

FONVCA

Minutes of September 15th 2005

Attendees:

Brian Platts	Chair	Pro-Tem Edgemont C.A.
John Miller		Lower Capilano C.R.A.
Diana Bellhouse		Delbrook C.A.
Hugh Murray		Lower Capilano C.R.A.
Corrie Kost		Edgemont CA
Cathy Adams		Lions Gate NA
David Knee		Norgate Park CA
Monica Craver		Upper Lynn R.A.
Fred Gooch		Blueridge C.A.
Bill Maurer		Seymour Valley C.A.
Nancy VanInsberghe		Seymour Valley C.A.
Maureen Bragg		Save Lynn Canyon Park
Vall Moller		Lions Gate N.A.

Guests:

Liz James	GAGE BC
James Ridge	CAO DNV
Paula Huber	DNV
Michael Sanderson	Aplin & Martin Consultants Ltd
Jan O. Voss	CTS Consultants

Jenny Knee Notetaker

Meeting started 7:10pm

5.1 DNV staff presentations

- a) James Ridge presented an update on land slide issue.
- b) Parking and Loading Standards Review by Aplin & Martin, CTS consultants and District staff
 - A power point slide presentation of the proposed changes was given by the consultants and staff. There was some discussion and questions on the issue and they would appreciate further input from the FONVCA members before going to Council.

1. ORDER/CONTENT OF AGENDA

- Add -
- 6.2 Block Parties
 - 6.3 Irwin Torry Replacement
 - 6.4 North Shore Translink Meeting
 - 6.5 Pesticide Bylaw
 - 6.6 Draft Sign Bylaw
 - 6.7 Westview Pub License

2. ADOPTION of July 21st MINUTES

Approved as circulated.

3. OLD BUSINESS

3.1 Sale of Crippen Regional Parkland:

FONVCA had a response to its letter to the minister. This response was termed unacceptable. Corrie circulated a draft response (attachment A) to this letter and a Motion was made by Cathy and seconded by Diana to send this response to the Minister and all the other parties previously copied the original communication. Unanimously endorsed. **ACTION ITEM**

3.2 Waterfront Street ends budget - Maureen

reported that staff had proposed to spend most of the money in the current budget on Lowry Lane and some on Panorama. The W.T.F. recommended opening up the street end on Panorama first and then Lowry lane, \$65,000 allotted to Panorama and \$15,000 allotted to Lowry Lane.

The two lots at the end of Panorama Park were sold to a private owner - the District low bid the properties.

4. CORRESPONDENCE ISSUES

4.1 Business arising from 135 regular emails – 27 on topic of Pesticides, 17 on false alarm issue
- no actions.

4.2 Non-posted letters -22

-some were non-posted by request. Some for inappropriate language, and others resulted from a request by James Ridge (and subsequently removed) due to possible litigation problems (not with FONVCA).

5. NEW BUSINESS

5.1 District Presentation see above

5.2 Filming in Edgemont village - Brian reported that there was no notification to the residents of a recently filming session in the village that disrupted traffic and created other inconvenience to some residents.

5.3 B.C. Rail lands for Translink Bus Depot

Cathy reported that she attended the announcement at the site - no one from the District attended. There had

been some concern at the lack of process prior to this announcement. There will be a public meeting at Norgate School at 6.30 p.m. 21st September 2005.

5.4 Waste removal Bylaw 7562 - Corrie reported that this bylaw had not been well thought out.

5.5 Development Variance Process - Brian reported that staff had written a report that almost all other municipalities **do not** issue DVP's for floor space ratios. The DNV is a notable exception.

5.6 QUESTIONS FOR MUNICIPAL CANDIDATES NOVEMBER 2005

The following questions are to be sent to all candidates the day after close of nominations on October 14th. Replies are requested to be sent by EMAIL fonvca@fonvca.org no later than Friday Oct 28th.

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?

6. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

6.1 Legal Issues: Corrie reported how some municipalities (and now being considered by West Vancouver) allocate almost the full amount of "rezoning uplift" towards community benefits. Carolanne Reynolds' input to West Van Council on this issue has been posted at <http://www.fonvca.org/agendas/sep2005/cmnty-benefit-wv-policy.pdf>

6.2 Block Parties - the district eliminated the need for insurance for block parties but now charges \$25 for the rental of barrier to block off the street. Brian will write a letter requesting this be waived. **ACTION ITEM**

6.3 Irwin Torry s (Director of Sustainability, Planning and Building) **replacement** to be Mrs. Margaret Eckenfelder - starts on the 19th September 2005

6.4 North Shore Transportation Advisory Committee: Many issues on the agenda for this meeting Cathy is going to attend and will report at the next meeting.

6.5 Pesticide - Corrie reported on this proposed bylaw and his review in this issue is posted at <http://www.fonvca.org/agendas/sep2005/Corrie-Kost-about-pesticides.pdf>

6.6 Sign Bylaw - Cathy reported that the sign bylaw is coming to Council at next week's council meeting

6.7 Mosquito Creek bar and grill - Diana reported that this establishment has applied for a pub and nightclub license and is on the North Vancouver City agenda on 19th September meeting.

7. CHAIR AND DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Next Meeting on the usual 3rd Thursday

October 20th, 2005.

Pro-tem Chair will be **Cathy Adams** – Lions Gate Neighbourhood Association. Tel: 604-987-8695

Meeting adjourned 10:35pm

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" 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 CPP 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 CPP 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.