

Subject: RE: Tree Bylaw

Date: Tue, 4 Mar 2003 23:01:12 -0800

From: "Ernie Crist" <ernie_crist@dnv.org>

To: "Brian Platts" <bplatts@shaw.ca>, "Don Bell2" <belld@dnv.org>, "Alan Nixon" <Alan_Nixon@dnv.org>, "Maureen McKeon Holmes" <Maureen_McKeonHolmes@dnv.org>, "Richard Walton" <richard_walton@dnv.org>, "Lisa Muri" <lisa_muri@dnv.org>, "Janice Harris" <Janice_Harris@dnv.org>, "DNVCouncil" <DNVCOUNCIL@dnv.org>, "Ken Bennett" <Ken_Bennett@dnv.org>, <fonvca@fonvca.org>

CC: "Directors Team" <managecomm@dnv.org>, <m.bragg@shaw.ca>, "Ken Bennett" <Ken_Bennett@dnv.org>

Dear Brian;

Thank you for your input. A short story re this issue may be of interest to you. I recently went to my bank on the North Side of the Lynn Valley Mall (Mini Mall) only to witness the removal of a green area with shrubs and small trees. It had been there since the building went up a few years ago and was part of the DVP stipulation.

When I enquired as to what they were doing I was informed that they were removing this green area to make room for additional parking. I went to the Hall to find out and was informed by staff that the elimination of the treed and landscaped area had been agreed to by Council. This example is in addition to the ones I mentioned in my recent letter to the NEWS. Mind you this was not on a single family lot so I suppose it did not matter.

Incidentally do you have any idea what happened to the green areas including the tree lined boulevards and the Pedestrian Oriented Town Center shown on the glossy brochures to the people of Lynn Valley when they were asked to vote in favor of the Lynn Valley Community Plan? All I see is more concrete. Do you also recall the recent hue and cry about the loss of green space by the Councillor posing as an environmentalist that would accrue if parking stalls would be widened by 6"?

When I recently suggested that the District Tree Protection Bylaw should be renamed the District Tree Protection Hypocrisy Bylaw I was not joking.

Ernie Crist;

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

From: Brian Platts [<mailto:bplatts@shaw.ca>]

Sent: Tuesday, March 04, 2003 5:23 PM

To: Don Bell2; Ernie Crist; Alan Nixon; Maureen McKeon Holmes; Richard Walton; Lisa Muri; Janice Harris; DNVCouncil; Ken Bennett; fonvca@fonvca.org

Subject: Tree Bylaw

Mayor & Council:

Regardless of how one feels about the District's tree bylaw, I feel that I must correct a statement made by Mr. Ken Bennett (and written in the report to Council) that simply isn't factual.

In response to a question by Councillor McKeon-Holmes, Mr. Bennett stated that for a tree to achieve a trunk diameter of 75 cm., it must be well over 100 years old. At 3262 Beverley Crescent (three houses away from my house) are two enormous fir trees, one of which I estimate to be in the range of a 75 cm. diameter trunk with the second tree a little smaller but not far behind. Both of these trees were once live Christmas trees that were planted about 35 years ago by the homeowner (now moved away). My parents and our long-time neighbours remember the trees being planted. This is but one example of many I can find. About 50-odd years ago, the building lots in the original subdivisions in Capilano were clear-cut, so the only 100 year-old trees still standing in the area would be in parks, ravines, or environmentally sensitive green belts.

I really hope the issue of the tree bylaw -- specifically, the 75 cm. protective standard on non-environmentally sensitive private property -- will be reconsidered by a full Council. Unfortunately last night there was far too much misinformation, misplaced concern, and red herrings thrown about. As I pointed out last night, trees on 82% of all District land including environmentally-sensitive private property (ravines, steep

slopes, and riparian areas etc.) are protected by a 10 cm. standard. No member of Council ever argued in favour of changing this aspect of the bylaw, so it was truly unfortunate that environmentally-sensitive land was included for discussion in the staff report.

Sincerely,
Brian Platts

