100.htm>

3.6 Comments on Community Planning Workshop

3.7 On meeting (non)notifications - Dave Sadler - see [http://www.fonvca.org/recent-letters/Agnes\\_Hilsen\\_20feb2001.pdf](http://www.fonvca.org/recent-letters/Agnes_Hilsen_20feb2001.pdf)

### 4) Correspondence Issues

4.1 Councillor Crist letter of Feb 19 - on barking dogs - see

[http://www.fonvca.org/recent-letters/Ernie\\_Crist\\_19feb2001.pdf](http://www.fonvca.org/recent-letters/Ernie_Crist_19feb2001.pdf)

4.2 Email form Angela Trudeau on "Big Box" - see [http://www.fonvca.org/recent-letters/Angela\\_Trudeau\\_11mar2001.pdf](http://www.fonvca.org/recent-letters/Angela_Trudeau_11mar2001.pdf)

### New Business

#### 5) Council and other District issues.

5.1 Violation of Conflict of Interest Guidelines - Cathy Adams

5.2 Big Box "approved" - Read the Dec/2000 Issue of Scientific American "The Science of Smart Growth" to see how dumb this was! - Corrie Kost

5.3 Staff report recommends "no links" to Community Associations - See staff report at <http://www.dnv.org/council/reports/215381.pdf> and Letter to council/cc-fonvca by Corrie Kost at [http://www.fonvca.org/recent-letters/Corrie\\_Kost\\_10mar2001.pdf](http://www.fonvca.org/recent-letters/Corrie_Kost_10mar2001.pdf) and additional letter to fonvca only at [http://www.fonvca.org/recent-letters/Corrie\\_Kost\\_11mar2001.pdf](http://www.fonvca.org/recent-letters/Corrie_Kost_11mar2001.pdf)

5.4 The "REAL" tax increase - see web location [http://www.fonvca.org/recent-letters/Corrie\\_Kost\\_4mar2001.html](http://www.fonvca.org/recent-letters/Corrie_Kost_4mar2001.html)

5.5 The Budget (non)Process - see input at: [http://www.fonvca.org/budget2001/John\\_Hunter\\_1mar01.htm](http://www.fonvca.org/budget2001/John_Hunter_1mar01.htm) [http://www.fonvca.org/budget2001/Corrie\\_Kost\\_4mar01.html](http://www.fonvca.org/budget2001/Corrie_Kost_4mar01.html)

A report will be given of the Mar 7th Budget meeting.

5.6 Is council charging fairly for encroachments? - see web location [http://www.fonvca.org/recent-letters/Corrie\\_Kost\\_11mar2001b.pdf](http://www.fonvca.org/recent-letters/Corrie_Kost_11mar2001b.pdf)

5.7 TPAC requests input on dangerous pedestrian and cyclist locations - see web location <http://www.fonvca.org/agendas/mar2001/tpac-mar4.pdf>

5.8 Cates Park (Whey-ah-Wichen) Agreement - where was public process? - Dave Sadler

### 6) Any Other Business

6.4 - For those with a leaning to the legal side: The Code of Ethics for Local Government Management Association of BC see web address: <http://www.lgma.ca/codeethics.htm>

### 7) Chairperson & Date of next meeting. April 19/2001

#### Attachments

- FONVCA minutes of Feb 15/2001

#### Referenced Material

- <http://www.courts.gov.bc.ca/jdb%2Dtxt/sc/01/01/2001bcsc0100.htm>
- [http://www.fonvca.org/recent-letters/Agnes\\_Hilsen\\_20feb2001.pdf](http://www.fonvca.org/recent-letters/Agnes_Hilsen_20feb2001.pdf)
- [http://www.fonvca.org/recent-letters/Ernie\\_Crist\\_19feb2001.pdf](http://www.fonvca.org/recent-letters/Ernie_Crist_19feb2001.pdf)
- [http://www.fonvca.org/recent-letters/Angela\\_Trudeau\\_11mar2001.pdf](http://www.fonvca.org/recent-letters/Angela_Trudeau_11mar2001.pdf)
- <http://www.dnv.org/council/reports/215381.pdf>
- [http://www.fonvca.org/recent-letters/Corrie\\_Kost\\_10mar2001.pdf](http://www.fonvca.org/recent-letters/Corrie_Kost_10mar2001.pdf)
- [http://www.fonvca.org/recent-letters/Corrie\\_Kost\\_11mar2001.pdf](http://www.fonvca.org/recent-letters/Corrie_Kost_11mar2001.pdf)
- [http://www.fonvca.org/recent-letters/Corrie\\_Kost\\_4mar2001.html](http://www.fonvca.org/recent-letters/Corrie_Kost_4mar2001.html)
- [http://www.fonvca.org/budget2001/John\\_Hunter\\_1mar01.htm](http://www.fonvca.org/budget2001/John_Hunter_1mar01.htm)
- [http://www.fonvca.org/budget2001/Corrie\\_Kost\\_4mar01.html](http://www.fonvca.org/budget2001/Corrie_Kost_4mar01.html)
- [http://www.fonvca.org/recent-letters/Corrie\\_Kost\\_11mar2001b.pdf](http://www.fonvca.org/recent-letters/Corrie_Kost_11mar2001b.pdf)
- <http://www.fonvca.org/agendas/mar2001/tpac-mar4.pdf>
- <http://www.lgma.ca/codeethics.htm>

#### OUTSTANDING FUTURE FONVCA ITEMS

- Status of petition list appearing in library copy of council package - Dave Sadler
- Sub-committee - models for community involvement in municipal election
- A process to follow outstanding issues of Council, for example, where is the "Joint Use Agreement", "Sign Bylaw", and "Cat Regulation Bylaw", to name a few.

# FONVCA MINUTES

## February 15/2001

### Attendees:

Maureen Bragg(Chair)	Save Lynn Canyon Park
Eric Andersen	Blueridge Comm. Assn.
Corrie Kost	Edgemont Comm. Assn.
Cathy Adams	Lions Gate Neigh. Assn.
Dave Sadler	Seymour Comm. Assn.
Hugh Murray	Lower Capilano Res. Assn.
John Miller	Lower Capilano Comm. Res. Assn.
David Knee	Norgate Park Comm. Assn.
Tom Hodson	Panorama Ratepayers Assn.
George Thorpe	Panorama Ratepayers Assn.
Brian Platts	Edgemont Comm. assn.
Margaret Fraser	Lynn Valley Comm. Assn.
John Hunter	Roche Point Comm. Assn.
Bruce Ward	Sunset Gardens Comm. Assn.
Dan Ellis	Lynn Valley Comm. Assn.
Bill Tracey	Seymour Comm. Assn.
Al Price	Pemberton Heights Comm. Assn.
Alf Cockle	Blueridge Comm. Assn.
Diana Belhouse	Delbrook Comm. Assn.

