

Subject: RE: Agenda Item: Leasing of Public Land

Date: Sun, 23 Sep 2001 11:32:04 -0700

From: "John Hunter" <johnhunter@idmail.com>

To: <bill_tracey@telus.net>, "Corrie Kost" <kost@triumf.ca>

CC: "Elizabeth James" <cagebc@yahoo.com>, "Dave Sadler" <davesadler@telus.net>, <eandersen@seatradeshshipping.bc.ca>, "Dan Ellis" <ellis7880@home.com>, "Norm Epp" <normepp@home.com>, "David Knee" <pairofknees@telus.net>, "Brent Mayall" <bmayall@direct.ca>, "Val Moler" <valeriem@blaze.ca>, "Hugh Murray" <Hugh_murray@telus.net>, "Brian Platts" <brian_platts@telus.net>, "Al Price" <alprice@quik.com>, <rmadams@wimsey.com>, "Peter Thompson" <bedeconsulting@home.com>, "Angela Trudeau" <a.trudeau@canada.com>, <weemalkies@telus.net>, "FONVCA" <fonvca@fonvca.org>, <annettem@digital-rain.com>, "Outlook" <newsroom@northshoreoutlook.com>, "northshore news" <editor@nsnews.com>

Could we find a real estate type to present to council at the public meeting on encroachments re the value of land?

It seems to me NVD should charge these encroachers, who in my view we owe nothing special to, what it would cost them had they bought the land originally cost in today's terms) or if they rented the land today at market.

Or sell them the land if it does not negatively affect others.

Good work Corrie.

Guys, we need a plan and strategy for this public meeting.

John

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

From: Bill Tracey [mailto:bill_tracey@telus.net]

Sent: September 22, 2001 11:44 PM

To: Corrie Kost

Cc: Elizabeth James; Dave Sadler; eandersen@seatradeshshipping.bc.ca; Dan Ellis; Norm Epp; johnhunter@idmail.com; David Knee; Brent Mayall; Val Moler; Hugh Murray; Brian Platts; Al Price; rmadams@wimsey.com; Peter Thompson; Angela Trudeau; weemalkies@telus.net; FONVCA; annettem@digital-rain.com; Outlook; northshore news
Subject: Re: Agenda Item: Leasing of Public Land

Corrie,

Nice work. I think you present a very persuasive argument. This is the kind of stuff that also should get into the newspapers if council does not act on it.

Regards,
Bill

Corrie Kost wrote:

> It appears that council as a body is not convinced that the current
> situation is a poor return for the use of district assets. Not only
> that, they are unwilling to remedy the situation for many years to
> come since it is now proposed that the current poor return (i.e.
> subsidy to those who have occupied public property) continue until the
> property is sold. To add some clarity to just how little money
> is paid to the district for return of occupying public property I
> have attached a graph (pdf) showing the annual rent vs the area
> encroached for all properties. Note that I have not included the
> Cascades/Woodlands access roads as they constitute a special
> case for which the encroached area is not provided.
>
> The bottom line is:
> An annual return of less than \$1 / sq-ft.
>

> Another way to view this is to note that the total area encroached (
> 9425 sq-ft) is about the size of a lot - now typically worth at least
> \$250,000. Since a lot can only have structures on about 35% of the lot

> and these encroachments cover 100% of the area it should be argued
> that the value is closer to \$714,000 (100/35x250,000). A return of
> even 7.5% on \$714,000 is about \$53,000 . We got only \$8913.
>
> The 2.5% figure based on a pro rata formula using the "Maximum Floor
> Space" is more than fair - generating about \$22,000 in rent. I urge
> everyone to support
> an immediate 1.5% charge (generating about \$13,000)
> with a 5 year phase-in to 2.5%.
>
> I find it strange that council supported an immediate 50% increase in
> recreation fees to seniors (which Burnaby will phase in over 4 years,
> and Vancouver
>
> will phase in over 3 years), while they propose a phase in, for those
> who have had a "sweet deal" on the use of public property for many
> years, of what may well average more than another 20 years. Some
> inequity in fairness!
>
> Corrie Kost
>