

Subject: Re: SVCA Financial Plan Input**Date:** Sun, 07 Dec 2003 23:56:49 -0800**From:** Bill Tracey <wrtracey@telus.net>**Reply-To:** systek@engineer.com**Organization:** Systek Engineering Ltd.**To:** Bill Maurer <billm@millsoft.ca>**CC:** "Ernie Crist" <ernie_crist@dnv.org>, "Maureen Bragg" <m.bragg@shaw.ca>, systek@engineer.com, "Elizabeth James" <cagebc@yahoo.com>, "FONVCA (E-mail)" <fonvca@fonvca.org>, "Cathy Adams" <cathyadams@canada.com>, "Eric Andersen" <eric_g_andersen@hotmail.com>, "Corrie Kost" <kost@triumf.ca>, "Allan Orr" <allandorr@shaw.ca>, "Pat Higgs" <patroberta@telus.net>, "Brian Platts" <bplatts@shaw.ca>

Bill,

The problem you describe is associated with the insistence of some people that we build single-family homes, or restrict development to two or three stories. Of course when that happens developers are going to want 33' lots. What we need to do is accept some four-story and higher buildings, and insist on lots of green space around them. That's what has been happening in Markham and other areas north of Toronto, and it works very well. I agree that destroying trees is the wrong way to go, but it's going to be difficult to preserve trees if we continue to insist on only single-family two story development.

Bill

Bill Maurer wrote:

My personal opinion is that we should be preserving the forested character of the north shore. While in an abstract sense it would be nice to see high density pockets set amongst forested greenbelts I'm not seeing much of that being planned. All the development going on in my neighbourhood is simply increasing density with no corresponding setting aside of additional greenspace. An example might be a single 99 foot riverfront property with one home on it and lots of trees that was recently subdivided into 3 x 33 foot properties with 3 homes and virtually no trees. Noort wanted to do this with another property on Riverside. The neighbours complained so they were forced to limiting it to 2 x 45' lots. That saved about 10 trees on the very outer edge of a property that probably had 40 trees on it. I think what's going on with the high density town homes being developed on Lynn Valley Rd and Mountain Hwy is appalling. Where are the greenbelts Maureen? I don't see any. Just a lot of one time money into developers and owners pockets. The developers are developing virtually every inch of these properties. Once treed areas are removed it is extremely difficult to get them back. The finished result looks like Vancouver and if there isn't any effort made to require developers to set aside more green space and leave or replace evergreens they remove then that's what we'll end up with. I see the developers using arborists to justify the removal of unsafe trees but no corresponding requirement to replant trees that are subsequently removed. I think the focus of a community association should be it's community. Current development patterns in my community can result in only one thing. 33' lots and very few evergreens except along steep slopes and creekbeds where you can't build homes. No one should be under any illusion that development in the Lower Mainland is going to be anything but wholesale urban sprawl. I have seen how land is deloped in England. They have something called the National Trust which severely limits municipalities ability to remove land from the agricultural reserve. This results in focused development in areas designated for residential development. I am extremely happy to see that horses have been re-introduced into the Seymour Valley. It took significant variances and lobbying by the community association to enable the new owner of the farm to rebuild virtually the same buildings that were there before. The high density developments took no variance approvals at all other than the initial subdivision applications. I agree with Ernie. The North Shore community associations should be doing a lot more to limit and control the high density and massive in-fill development currently in full swing with virtually no coordinated planning. Let's keep the north shore looking green! Regards, Bill

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

From: Ernie Crist [mailto:ernie_crist@dnv.org]**Sent:** Sunday, December 07, 2003 9:25 PM**To:** Maureen Bragg; systek@engineer.com**Cc:** Elizabeth James; Bill Maurer; FONVCA (E-mail); Cathy Adams; Eric Andersen; Corrie Kost; Allan Orr; Pat Higgs; Brian Platts**Subject:** RE: SVCA Financial Plan Input

Hello Maureen: I think you and I are talking about two separate issues. Cheers. Ernie

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

From: Maureen Bragg [<mailto:m.bragg@shaw.ca>]**Sent:** December 6, 2003 5:06 PM**To:** Ernie Crist; systek@engineer.com**Cc:** Elizabeth James; Bill Maurer; FONVCA (E-mail); Cathy Adams; Eric Andersen; Corrie Kost; Allan Orr; Pat Higgs; Brian Platts**Subject:** Re: SVCA Financial Plan Input

Oh dear my children have recently added three new people to the population of the North Shore. There are 28,000 thousand people in Lynn Valley, they could produce another fourteen thousand people all by themselves within the next five years. What to

do!!!!!!