### 1. Order/Contents of Agenda

The meeting was called to order by Chair Maureen Bragg. 30 minutes to be devoted to regular agenda

**2. Adoption of Minutes of Jan 18/01** - moved by Bill Tracy, seconded by Hugh Murray - carried unan.

### 3. Old Business

**3.1 Smart Growth** -Eric Andersen has re-arranged the presentation by "Smart Growth" to the March 15th FONVCA meeting.

**3.2 Petition lists** - deferred for Dave Sadler to bring to a future meeting

**3.3 Monitoring of APC and ADP** - Bruce Ward gave report (attach-8.pdf of feb2001) on behalf of Kitty. There are 24 committees noted on the District web site, including members names and meeting information and a brief agenda. They can be found in other locations too, such as the Capilano Library.

### 3.4 FONVCA email forwarding:

Suggestion that a warning be put on the FONVCA web site that if you do not want your correspondence posted there, you should explicitly say so. Brian will continue to filter what is appropriate. Please inform Brian if you want everything forwarded to you personally and immediately. Please send your request to [fonvca@fonvca.org](mailto:fonvca@fonvca.org).

### 4) Correspondence

**4.1** Councillor Crist's letter of January 22,2001 replying to Mr. John Garratt's letter of December 7th 2000 - copies of both were circulated.

**4.2** Email from Dave Sadler- no discussion.

**4.3 North Shore Employment Programs** -Hugh Murray will report at next meeting on this Feb 15th meeting held at Parkgate. It was noted that not all Community Associations were listed on Feb 15/2001 Invitee List

**4.4 FONVCA letter to Tim Renshaw**- attach-3.pdf of feb2001 -no discussion

**4.5 FONVCA letter to Council**- attach-4.pdf of feb2001 -no discussion

**4.6 Draft letter to Council re-joint chairing of public information meetings.** -attach-5.pdf of feb2001 -Members to take a look at this letter and give feedback to Brian. Final version to be approved at Mar 15th meeting.

**4.7 Secret meetings** - attach-6.pdf of feb2001. Dave Sadler will give report when he gets a response.

**4.8 Email from Dave Sadler** - attach-7.pdf of feb2001 - no discussion

### 5. New Business

As the meeting was to be given over to the Planning Department Review at 7.30.p.m., the Chair directed the meeting to **Any Other Business** at this point.

**a. Financial Plan** - concerns was again expressed this year over the process. Last year's comparison is not included in spite of requests that it would be. The recommendations for the Financial Advisory Committee from June 30th were not included as well - "there was no time"! was the reason given by staff.

**b. Clarification on status of Roche Point C.A.**- ie. has it separated from Seymour C.A.?. Dave and Bill to discuss this. Question - how does a new C.A. get on the web site - what are the requirements? - reply: FONVCA does not enforce criteria - everyone can attend and intimate that they are representing a C.A. To date this has not been a problem.

**c. The District uses a document management system** for all documents - it does not affect the order in which they are presented to Council.

## Community Planning Phase II Workshop - Review of the Process

At this point, the meeting was given over to the Planning Department and representatives from Price Waterhouse Coopers.

PWC is in the second phase of their review, and tonight are seeking input from FONVCA on

- i) Pre-application stage
- ii) application review stage
- iii) approval process
- iv) post approval stage.

Irwin Torry introduced Bruce Chung and David James from PWC. Bruce indicated that they wanted to hear from us and return with input from all levels of discussion. Dave James gave a brief overview of the present process. Those present were invited to comment on needs or wishes of each area/neighbourhood.

Many examples were given by those at the table, and points were raised and discussed and put on the "board". General discussion ensued.

After completing the official part of the evening's format, informal discussion took place without the presence of District staff.

AOB and any other remaining agenda items will be dealt with at March 15th meeting.

**Date of next meeting - March 15th 2001**

**Chair: Eric Andersen**

**Subject: RE:Meeting of the Value Analysis Task Force**

**Date:** Tue, 20 Feb 2001 09:20:42 -0800

**From:** Agnes Hilsen <ahilsen@district.north-van.bc.ca>

**To:** "Dave Sadler" <davesadler@telus.net>

**CC:** FONVCA <fonvca.org@fonvca.org>, Tom Young <hangers@canadawired.com>, Brent Mayall <bmayall@direct.ca>, Councillor Bill Denault <bdenault@dnv.org>, Councillor Doug MacKay-Dunn <macdunn@dnv.org>, Councillor Janice Harris <jharris@dnv.org>, Councilor Ernie Crist <ernie\_crist@dnv.org>, Councilor Heather Dunsford <heather\_dunsford@dnv.org>, Councilor Lisa Muri DNV <lisa\_muri@dnv.org>, Mayor DON BELL <BellD@dnv.org>, Al Price <alprice@quik.com>, Angela Trudeau <angela@techtrain.bc.ca>, Bill Tracey <bill\_tracey@telus.net>, Brian Platts <brian\_platts@telus.net>, Cathy Adams <rmadams@wimsey.com>, Corrie Kost <kost@triumf.ca>, Dan Ellis <dellis@bcgas.com>, David Knee <dknee@bcgas.com>, Eric Andersen <eandersen@seatradeshshipping.bc.ca>, Francois Du Preez <richprop@home.com>, Geoff Thorpe <mtgg@telus.net>, Hugh Murray <Hugh\_murray@telus.net>, Ian Abercrombie <aber@telus.net>, Jean Thompson <hodgson.jean&bruce@telus.net>, John Miller <john\_miller@ultranet.ca>, Kitty Castle <mcastle@istar.ca>, Margaret Fraser <weemalkies@telus.net>, Ray Burns <rburns@direct.ca>, Timothy Renshaw <trenshaw@direct.ca>, northshore news <editor@nsnews.com>, Outlook <newsroom@northshoreoutlook.com>, Gord Howie <gord\_howie@district.north-van.bc.ca>, Shana Burrows <BurrowsS@district.north-van.bc.ca>

Dear Mr. Sadler:

You are correct in your observation that meetings of advisory committee or other advisory bodies established by council are open to the public as provided for in the Local Government Act. As I outlined to you in my email of last week, due to a miscommunication between the Task Force and District staff, the notice of the meeting unfortunately did not get posted on our website. There was certainly no intent to keep the public from attending the meeting.

We appreciate your comments regarding the notices on our web as well as the binder which is kept the front counter. Every effort is made to keep this information completely up to date - should you or Ms Adams notice any other problems, please let us know.

The Local Government Act specifies that all meetings must be open to the public. It also specifies that council must establish procedures for conducting council meetings, including requirements for giving notice ("council meetings" would include regular or special council meetings as well as meetings of select and standing committees of council or any other committee which is composed solely of council members).

There are no specific notification requirements for advisory body meetings. However, in keeping with the spirit of the intent of the Local Government Act for more open government, the notices are posted at least 72 hours before the meeting. In fact, it is our practice to post the notices for all advisory body meetings the same day the agenda is mailed to advisory committee members. This would normally occur at least one week before the meeting.

