

# FONVCA

## Minutes of October 20<sup>th</sup> 2005

### Attendees:

Cathy Adams	Chair-Pro-Tem Lions Gate N.A.
Brian Platts	Edgemont C.A.
John Miller	Lower Capilano C.R.A.
Hugh Murray	Lower Capilano C.R.A.
Corrie Kost	Edgemont CA
Monica Craver	Upper Lynn R.A.
Bill Maurer	Seymour Valley C.A.
Maureen Bragg	Save Lynn Canyon Park
Herman Mah	Pemberton Heights C.A.
Eric Andersen	Blueridge C.A.
Vall Moller	Lions Gate N.A.
Dan Ellis	Lynn Valley C.A. (Notetaker)

### Guests:

Liz James	GAGE BC
Salim Kaderali	
Lyle Craver	

Meeting started 7:15pm

## 1. ORDER/CONTENT OF AGENDA

Add - 6.2 Waiving \$25 Block Party Fees  
6.3 Outlook - Savings

## 2. ADOPTION of Sept 15<sup>th</sup> MINUTES

Moved/Seconded by Maureen/Brian – carried unanimously to approve minutes as circulated. The following item was moved to front of meeting to accommodate members present.

### 5.1 Format of All-Candidates Meetings

The merits/suggestions for various formats was discussed.

- limit opening statements to 90sec
- candidates not refer to their brochure material
- questions from public not be repeated
- use of 1 wild card given all candidates
- questions drawn from hat vs. named person asking the question.
- Limit total meeting time to about 2hrs
- Having an experienced moderator

Concern was expressed over use of DNV web site ([www.dnv.org](http://www.dnv.org)) to publicize private (closed to general public) all candidates meetings. It was suggested that

those “private” meeting dates be simply labeled as “unavailable”.

## 3. OLD BUSINESS

### 3.1 BC Rail Lands for Translink Bus Depot:

Despite community concerns the bus depot and rail-tour terminal are included as permitted uses in draft bylaw. Cathy outlined her findings

- provincial material (Nov 2003) indicating surplus lands would be denoted to communities – eg. 31 acres donated to Squamish
- CNV media release of Dec 2/2003 – rail noise in Cloverly Community
- May 26/2005 – passenger rail at Lonsdale Q or Waterfront Park.
- CNV would be main beneficiary of the current proposal

Of particular concern was the all/nothing approach of DNV public hearing on this issue and that discussion would be dominated by bus depot rather than the other proposed uses. It was suggested that a pair of parallel zoning bylaws – one with and one without the bus depot – should have gone to public hearing. **The public hearing date will now take place in January 2006 – after November municipal election.**

**3.2 Question for municipal election – Corrie/Brian** were thanked for their work on getting the questions out to the candidates. On a related issue – of financial contributions to candidates – **concern** was expressed about allowing post-election contribution, ie. **financial contributions that are sent to candidates after they have been successfully elected.**

**The following questions were sent to all candidates on October 15<sup>th</sup> - the day after close of nominations. Replies were requested to be sent by EMAIL [fonvca@fonvca.org](mailto:fonvca@fonvca.org) no later than Friday Oct 28<sup>th</sup>.**

1. Should community associations play a larger role with respect to local neighborhood and district-wide issues?
2. Do you advocate any further significant growth in specific areas of the District?
3. Do you support increased maintenance of our parks and public areas? If so, how?
4. Will you support the current council policy requiring a referendum in order to undedicate previously dedicated parks?

5. What are your primary goals/visions for the District over the next 5-10 years?
6. Which areas of municipal activity would you change in order to minimize tax increases?
7. What strategies would you pursue to control future tax increases?
8. What practical experience qualifies you for local governance?
9. Do you support the concept of community based planning?
10. What major issues are you concerned about in the District of North Vancouver?
11. What do you propose to do about the apparent lack of enforcement of our bylaws?

## 4. CORRESPONDENCE ISSUES

**4.1 Business arising from 129 regular emails – 25 on topic of Pesticides, 23 on Translink bus issue**  
- no actions.

**4.2 Non-posted letters -12**  
- will be received/reviewed at the November FONVCA meeting

## 5. NEW BUSINESS

**5.1 Format of All-candidates meeting – see above**

## 6. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

**6.1 Legal Issues:** None this month.

**6.2 Block Watch Party – Waiving Permit Fees-**  
FONVCA supports waiving such fees and urged council also involve RCMP in any future discussions on this issue.

**6.3 Potential Amalgamation Savings**  
FONVCA members discussed material on page 7 of Oct 20<sup>th</sup> article in OUTLOOK as well as DNV CAO James Ridge's response on this matter.

**6.4 Letter on "Sale of Crippen Regional Parkland"**  
had not yet been sent – waiting for complete email list.

No longer time sensitive – will be sent soon. Material attached as Attachment A.

## 7. CHAIR AND DATE OF NEXT MEETING

**Next Meeting on the usual 3rd Thursday**

– **November 17<sup>th</sup>, 2005.**

Pro-tem Chair will be **John Miller** – Lower Capilano Community Residents Association. Tel: 604-985-8594

Meeting adjourned 9:30pm

### Attachment A

The response is unacceptable.

An extensive study conducted by the UBCM determined that the use of the 5% counter-petition requirement was working properly, had never been abused by any disgruntled minority, and in fact was already held to be too onerous for large municipalities (much less Regional Districts with a population of over a million voters).

The adoption of the term "alternate approval process" is a misnomer. The original term "counter-petition opportunity" (CPO) is much more reflective of the true nature of this process. There is no "approval" aspect to this process.

It is our opinion that there was insufficient consultation on the matter of increasing the CPO from 5% to 10% and ample evidence that this % should have been reduced or at least maintained.

The application to a Regional District, requiring over 140,000 signatures, just to trigger a referendum by the entire 1.4 million voters in the GVRD, represents such an enormous requirement that we believe the courts would strike this down as being unreasonable.

History will show that not a single CPO will be successful due to this 10% threshold - thus making a mockery of the public's ability to have a say on significant issues between election.

It is a breach of good faith that a simple majority vote of council can now undedicate parkland which had been previously dedicated by referendum. Requiring those who wish to prevent the loss of their local dedicated park to muster up a petition of 10% of all registered voters across a region or municipality is far too onerous. This imbalance needs to be restored by requiring voter "assent" in order to undedicate parkland.