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

From: [Ernie Crist](#)**To:** [Maureen Bragg](#) ; systek@engineer.com**Cc:** [Elizabeth James](#) ; [Bill Maurer](#) ; [FONVCA \(E-mail\)](#) ; [Cathy Adams](#) ; [Eric Andersen](#) ; [Corrie Kost](#) ; [Allan Orr](#) ; [Pat Higgs](#) ; [Brian Platts](#)**Sent:** Saturday, December 06, 2003 12:53 PM**Subject:** RE: SVCA Financial Plan Input

My response. A MESSAGE FROM ERNIE CRIST It is clear now that nothing that we (I) have said has sunk in. Is this why the larger the cities the greater their problems? Is this why the largest cities are constantly on the verge of bankruptcy? Is this why they can no longer cope with crime, housing, waste, transportation, services etc? Is this why an apartment in New York costs ten times as much as it does in North Vancouver? Not to speak of a house? Is this why there are tens of thousands of homeless in the large cities? Is this why people are crammed into small rooms in New York, Toronto and Montreal etc? Development in itself brings benefits? Really? The real thinkers have given this a lot of thought and this is their verdict. Development for the sake of development brings no benefits, developers and their apologists notwithstanding - let me repeat that - development in itself does not result in lower taxes - it does not result in affordable housing - it does not, in itself, improve transportation and it does not enhance livability. Before the Pedestrian Oriented Town Center (Joke) in Lynn Valley the District was 4.5 million dollars richer. Have house prices come down? Where is the community center and where are the recreation and the cultural facilities? Where is the enhanced livability? Before the "Lynn Valley Pedestrian Oriented Town Center" there was less pollution and there were fewer traffic jams. It was safer to cross a street including at the Lynn Valley Mall. The only time development makes sense is when it is done under controlled conditions - controlled that is by the local people, for the local people and through the local people. If, as a result of this philosophy higher density development occurs than this is OK but the decision should not be made by the developers or by the Real Estate industry as is being advocated. It should be people and community driven. Anything else leads to the concrete jungle, more health problems, higher taxes not lower taxes and higher crime etc. It will however and I agree, lead to a fatter wallet for some people. Beware of developers and their apologists for their gifts are poisonous as is the air in New York, Los Angeles, Toronto and Chicago. Organize and fight back - organize and fight the developer agenda for it is the livability of YOUR neighborhood which is at stake. Ernie Crist -----Original Message-----

From: Maureen Bragg [<mailto:m.bragg@shaw.ca>]**Sent:** December 5, 2003 6:43 PM**To:** systek@engineer.com; Ernie Crist**Cc:** Elizabeth James; Bill Maurer; FONVCA (E-mail); Cathy Adams; Eric Andersen; Corrie Kost; Allan Orr; Pat Higgs; Brian Platts**Subject:** Re: SVCA Financial Plan Input

A smaller footprint lets in light and air and green space, Thanks Bill. Third street, lower Lonsdale is a typical example of people not understanding that four storey buildings covering several blocks are worse than towers. When you are on the sidewalk you cannot see around or over or through them, they are Towers laid on their sides. They cast a permanent shadow on the sidewalk. A tower at the end of each block gives the same accommodation but allows loads of green and open space in between. In my years in real estate Bosa Bros were respected as building excellent projects. regards Maureen Bragg

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

From: [Bill Tracey](#)**To:** [Ernie Crist](#)**Cc:** [Elizabeth James](#) ; [Bill Maurer](#) ; [FONVCA \(E-mail\)](#) ; [Cathy Adams](#) ; [Eric Andersen](#) ; [Maureen Bragg](#) ; [Corrie Kost](#) ; [Allan Orr](#) ; [Pat Higgs](#) ; [Brian Platts](#)**Sent:** Friday, December 05, 2003 4:58 PM**Subject:** Re: SVCA Financial Plan Input

Hey Everybody,

Hold on a minute! Who said higher density is not desirable? If you have read "Better, Not Bigger" you will realize that urban sprawl (i.e. low density) is a killer. It's only with higher density that we can get affordable housing and lower taxes. Higher density means less cost for services -- sewer, water, gas,

electricity, telephone, fire fighting, ambulance -- you name it. We need some higher density in the District if we're ever going to be able to afford good seniors' housing, homes for young families, and efficient public services.

Let's not knock developers as a knee-jerk reaction. Bosa knows what they are doing, and they do it well. I wish more of the other developers were as community-conscious and capable as Bosa!

Bill

Ernie Crist wrote:

Hello All:And that is just the start. Unless this community gets organized you can kiss low density good by. Bosa is here and intends to stay. Bosa has big plans, Bosa is smart and Bosa has powerful philosophical support on District Council and don't be taken in by the hypocritical baffle-gab of the so called environmentalist. When I said that FONVCA has to move, I was not kidding - beware. Ernie

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

From: Elizabeth James

[<mailto:cagebc@yahoo.com>]

Sent: December 4, 2003 11:34 AM

To: Ernie Crist; Bill Maurer

Cc: FONVCA (E-mail); Cathy Adams; Eric Andersen; Maureen Bragg; Corrie Kost; Allan Orr; Pat Higgs; Brian Platts; Bill Tracey