We are currently working with our Webmaster on improvements to our advisory committee section which will include a yearly schedule of notices for advisory committee meetings. Since these meetings are generally held on a

regular monthly schedule, it is hoped that this will encourage the public to attend as observers. That section will also include other information on attending advisory committee meetings similar to the "Coming to Council" sheet which is available at our Council meetings.

I am not aware of the meeting which Mr. Masterton held regarding Wye Street & the Maplewood Bird Sanctuary. Accordingly, I have forwarded your query to him for his direct response. I would advise that all District staff are guided by the policies, principles and practices for public involvement which are outlined in the "Public Involvement Framework" which was adopted by Council in 1996. This manual is intended to be used as a tool for staff to design effective public involvement processes to engage citizens, community groups and organizations in the decision making processes of the District.

I trust that this clarifies your concerns.

Yours truly,

Agnes Hilsen

-----Original Message-----

From: Dave Sadler [<mailto:davesadler@telus.net>]

Sent: Sunday, February 11, 2001 12:08 AM

To: Agnes Hilsen

Cc: FONVCA; Tom Young; Brent Mayall; Councillor Bill Denault; Councillor Doug MacKay-Dunn; Councillor Janice Harris; Councilor Ernie Crist; Councilor Heather Dunsford; Councilor Lisa Muri DNV; Mayor DON BELL; Al Price; Angela Trudeau; Bill Tracey; Brian Platts; Cathy Adams; Corrie Kost; Dan Ellis; David Knee; Eric Andersen; Francois Du Preez; Geoff Thorpe; Hugh Murray; Ian Abercrombie; Jean Thompson; John Miller; Kitty Castle; Margaret Fraser; Ray Burns; Timothy Renshaw; northshore news; Outlook

Subject: Secret Meeting of the Value Analysis Task Force

Dear Agnes Hilsen:

As you are well aware the Local Government Act allows the public to attend any Committee or task force meeting sponsored by the District. Therefore I question the ethics & legality of the 'secret' meeting between the Value Analysis Task Force & the Mayor on Tuesday February 6. Not only was this meeting not posted, a direct inquiry regarding the scheduling of the meeting by me was not replied to until after the fact. As Mr. Bell was aware of my attending every meeting of this body, I believe this was a shabby attempt to avoid public scrutiny.

On February 7, I also brought to your attention the fact that the Quality Assurance Committee meeting of February 9 was incorrectly posted as being held on February 16. I would also question the usefulness of the 'committee agenda' binder kept at reception as it seems to be very 'hit & miss' as to its contents. Mrs. Cathy Adams has also conveyed her concerns to me over the untimely updating & incompleteness of this binder.

Although I believe the QAC meeting was a careless oversight, I regard the transgression surrounding the Mayor's 'secret' meeting as a direct violation of the District's Code of Ethics & makes a mockery of the District's Model of Excellence.

In this regard, are there provisions in the Local Government Act that require public committees to post an announcement prior to holding a meeting & if so, how much advance notice is required?

This current state of affairs must be corrected. Therefore I suggest that if it is not already District policy, that any publicly sponsored District meeting can not take place unless properly posted at least 72 hours in advance. This should include all meetings, special interest or otherwise, unless specifically authorized under the Local Government Act.

By rights, the agenda should be posted at the same time.

Other examples: last week Mr. Masterton held a select meeting concerning the opening of Wye Street & the Maplewood Bird Sanctuary. Certain members of the Parks Committee were interested in this issue but were never informed nor was the general public. Last fall, the District held a meeting on repairing, removing or enlarging the Woodland's Dock. Although this was a District wide issue, only the residents of Woodlands were notified.

I hope you will give this matter high priority, as it concurs with what was discussed & endorsed at the recent workshop which District Council & staff attended at the Holiday Inn.

Sincerely,

Dave Sadler



**The Corporation of  
The District of North Vancouver**

355 West Queens Road  
North Vancouver  
British Columbia  
V7N 2K6

District of North Vancouver

F  
I  
L  
A

Councillor

Telephone 604 987 7131

Fax 984 9637

February 19, 2001  
File No.: 4000-01/04  
RCA# 03167

By e-mail: [dplatt@sprint.ca](mailto:dplatt@sprint.ca)

Mrs. Darilyn Platt  
2869 Wembley Place  
North Vancouver, B.C. V7J 3C1

**Subject: Your letter dated January 26, 2001**  
**Re: Barking Dog**

This is further to your letter of January 26, 2001 and our recent telephone conversation regarding a barking dog.

I understand that although your letter was written on January 26, 2001, no action has been taken by staff to alleviate this situation.

I further understand that one of our Bylaw Officers informed you and your neighbours that if the owners of the dog did not heed the warning, you would have to be prepared to go to court as a witness. This is not correct. Both District staff and the RCMP have been equipped with portable noise guns which enable them to go on your property and take noise measurements at the time when your neighbour's dog barks incessantly more or less and for no apparent reason.

This is simply a matter of our staff doing their job rather than giving you the run-around and using excuses. The bottom line is that the District **CAN** address this matter without you going to Court. If the noise caused by the barking dog is in excess of the allowable decibel limit, District staff can hand out a warning ticket and a fine if no improvement is made.



Y:\MO\MO\2001\0126\001  
Subject: Your letter dated January 26, 2001

Re: Barking Dog

February 19, 2001

Page 2

I will pass on a copy of this letter to Richard Zerr, Director in charge of Bylaws. I will also provide copies to the RCMP and to the Customer Service/Quality Assurance Committee of the District for information.

I trust that this issue will be resolved.

Yours truly,



Councillor Ernie Crist

EC/mfv

cc: Mayor and Council  
Gord Howie, Municipal Manager  
Richard Zerr, Director of Planning, Building & Environment Services Div.  
Supt. Jamie Graham, Officer in Charge - North Vancouver RCMP  
DNV Directors Team  
Ian De Groot, Chair - Customer Service/Quality Assurance Committee  
FONVCA

P.S. "The views presented in this correspondence are my own, and do not necessarily represent the views of Council."



2869 Wembley Place  
North Vancouver  
V7J3C1

January 26<sup>th</sup>, 2001

Mayor and Council  
District of North Vancouver

Ack. Sent:	02/07/01 ✓
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Copies to M&C	02/07/01 ✓
<input type="checkbox"/> Staff to Report	
<input type="checkbox"/> Future Agenda Item	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Staff to Handle & Advise	RAZ ✓
Response Dated:	
<input type="checkbox"/> For Council/Staff Consideration	
File Number:	4000-01/04
Ownership:	LLN
Order Number:	03167 ✓

Dear Mayor and Council:

I am writing to inform you that the present Noise Bylaw re barking dogs left alone outside is not effective. I am interested in your opinion and intention as to how to alleviate this growing problem.

