Subject: [Fwd: DVP Application For 2826 Panorama Drive]

Subject: RE: DVP Application For 2826 Panorama Drive

Date: Mon, 3 Dec 2001 14:59:27 -0800

From: Ernie Crist < CristE@district.north-van.bc.ca>

To: "'John Hunter'" <johnhunter@idmail.com>, Ernie Crist <CristE@district.north-van.bc.ca>, "'FONVCA (E-mail)'" <fonvca@fonvca.org>

Hello:

What he is saying is that only people with HIS bias should be able to vote - as for God he/she too was biased, otherwise he/she would surely not have bothered.

Ernie.

----Original Message----

From: John Hunter [mailto:johnhunter@idmail.com] Sent: Monday, December 03, 2001 10:25 AM

To: 'Ernie Crist'; 'FONVCA (E-mail)'

Subject: RE: DVP Application For 2826 Panorama Drive

Unbelievable.

Is Denault saying that only those with a bias should be allowed to raise issues, or only those without?

Find me a man or woman without bias and I'll show you God.

John Hunter

----Original Message----

From: Ernie Crist [mailto:CristE@district.north-van.bc.ca]

Sent: December 3, 2001 9:56 AM

To: FONVCA (E-mail)

Subject: FW: DVP Application For 2826 Panorama Drive

----Original Message----

From: Bill Denault

Sent: Monday, December 03, 2001 8:31 AM

To: Mayor and Council - DNV

Subject: FW: DVP Application For 2826 Panorama Drive

Dear Council Members,

Given the attached comments by a member of Council, I would like to know if anyone feels that Cllr. Crist has demonstrated a bias for this agenda topic and, if in fact, he should be allowed to discuss and vote on this issue at tonight's meeting?

Cllr. Denault

1 of 3

----Original Message----

From: Ernie Crist [mailto:CristE@district.north-van.bc.ca]

Sent: Sunday, December 02, 2001 9:43 PM

To: 'brian_platts@telus.net'; Bill Denault; Don Bell; Doug Mackay-Dunn; Ernie Crist; Heather Dunsford; Janice Harris; Lisa Muri; NVD Council

Cc: FONVCA

Subject: RE: DVP Application For 2826 Panorama Drive

Dear Mr. Platts.

Indeed it appears that the CCA endorsed District Council is working feverishly to create a point of no return on the waterfront.

There is a solution and that is to expose their path of destruction and their gall at the publics expense - sooner or later the public will get the message - many of them already do.

Ernie

----Original Message----

From: Brian Platts [mailto:brian_platts@telus.net] Sent: Sunday, December 02, 2001 7:52 PM

To: Bill Denault; Don Bell; Doug Mackay-Dunn; Ernie Crist; Heather

Dunsford; Janice Harris; Lisa Muri; NVD Council

Cc: FONVCA

Subject: DVP Application For 2826 Panorama Drive

Mayor & Council,

I would like to raise a few points in connection with agenda item #5, a Development Variance Permit application for 2826 Panorama Drive.

This application for variances to floor area, building coverage, building height, eave height, and rear building setback, is but the latest of a string of DVP applications from this street in particular, and waterfront homeowners in general.

With the number of variances requested from this area of the District, I can't help wonder why a neighbourhood specific zoning process has not been initiated. If the current zoning bylaw causes so much difficulty for Panorama Drive, then why not create separate zoning bylaw like Edgemont, Delbrook, Pemberton Heights, and other neighbourhoods have done? At least that way some practical boundaries would be set, and requested variances eliminated, or be significantly reduced.

On the issue of steeply sloping lots, more than one-third of 2826 Panorama has a slope greater than 50%. When the bylaw governing development on steep lots was amended, a big part of the reason behind it was to ensure that any development in such areas was environmentally safe. In this regard, development applications were to include a geotechnical study to guarantee the stability of the lot. Has such a study been completed for 2826 Panorama? Certainly the Staff Report to Council makes no mention of one.

In closing, based on precedent it is highly unlikely that Council will reject this DVP application. In fact, it almost seems pointless to mention once again that you cannot change use or density without a

2 of 3

rezoning. Part of the problem with issuing all these variance applications is that each one is used to justify the next. It's a continuing spiral that can only result with the waterfront being completely blocked by three-storey monster houses.

Sincerely, Brian Platts

3 of 3