**Subject: FW: Notice of Motion;**
   **Date:** Sat, 1 Jun 2002 00:28:50 -0700
  **From:** Ernie Crist <ernie_crist@dnv.org>
     **To:** "FONVCA (E-mail)" <fonvca@fonvca.org>

> *-----Original Message-----*
> *From:        Ernie Crist*
> *Sent: Saturday, June 01, 2002 12:28 AM*
> *To:   Nathalie Valdes*
> *Subject:      Notice of Motion;*
>
>
> *Notice of Motion - Report - Councillor Crist.*
>
> *That the report " Lynn Valley Core Road Repairs - Financial  Impact on*
> *Taxpayers" be put on  a Regular Council Agenda for debate.*
>
> *Reason for Report:*
>
> *In March 2002 Councillor Crist submitted a motion for Council's*
> *consideration that  Staff be requested to provide a detailed report*
> *listing the total expenses to District Taxpayers  as a result of repeated*
> *road repairs  such as openings and subsequent closures of roads to*
> *accommodate new development services requirements in and around the Lynn*
> *Valley Core construction areas.*
>
> *On March 25 -2002 Councillor Crist's motion  ( not included nor mentioned*
> *in the staff report) was considered and passed by Council.  A  report*
> *dated May 14-2002 in response to Councillor Crist's motion has now been*
> *submitted by Staff without mentioning Councillor  Crist's original report.*
> *This Staff  Report answers some of the questions but by no means all,*
> *while a number of relevant questions appear to have been dealt with*
> *without giving adequate detail. The staff report while answering some*
> *questions raises a  whole number of additional key questions with*
> *considerable implications for the taxpayers.*
>
> *The report states for instance that "Over the past three years the major*
> *roads in the Lynn Valley Core area have seen a number of new developments*
> *and more are expected in the future". Developers are required to pay for*
> *the upgrading or installation of servicing required for their projects*
> *including the paving of service cuts. Some of these patches are*
> *substandard and are beginning to show minor settlements, and edge cracking*
> *is beginning to appear.  Some of the patches are substandard and still*
> *under warranty and the responsible developer will be required to repair*
> *these patches at no cost to the District"*
>
> *The question is what is the cost to the District of monitoring  this on an*
> *ongoing basis and are those cost charged against  the DCC's?.  This is*
> *also true for the comment on page 2 of the staff report that "All work by*
> *the developers is inspected by a private engineering firm and District*
> *Construction inspectors?".  And "Cuts and patches in road surfaces*
> *contribute to pavement deterioration as settlement and joints allow water*
> *to infiltrate and deteriorate the structural gravel base". Are all these*
> *costs charged against  the DCC's?.*
>
> *The report goes on to say " The installation of servicing for these new*
> *developments has had a major impact  on the condition of the pavement on*
> *these streets". An inspection  of Mountain Highway, Lynn Valley Road and*
> *27th Street revealed 111 service cuts in the pavement with a total area of*
> *2,428 square meters. Of these cuts 68 area associated  with developments.*
> *The remaining cuts  are mostly repairs to the existing  system undertaken*

> *by our Utilities department.*
>
> *Several key questions remain unanswered  in the Staff report.*
>
> *1) What was the condition of all these roads before they were cut up*
> *repeatedly and what was the expected life span had they not been cut up to*
> *accommodate the large reconstruction of the area. This question is*
> *important in light of question number 5 listed below.*
>
> *2) What is the total cost to the District to accommodate the development*
> *in this area and what are the total returns to the District  in the form*
> *DCC's to compensate such expenses.*
>
> *3) What is the exact amount of DCC's collected so far by the District and*
> *how much of that amount has been spent and where.*
>
> *4) What is meant by the statement "Some of the road repairs due to*
> *overlapping  and staging  of development and staging of development*
> *projects in the Lynn Valley area over the past few years some of these*
> *patches are beginning to show minor settlements, and edge cracking is*
> *beginning to appear".*
>
> *5) In light of question number 1 what is the meaning of the statement  on*
> *Page 2 "These roads would be on the rehabilitation schedule even  if the*
> *pavement cuts associated with the private  developers had not occurred".*
> *Does this mean the developers are not paying for the full cost  since they*
> *roads would have been rehabilitated in any case?*
>
> *6 What is the meaning of  "Estimated cost  of $ 445,996 for three roads*
> *namely Brody site to Lynn Valley Road,  Kirkstone Road to Mountain Highway*
> *and Lynn Valley Road  to Mountain Highway in light of the fact that both*
> *roads are dissecting Mountain Highway?.*
>
> *7) What is the meaning and what are the implications  to the  District*
> *taxpayers of "Approval of the Inspector of Municipalities in 1998 that*
> *permitted the District to include the annual Street Reconstruction Program*
> *for use of Development Cost Charges provided that they paid no more then $*
> *8.45 % of the cost or street reconstruction"?*
>
> *8) The single most important question to be answered however, is what is*
> *the total  cost of the redevelopment in the Lynn Valley Core area  and how*
> *much is the total amount received from development to cover those expenses*
> *occurred by the District and how much of that amount has been spent  and*
> *where. WHAT AND WHERE IS  THE DETAILED LIST?*
>
> *9) What is the total affected area under development  which in the report*
> *is given as   27, 000 square meters and what is the relationship between*
> *that figure and the figure given in a different part of the report*
> *suggesting that the total area of service cuts is a mere 2,428 square*
> *meters?. How does a redevelopment of that magnitude begin to be covered by*
> *$ 445.996 as indicated  in the report and what is it's relationship with*
> *the  $ 1,172, 320 budgeted for the total 2002 Rehabilitation program? Does*
> *this include the $ 445, 968 or is that amount separate from that amount*
> *and subsequently from the Lynn Valley Core area and if so where are the $*
> *1,172.320 being spent in the District?.*
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

| | |
|---|---|
| 📄 Part 1.2 | **Type:** application/ms-tnef<br>**Encoding:** base64 |