Our neighbors own a LOUD part wolf/malmutte who they leave outside all day and evenings. The dog is quiet when they are home, unfortunately there are long periods of time when they are not around, ie during the day when they go to work, evenings when they go out and when they go away on holidays. The dog knows when their car leaves and barks for attention with every noise, at every squirrel, and howls with every siren within miles.

This has gone on for four years, during which, we and other neighbors, have tried the following:

- Informing the neighbors that there was a problem and asking them to take action. More times than I can count.
- Reporting the problem to the Bylaws Officer who on two or three occasions put the warning in the mailbox. I am reasonably sure personal contact was never made.
- Called the SPCA on more than one occasion to see if they could take action.
- Called the Bylaws Officer several times for advice.
- Had a conference with the neighbors begging them to do something.

The Bylaws Officer informed other neighbors and us that if the owners didn't heed the warning we must document when the dog barks, be prepared to witness, and the District will take the owners to court. This is not an option for us and most neighbors because we are not prepared to make enemies of people living this close who could make our lives even more miserable. This is why the bylaw is without teeth.

We know this is a growing problem in the District, as we have often noticed barking dogs left alone on decks and in yards. It has also been a complaint frequently voiced by other residents. There has been quite a change in North Vancouver over the past 25 years. Now, in neighborhoods, parks, and out walking, dogs, and their owners seem to have the most rights and privileges. I have been a dog owner for a good part of my life and understand the responsibility it requires.

The neighbors seem resolute in their opinion that leaving the dog outdoors is their perfect right.

I would like to know if you are prepared to get tough and stop the noise nuisance of barking dogs being left outside alone to disturb the community. Having our home and sleep disturbed to this extent is not something one should have to tolerate. It certainly ruins the quality of life. Thank you for giving this problem your attention. I would appreciate an answer.

Sincerely

Darilyn Platt 985-9488  
dplatt@sprint.ca

**Subject: Re: BIG BOX STORE**

**Date:** Sun, 11 Mar 2001 09:27:56 -0800

**From:** Angela Trudeau <a.trudeau@canada.com>

**To:** Dave Sadler <davesadler@telus.net>, Councilor Heather Dunsford <heather\_dunsford@dnv.org>

**CC:** Judi Ainsworth <jains@cofcnorthvan.org>, Councillor Bill Denault <bdenault@dnv.org>, Councillor Doug MacKay-Dunn <macdunn@dnv.org>, Councillor Janice Harris <jharris@dnv.org>, Councilor Ernie Crist <ernie\_crist@dnv.org>, Councilor Lisa Muri DNV <lisa\_muri@dnv.org>, Mayor DON BELL <BellD@dnv.org>, Al Price <alprice@quik.com>, Bill Tracey <bill\_tracey@telus.net>, Brent Mayall <bmayall@direct.ca>, Brian Platts <brian\_platts@telus.net>, Cathy Adams <rmadams@wimsey.com>, Corrie Kost <kost@triumf.ca>, Dan Ellis <dellis@bcgas.com>, David Knee <dknee@bcgas.com>, Eric Andersen <eandersen@seatradeshipping.bc.ca>, FONVCA <fonvca@fonvca.org>, Francois Du Preez <richprop@home.com>, Geoff Thorpe <mtgg@telus.net>, Hugh Murray <Hugh\_murray@telus.net>, Ian Abercrombie <c.aber@home>, Jean Thompson <hodgson.jean&bruce@telus.net>, John Miller <john\_miller@ultranet.ca>, Kitty Castle <mcastle@istar.ca>, Margaret Fraser <weemalkies@telus.net>, Ray Burns <rburns@direct.ca>, Tom Young <hangers@canadawired.com>, Annette Martin <annettem@digital-rain.com>, "Renshaw, Tim" <trenshaw@nsnews.com>, northshore news <editor@nsnews.com>, Outlook <newsroom@northshoreoutlook.com>, Richard Zerr <Richard\_zerr@district.north-van.bc.ca>, Gordon Harris <gordonharris@canada.com>

Open comment regarding Mr. Sadler's letter.

I have not been an active participant in local zoning issues for some time and have not heard the specific discussion referred to however, when it comes to broad economic development and land-use issues, I remain interested and have the following comments to add to this discussion.

The competitive position of the developer will be addressed by his proposal but we need to step back and review the big picture - consider the socio-economic interests of the municipality as a whole.

Proposals bringing additional capacity to the North Shore will impact the viability of existing businesses and must include a careful examination of over-all market-share capacity/balance. Otherwise these proposals may only provide for replacement tax revenues – i.e. swapping one new taxpaying retail business for one driven out of business.

In addition, the many economic development studies undertaken by NVD planning department staff and consultants, as well as many OCP committee groups (particularly the comprehensive Harris-Hudema report) together with present and past Councils all agree about the need to diversify our tax base to build broader revenue capabilities for the District and diversified employment opportunities for residents.

Protection of zoned industrial land – every square inch - is pivotal in advancing new economic development opportunities for NVD.

Sincerely  
Angela Trudeau

---

Dear Councillor Dunsford:

During the debate on the Canadian Tire Big Box Store & accompanying fast food restaurants, you repeatedly stated that you supported the project as it was in line with the Lower Lynn Official Community Plan. I do not know where you're receiving your information, but this is simply not true. The OCP in fact recognizes the value of industrial land in the area and specifically asks that it be protected. The community realized that businesses operating on such lands have the potential of providing real jobs at a wage scale much higher than the retail sector.

As you were obviously misled on this fact, I would naturally expect that you would bring this matter back for re-consideration.

Defeating this project would be more in line with the opinion of the Chamber of Commerce and the petition of one hundred & twenty-five businesses in Lower Lynn, as well as the general sentiment of residents

Re: BIG BOX STORE

across the North Shore. I will look forward in you bringing this back to Council ASAP.

Yours truly, Dave Sadler

**COUNCIL AGENDA/INFORMATION**

<input type="checkbox"/> In-Camera	Date: _____	Item # _____
<input type="checkbox"/> Regular	Date: _____	Item # _____
<input type="checkbox"/> Info Package	Date: _____	Item # _____
<input type="checkbox"/> Agenda Addendum	Date: _____	Item # _____

_____ Dept. Manager	_____ Director	_____ Municipal Manager
---------------------------	-------------------	-------------------------------

**The District of North Vancouver  
REPORT TO COUNCIL**

February 21, 2001  
File: 1337-20/02  
Tracking Number: RCA -

**AUTHOR:** Jeanine Bratina  
Communications and Community Relations Officer

**SUBJECT:** District Links to Community Association Web Sites

---

**RECOMMENDATION:**

THAT the District

- 1) not provide links on the District's web site to separate Community Association web sites;
- 2) provide a District-maintained information page for each Community Association, which contains basic information (i.e. association mission statement, geographical area covered, meeting information such as dates, times, locations, agenda items, and association contact information), in order to provide consistency throughout the site.

**REASON FOR REPORT:**

To recommend approval of a policy to respond to requests from Community Associations for the District to establish links to their respective web sites.

**BACKGROUND:**

There are currently 29 Community Associations listed on the District's web page (listed under Community, Associations). Of these, eight Community Associations provide direct e-mail links to association contacts and five have their own information pages, which are maintained by the District. Information contained on these pages is general in nature (association mission statement, geographical area covered, meeting information such as dates, times, locations, agenda items, and association contact information).

**EXISTING POLICY:**

There is currently no policy regarding linking the District web site to Community Association web sites.

**ANALYSIS:**

Until now, there has not been a policy regarding linking the District's web site to Community Association web sites. However, with the growing popularity of the Internet as a communications tool and redevelopment of the District web site under way, there is now the requirement for a policy to be put in place.

The District has received a request to link to a Community Association web page (FONVCA – web address: [www.fonvca.org](http://www.fonvca.org)). There are several concerns that arise when considering a District link to web sites maintained by others. As the responsibility and control for maintaining third party web sites rests with the owners of those sites, we have no assurance that the content is current, accurate and unbiased. This is not to suggest this is the case at present, rather there is a need to establish a policy that would be applied evenly and equitably to all Associations and all requests.

There would be a particular concern in the lead-up to a Municipal Election where personal views could be expressed, or possible bias on one issue or candidate over another.

While the District encourages communication and resident participation in local Community Associations, Council may now wish to consider implementing a policy in order to maintain consistent information flow to the public.

It should be noted that in the near future, other policies will be developed for Council's consideration regarding links to other types of web sites (i.e. community organizations such as Family Services and private organizations such as Grouse Mountain).

**FINANCIAL IMPACTS:**

None.

**LIABILITY/RISK:**

Without a policy in place, the District cannot maintain control over the content of other web sites. This could result in sites containing inaccurate information or content that could be, or perceived to be, of a biased nature. This may be of particular concern in the months leading up to a Municipal election, when the District's goal is to remain unbiased with regards to information dissemination to the public.

**SUBJECT: District Links to Community Association Web Sites**

February 21, 2001

Page 3

---

**OPTIONS:**

1. Approve the provision of links to Community Association web sites; or
2. Do not provide links to Community Association web sites. Instead, provide a District-maintained information page for each Community Association, which contains basic information (i.e. association mission statement, geographical area covered, meeting information such as dates, times, locations, agenda items, and association contact information) in order to maintain consistency throughout the site.

Jeanine Bratina  
Communications and Community Relations Officer

<u>REVIEWED WITH:</u> <input type="checkbox"/> Communications <input type="checkbox"/> Env. Protection <input type="checkbox"/> Human Resources <input type="checkbox"/> Eng. Public Works <input type="checkbox"/> Eng. Admin. <input type="checkbox"/> Eng. Parks	<u>REVIEWED WITH:</u> <input type="checkbox"/> Finance <input type="checkbox"/> Fire Services <input type="checkbox"/> Legislative Services <input type="checkbox"/> Land <input type="checkbox"/> Permits & Licenses <input type="checkbox"/> Planning <input type="checkbox"/> Social Planning	<u>REVIEWED WITH:</u> External Agencies: <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation Commission <input type="checkbox"/> Library Board <input type="checkbox"/> Health Dept. <input type="checkbox"/> RCMP <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____	<u>REVIEWED WITH:</u> Advisory Committees: <input type="checkbox"/> _____ <input type="checkbox"/> _____ <input type="checkbox"/> _____
---	---	--	---

March 10/2001

To: Mayor & Council  
District of North Vancouver

From: Corrie Kost  
2851 Colwood Dr.  
North Vancouver V7R2R3

Re: Agenda item #7 – District Links to Community Association Web Sites

At the behest of FONVCA an email was sent on January 19/2001 requesting a hypertext link be put in the District's web page (as part of the District's current listing of the Federation of North Vancouver Community Associations) to FONVCA's recently launched web site at **fonvca.org**

A reply email was received Feb 2/2001 stating that a review of the policy of putting in links to other web sites would be undertaken with direction from council. A Staff Report to Council has been circulated as part of Agenda item #7 for Monday March 12. It recommends that the District provide no links to any community association web sites. The basis of this is that the content of those sites cannot be controlled.

It would seem that staff's primary concern is one of accountability. Overall I find the report lacks a positive direction to work with the community. For example, Council could set a policy of permitting links on the District's web site to only registered community associations. Meeting the District's registration requirements for a community association should be a sufficient safeguard to allow a link to that organization. I would remind Council that to achieve official status with the District, a community association must agree to the following:

- a) Providing a mandate which includes improving the quality of life of the neighbourhood
- b) A membership that is open to all persons residing in the general geographic area
- c) The Association will register with the District the names and phone numbers of all officers and directors and will update this information when changes occur
- d) There will be regular communication of the activities of the CA with its members
- e) There must be a duly advertised and open AGM
- f) There must be records kept
- g) There must be a process by which residents may bring their concerns to the association

If meeting the above criteria is sufficient for CA's to achieve official status with the District and even receive funds through the Healthy Neighbourhood fund, then surely it qualifies those officially registered organization to have not only their address and phone numbers listed (as they do now) but to have a link to their web sites.

In closing, registered community associations are responsible to their members and therefore strive to maintain ethical standards that exceed even those of the District. In this respect, we look forward to receiving help from our local government, not resistance. **I therefore urge council to deliberate carefully on this matter, and at the very least consult with the community associations before making a final decision on this matter.**

Yours truly,

Corrie Kost

CC: FONVCA

March 11/2001

To: FONVCA Members

From: Corrie Kost

Re: Agenda item #7 – District Links to Community Association Web Sites

At the behest of FONVCA an email was sent on January 19/2001 requesting a hypertext link be put in the existing listing of the Federation of North Vancouver Community Associations to FONVCA's recently launched web site at **fonvca.org**

A reply email was received Feb 2/2001 that a review of the policy of putting in links to other web sites would be undertaken with direction from council. I replied that since a link already existed to the Indian Arm Ratepayers Association (which appears to have been subsequently removed!) that to put a link in for FONVCA would not be unreasonable.

**A Feb 21/2001 report has now been circulated to council as part of Agenda item #7 of Monday March 12. It recommends that the district provide no links to any Community Association web sites.** The basis of this is that the content of those sites cannot be controlled (especially as to accuracy, currency, and bias). This raises a number of concerns:

- There appears to be a lack of understanding by district staff in the fundamental workings of the internet. Virtually every site in the world has links to other sites. The responsibility of a site is limited to its own contents. It has no control over the contents of a site that is being referred to by a link.
- As community associations, responsible to our members, we strive to maintain standards that exceed those of the District. We look forward to help from our local government, not resistance.
- To attempt to control the contents of linked to sites seems dictatorial and stifles the very free speech we so proudly uphold. Would you remove links to our libraries because there are books there with whose contents you disagree, find biased, inaccurate, or out of date?
- It is stated in the report under LIABILITY/RISK that “without a policy in place, the District cannot maintain control over the contents of other web sites”. Again, this shows either a lack of knowledge of how the internet works, or it illustrates a desire to unreasonably control what the community associations wish to accomplish.
- There seems to be a fear that community association web site could participate in a biased fashion during a municipal election. Of course community associations are free to participate just that way in the democratic process – IF they have the explicit mandate of their membership and they follow the rules stipulated in the Local Government Act. Under certain circumstances it may then be warranted for the District to remove the link for an appropriate period proceeding election day.
- Would it not be appropriate for council to discuss this matter with the community associations before making a final decision on this matter?

Overall I find the report lacks a positive direction to work with the community. Meeting the registration requirements of the District allows access to district funds. Such qualifications should be sufficient to allow a courtesy link to that organization, in the same way that one currently lists their phone number and address.

Yours truly,

Corrie Kost



## A "quick" review of the draft financial plan 2001-2005 submitted to FONVCA by Corrie Kost - March 4/2001

Note that the full Draft Financial Plan 2001-2005 is available at District Hall. [Parts](http://www.dnv.org/council/agn-min/ca010214.htm) are on the web site at url <http://www.dnv.org/council/agn-min/ca010214.htm> Page numbers below refer to the Draft Financial Plan 2001-2005. **Municipal Taxes are to increase 4.36% BUT the "real" amount is much higher!**

### PRINCIPLE USED TO DETERMINE THE REAL TAX INCREASE

Money taken from savings constitutes a "hidden" tax increase upon future budgets. It is tantamount to going into debt - sooner or later the difference will need to be made up. If you don't balance the books you are living beyond your means.

Yes REVENUES must equal EXPENDITURES but REVENUES by the District are made of two components: TAXES and use of our SAVINGS Our real TAXES are thus TAXES we pay now **plus the loss of our savings**. For reference we note on page B4 that

**A 1% property tax is equivalent to a budget amount of \$429,570 or about \$18/home**

- a) Transfer capital costs for drainage works from the tax levie to the sewer and drainage user fee adds another \$545,000  
[See "The real drainage fee program" below ] 1.26%
- b) Use of 2000 accumulated surplus(savings) \$250,000 0.58%
- c) Use of accumulated water surplus - resulting in loss of saving of \$1,008,824 (page B2) 2.35%
- d) Use of accumulated sewer surplus - resulting in loss of saving of \$795,256 (page B2) 1.85%
- e) Use of Riverside reserves of \$214,333 (page B2) (slightly inconsistent with \$187,333 on page B10) 0.50%
- f) Use of Heritage funds which will not be repaid (ie. loss of savings in long term) \$2,877,500 (page B2) 6.72%
- g) Loss of Interest payment from Northlands golf course to Heritage fund of \$590,000 (page B10) See note below on legality of this. 1.37%

Real amount now at ----> 18.99%

Now add change in service levels or additional user fees:

- A 11.1% decrease over 2000 in capital expenditures of watermain replacement (Page D20) - \$350,000 0.82%
- Secondary suite user fees -\$250,000 0.58%
- Three can solid waste limit reduces to two cans
- Green waste pickup every alternate week
- Sportsfield user fees
- Increased rec. fees

Real amount now at least ----> 20.39%  
=====

Note: There are improvements in services which have resulted in benefits and/or savings that have not been quantified - eg. use of environmentally friendly liquid magnesium chloride instead of common road salt.

The bottom line : We are still living way beyond our means and/or not managing our affairs properly.

Other inconsistencies/items of note:

Other problems with the financial plan:

1. Solid waste reduction from 3 cans to 2 will save \$2.50 in recycling and Solid waste charges - a very small amount. The cost to acquire even a single tag /year for going over limit would far exceed this extra cost. Since we are well below the targeted 50% reduction in our waste stream, have a blue box, yellow bag, blue bag, and cardboard program this seems punitive. The Schaefer (wheeled carts) are well suited for our needs as well as being easier on our sanitation engineers and should be encouraged. I suggest that in order to do so that as a compromise the limit be set at 2 cans or 1 Schaefer unit. No figures were given for the expected revenue to be generated by the number of \$2 tags/extra-can.
2. The 1999-2010 Sidewalk program, totaled \$1.52million (Dec 1/98 report from Bob West-Sells Doc # 144278v1  
There seems to be NO money this again year for sidewalks!
3. Lack of 2000 figures in many tables, making comparison hard.
4. No lane improvements - service drop ~\$200,000 ie. 0.4%
5. Use of Heritage investment earnings to pay for maintenance (really part of operating budget) as outlined on page A1, column 2, paragraph 3 seems both inconsistent with current policy and the Local Government Act. This is how the District went bankrupt before - selling land to pay for operating.
6. Cancellation of interest charge to Northlands Golf Course (see page A1, column 2, paragraph 1) effectively constitutes use of Heritage Funds for Operating - contrary to Local Government Act
7. Apportionment of Police Costs between District/City  
Page 2-8 of report by CNV (available for City of North Vancouver)
 

	Crime Rate	Case Burden
NVC Population 44,975	122	89
NVD Population 85,995	68	64
NVD Pro-rata gives share of	45%	58%

The actual share paid by DNV is 62% .  
Note that property crimes in 1990 were 3908(city), 5002(district) while  
in 1999 were 3247(city), 3575(district)  
It would appear that District is paying more than a fair share!

8. There is virtually any accounting for the state of the \$26million referendum money. See line items 186-188 on E5 and 205 on E6 and E17.
9. Status of council reserve funds for 2001 is unknown.
10. Healthy Neighbourhood funds (line 74 of page B13).  
Increases request from \$10,000/yr to \$14,000/yr but no information was made available on money spent last year.
11. Why are we not seeing a benefit to the reduction in the Neighbourhood Zoning Program?
12. Concern over process over funding of Lynn Valley Library.  
The 1996 Referendum stated a replacement cost as \$6million.  
Five years later we are now being told that the real cost may be \$15million or more! We are also told that if truth be told when the Referendum was conducted in 1996 the Referendum would in all likelihood not have passed.
13. Subsidy of public/private ice rink facility.  
Icetime rates are the same for the higher quality private rink as they are for the public rink. That is, it seems that the rates for for the lower quality public facilities were raised in order to subsidize the private rink in Seymour.
14. Overall the Financial Plan report is a sham.  
Comparison to previous years are missing. Increases in requested funding are not put into perspective by giving a % change.  
the public rink

### **The real "drainage" fee program!**

In my opinion, drainage fees cannot be justifiably be moved to the flat rate sewer utility fees. This is because the user has no control of the use of this resource. Sewage, water, elctricity, gas - these are all utilities whose use can be controlled by our residents. Drainage use cannot. So why are we billing "drainage" works to our sewer utility bill? Well, because it deduces our "municipal taxes" part of the ledger. This makes it appear that are taxes have only gone up 4.36% but the real motive could well be more sinister:

**to set a precedence to move all future "drainage fees" works to our "sewer utility fee".** This will ensure that those with expensive properties will not have to pay their fair share of the huge upcoming costs to mitigate the risk as outlined in the "Debris Flow Hazards" report of April 1999 by Kerr Wood Leidal Association to the District of North Vancouver. Many millions of \$'s will need to be spent to address, with due diligence these flood risks. The policy of moving all drainage to a flat rate sewer bill will ensure that those who have the most to lose will be subsidized by those who can least afford it - ie. our poor. The equitable way is that those with more to loose (expensive properties) should bear a higher burden.

### **Legality of using interest payment destined for Heritage Fund**

Via a bylaw change council declared a moratorium on repaying the **principal** for the five year period 2000-2004. The interest was also reduced to 5.0% so that interest payments would only amount to \$590,000/year on a principal balance of \$11,800,000. This was already down from the \$711,400 set in 1998. Now it appears Northlands cannot meet this repayment and council has decided to take the \$590,000 to meet its operational cost obligations. I deem this contrary to the Local Government Act which does not allow land sale funds (Heritage Fund) to be used to fund operations. Council could

- Pass a bylaw to reduce the interest payment rate to 0% or
- Add the deferred interest charges to the outstanding principal

Unless council does one of the two above, they appear to be breaking the law.

## **REMARKS TO PUBLIC HEARING ON DNV BUDGET FEB. 24-01**

### **INTRODUCTION:**

- Good day ladies and gentlemen. My name is John Hunter. I am a resident of Roche Point and a council watcher for about 8 or 9 years.

I give this input not only as a concerned resident of DNV, but also as a fellow who for the last 25 years was a senior executive of major Canadian utilities and energy companies, and hence I am very familiar with budget practices, and the analysis and interpretation of budgets. I actually like this stuff!!!!

My analysis relies on the booklet “draft financial plan 2001-2005”. I have talked to two councilors who tell me that, at budget time, “what I have is what they got”. I hope my assessment is wrong, but in any event please don’t shoot me for telling it as I see it.

### **First Let s Look at The Budget Message**

This year, absent action, DNV was looking at a tax increase due to a number of “surprises” in the order of 15-20%. So two choices arise – make some tough decisions and cut programs and trim fat, or play accounting games and take the route of the short-term fix. My analysis says this draft budget took the latter course – “for heaven’s sake don’t take the risk and unpleasantness of tough decisions and cuts, but rather take steps to push off the harsh reality that we are outspending our means and hope things will improve before we get hit again”. I hope Mayor Bell and Council will show the wisdom and leadership to reject this proposal.

### **The Budget Strategy**

- What is the budget strategy and objective? Oddly enough, you have to guess, because unlike any normal business plan, there is not much in this book to describe it. Here is my assessment.

Due to a number of factors, including RCMP costs, provincial downloading, wage settlements, etc., a huge tax increase was in the works. To make this problem disappear, the draft plan raids the Heritage Fund. For example, now we go beyond deferring any capital repayment from the golf course to the Heritage Fund – now we are canceling debt

service repayment of about \$600,000/year, in violation of the spirit if not the letter of the Heritage Fund Policy on page E18 of the draft plan.

But now we have another problem. People have bought into Ernie Crist's point that selling land to pay operating costs is a bankrupt and dead end practice – financially, practically, and morally. So if we are going to raid the Heritage Fund, we better refill it so we can raid it again. Despite the fact that DNV staff's own surveys show that the majority of residents want little or no residential development including the effect of band land developments, and despite the fact that there is very strong opposition to ANY development in Seymour before the east-west traffic issue is fixed, we go back to the old tactic of land sales – that is, more development - to refill the Heritage Fund – you can see that on page E19-20 of the book.

But this year's budget problem needs more than just raiding the Heritage Fund. So now we raid the various reserve funds – the “rainy day” monies that we were previously told before were at prudent levels to cover unexpected emergencies. The plan raids the Riverside reserve, the equipment replacement reserve, the accumulated surplus, the water system reserve, and the sewer reserve. And we are not talking pennies here, but millions. You can see that in page B2 of the book.

It's a **beautiful** plan - as long as you do not mind ignoring the expressed wishes of DNV residents and the promises of Council members and the Mayor at the last election. It is also the ONLY plan, if Council has neither the desire nor the resolve to make tough decisions, and cut programs, as opposed to the usual practice of nibbling at the edges of programs.

What is the plan if, as this year, we get more negative budget surprises next year or the year after? Well, that is in the book too, on page E2, an inventory of district land that could be sold. The hint is “don't worry Council, be happy, we can always sell land so you do not have to stop spending – you can still make everybody happy!” This only leaves Council the minor problem of rationalizing that plan with the fact that this new Council was elected to do the opposite!

In summary, my analysis indicates this is a plan that can only be approved if Council is prepared to ignore the expressed wishes of residents of DNV and ignore the future. It should not be called a financial plan, but rather a “bread and circuses” plan. It is a plan that will result in continued raiding of the land bank for operating costs, plundering of Heritage Fund principal instead of interest, more traffic congestion, more forests cut, more heavy development – everything this Council was elected NOT to do.

Only a Council that has no stomach to make tough decisions will approve it. Mayor Bell, let's see some leadership here. Prove the North Shore News was wrong when they said you had no stomach for controversy. We need controversy here.

## **Now Let s Spend a Few Minutes on the Budget Process and Package**

I would add that I have done a comparison of the DNV draft financial plan package vs. a typical business budget submission and compared it to the equivalent City of North Vancouver package. Remember DNV is a corporation, with expenses just short of \$100MM. A corporation of this size should have a professional, thorough business and financial plan to allow businesslike behavior and decisions.

In my view, we don't. The DNV package is, in my opinion, a package that even a skilled budget reader can do little with. It has few meaningful breakdowns. It does not even show manpower changes - your biggest cost. Historical data is sadly lacking – the department that looks like a hero today with a very small increase may in fact be a bum due to a huge increase two years ago – but you can't tell, because only 1999 historical information is there. Spending a lot higher on conventions and the like, or consultants??? I can tell you with the CNV package, but not DNV's. It is impossible to apply the standard tests a business person (read Councilor) should apply with the DNV budget – the basic information is not there.

As an example, the DNV Parks and Recreation submission is seven pages and the equivalent package at the City of North Vancouver is about 60. I can tell you an awful lot about CNV spending down to convention expenses, manpower, spending history by year, but from the DNV package, I could tell you almost nothing. CNV's process is not perfect, but it is light years ahead of DNV's. The information is there if you care to review it.

It may well be that Staff have done a great job and there is not an ounce of fat in the DNV budget. But you as a Council need the information to spot test areas to develop that confidence. With this package, you cannot. In my view, you cannot accept such a package and claim to be running a businesslike operation.

The worst point of all is the lack of “zero base” budget – the ability to see what is in the budget from the bottom up, broken into standard cost categories, with a five-year history. The information exists – your Staff can't produce this plan without it. You have allowed them or told them not to give it to you. So you are examining 3% of the budget that Staff suggests you examine on page B10-11, and fundamentally ignoring most of the \$99MM on page B2.

Your budget process is fatally flawed, and if Council has trouble generating questions about the budget, I am not surprised. No wonder we see questions from Council on garbage can sizes and flower beds, as opposed to questions on staffing levels overall, and overtime levels, and programs, appropriate budget for information services, etc.

I am told your finance and budgets advisory committee have come to the same conclusion

as I on this budget package.

Mayor Bell and Council, when are you going to require of Staff a budget package and process that puts the corporation on a businesslike basis? The corporate values and strategic plan, corporate policies, and the financial plan are not things you can delegate 97 plus percent to Staff, which in my view is what you have done in the case of the budget and financial plan to date. Sadly, with this package, I am not sure you can do otherwise – you gave up your management rights when, sometime last year, you apparently did not tell Staff what you wanted for a budget package.

JCH Feb. 24-01 finance and budgets



March 11,2001

To: Mayor and Members of Council  
District of North Vancouver

From: Corrie Kost  
2851 Colwood Dr.

Re: Encroachment Bylaw 7224 – Agenda Item #5 Monday March 11/2001

Your Worship & Members of Council,

Let us review some of the facts of this encroachment – especially those which are NOT noted in the staff report of March 1,2001 (File: 3060-20/61.00)

According to District records the property is assessed at \$479,000. The lot area is approx 3554 sq-ft and is thus valued at \$134.78 per sq-ft. For any property in the district the normal yearly lease for 134sq-ft of encroachment would be 7.5% of 134\*\$134.78 or **\$1354**. However for properties on this road, and this road only there are “special” rules.

This is the “spin” that was taken...

To treat owners “equitably” it is assumed that the land "taken" from the District is located elsewhere - ie. not on the expensive waterfront property. The “assessed” value is thus reduced to \$25.41 per sq-ft. The result of this policy is that this encourages encroachments on these very properties! Where else can you take away someone else's land and get such a good deal? The resale value goes up and the costs are externalized to the District taxpayer. With an “assessment” of \$25.41 per sq.ft. **instead of paying \$1354/yr the owner pays only \$256/yr for taking away 134 sq-ft of public land.**

There are a few other things that still bother me as well...

1. Are the properties away from the waterfront really assessed at only \$25.41 per sq-ft ?
2. Did the Board of Variance have the authority to grant a variance which would result in an encroachment on public property? Is their authority not limited to dealings within the property line?
3. Is it truly “equitable” to the > 99% of us who do not encroach upon other people's land to allow this property to encroach upon an already congested street? Is it ethical for staff to use the argument that since 8 other owners in the area do so then this one should also be allowed to do so? Does staff not have ethical guidelines directing them to “protect the public interests”?

I urge council to adopt, as soon as possible, a more financially responsible position on the matter of encroachments upon public property. Finally I remind council that your oath of office requires you to value the protection of the public interests above any private interests.

Yours truly,  
Corrie Kost

CC: FONVCA

**Subject: [Fwd: Request from TPAC to FONCA]**

**Date:** Sun, 04 Mar 2001 17:51:28 -0800

**From:** Brian Platts <brian\_platts@telus.net>

**To:** Corrie Kost <kost@triumf.ca>

Corrie, the following is a request from Alan Orr to FONVCA. I told Alan that we wouldn't be able to discuss it last month (because FONVCA met with the consultants studying Planning), however, we might want to add it to this month's agenda.

-Brian

---

**Subject: Request from TPAC to FONCA**

**Date:** Sat, 20 Jan 2001 16:45:52 -0800

**From:** Allan Orr <allandorr@home.com>

**To:** <brian\_platts@telus.net>

Dear Brian: At the Jan.18 meeting of TPAC the following item appeared under "TPAC Priority Issues for 2001."

#4 "Pedestrian and Cyclist Access to Major Commercial and other Services."

The committee heard that "certain locations in the community are a deterrent to safe pedestrian access and do not encourage walking or cycling. The spirit and the language of most of the community plans including the OCP encourage alternate modes of transportation. Places that deter pedestrian and cycling access need to be identified and receive attention."

Discussion followed and we identified some sites: 1. walking to Superstore to and from Lilloett Road, the Holiday Inn and Fern Street 2. Parts of Marine Drive 3. Access to Phibbs Exchange from Lynnmore.

It was suggested we request that FONKA might be prepared to brainstorm a list of points in the community where members believe pedestrians are currently at risk. In Seymour, for instance, we agitated and got a pedestrian-activated cross-walk at Parkgate Place and Seymour Parkway.

That's it! Any dangerous spots in the community that your representatives can identify will provide us with more examples and we will direct these concerns to staff and ultimately through the budget process (if necessary) to Council.

Regards, Allan Orr, Chair of TPAC

**Subject: FONVCA Final Draft Letter**

**Date:** Sun, 04 Mar 2001 17:59:58 -0800

**From:** Brian Platts <brian\_platts@telus.net>

**To:** Corrie Kost <kost@triumf.ca>

Dear Mayor & Council:

At the January meeting of the Federation of NV Community Associations the following motion was carried unanimously:

"THAT a letter be sent to Council requesting that community associations be given the first right of refusal to chair/co-chair Public Information Meetings and that all the usual arrangements be made by developer as is the current practice."

It is the general belief that developer-sponsored Public Information Meetings amount to nothing more than a glossy "sales pitches" for proposed redevelopments. This type of meeting structure puts developers in the awkward position of trying to appear neutral and informative, while the public in attendance often looks on with varying degrees of distrust.

In most neighbourhoods in the District, community associations have become the trusted vehicle for residents to express their views and opinions on issues of local concern. Rather than holding multiple meetings on any particular redevelopment proposal, the community association might wish to take advantage of the opportunity to either sponsor or co-sponsor with the developer the required Public Information Meeting. (The developer would still be responsible for the costs associated with the meeting, i.e. public notification and meeting room rental.)

For the developers, community association involvement in a Public Info Meeting would reduce the pressure to appear neutral and informative. Questions from the floor of such meetings would be directed by the C.A. Chair to either the developer or the District Planner in attendance. For members of the community, having their local community association sponsor Public Information Meetings would provide both initial neutrality and consistency at the early stage of the redevelopment process.

Sincerely,  
David Knee