Subject: RE: SVCA Financial Plan Input

Dear Clr. Crist, Bill Maurer and Brian

Platts: This is good stuff! To add to your comments.....I was told the other day that BOSA is looking at some multi-family re-development in the Delbrook area. That would be in addition to what is going on at Edgemont Terrace. What happened to the slow/no growth concept? Brian...could you tell me when the Edgemont OCP was (a) completed; and (b) last reviewed? Thx to all Liz

Ernie Crist <ernie_crist@dnv.org>

wrote:

Hello Bill:Good work and congratulations. SVCA has come a long way. Your ideas should be incorporated into the strategic planning process conducted by our new CAO. I too am working on the major issues. Also, it should be raised with FONVCA when we meet. On the whole the role of community associations has to be enhanced and elevated. FONVCA itself should press for it. If this does not happen the pro development forces will take over. They are

waiting to make their move. At stake is the whole concept of neighborhood and community driven development. It is either moving forward or stand to lose all the gains that make us unique. You were supposed to give me some drawings re advertising boards or am I mistaken? That too is important because they want to open the door to street signs unlimited. Ernie -----Original Message-----

From: Bill Maurer
[mailto:billm@millsoft.ca]
Sent: December 4, 2003 5:58 AM
To: Mayor and Council - DNV; Lindsay Hoeberechts; Rick Danyluk; Charlene Grant; Irwin Torry; Richard Zerr
Cc: SVCA Directors
Subject: SVCA Financial Plan Input

Here is the electronic copy of the SVCA input to last night's Financial Plan Public Hearing. Some additional links:

- [SVCA 2004 Budget Request](#)
- [SVCA Web site](#)

If you have any further questions, I can be reached at 604-789-2172 or billm@millsoft.ca Regards, Bill Maurer co-chair SVCA

My name is Bill Maurer. I have been co-chair of the

Seymour Valley Community Association for the last 2 years. I'd like to explain how our community association has been making funding requests, how well this has worked, and to make suggestions for how it can be improved. We sent our first funding request to the planning department in September 2002 in the form of an email. This was simply a list of 15 projects which we wanted to see undertaken and funded. Three of these projects have been completed. The status of the remaining ones is unknown. Our current funding request to "Mayor and Council" and the planning department was sent last month. This was

sent as an email and provides more detail about each project for which funding is being requested. We have also added digital photographs to provide further information about each project. The new request contains 9 items which were in last year's request as well as 2 new items. The process we are using to date is completely informal and has provided us with mixed results. Here are some suggested changes which would greatly enhance the way community associations both communicate with planning and request funding.1. **Provide a single point of contact in the planning department who acts as the district's representative for each**

community association.

In our case this seems to be in place at an informal level but it would be much clearer if this was formalized and published.

Anyone should be able to phone the District and ask for the SVCA's district rep and reception should know who this person is. 2.

Schedule quarterly meetings with community associations to review project status and/or introduce new projects.

Projects may or may not have a financial impact.3.

Assign the planning department as the primary interface to finance. It

is assumed that the majority of community association requests fit within existing district budget

parameters and would never show up directly as items in the District Financial Plan. Planning would provide finance with a detailed budget for projects which reach that stage. Community associations will generally not be in a position to assign dollar amounts to projects since district staff and resources normally implement them.4. **Provide timely feedback to requests made by community associations.** A community association needs to be aware of how the district views each of its project requests. This includes such things as expected start / completion dates, expected costs, detailed

plans /
drawings,
and project
disposition. 5.

**Work with
local
community
associations
on all
community
related
issues.**

Planning
occasionally
receives
requests
from
residents
directly as a
result of an
issue or
problem
they have
with streets,
lighting,
traffic,
noise, etc.
Planners
should
inform the
local
community
association
of such
requests
and enable
the
community
association
to provide
input/feedback
on the
solution.
The local
community
association
will often
be aware of
additional
factors
which may
impact the
best
solution to
an issue and
should have
input on
priorities. It
would help
if
community
associations
were cc'd

on
community
related
requests
from
residents
for
additional
services /
improvements.6.

**Formalize
and
document
the process
by which
community
associations
interact
with the
district.**

Once this
process has
been
established
document it
and place it
in the
community
association section
of the DNV
web
site. We
have
recently
revised the
format of
the
Seymour
Valley
Community
Association
website
(seymourvalley.ca)
to better
enhance the
visibility
and
documentation
of projects.
We used to
have a
section
called
Issues
which was
really a mix
of
committees
and
projects.
These have
now been
split into 2

categories.

The primary difference between a project and committee is that a project has a specific goal and a start and completion date.

Committees are ongoing and are charged with a given problem domain.

They typically monitor the situation and propose solutions as problems arise. There is

substantial amount of roadwork being undertaken on

Riverside Drive which the community association never seems to be

informed of in advance and often degrades the road surface.

Recently BC Gas has replaced a section of pipe between the 1700 and 1900 block of Riverside.

They have closed this with an extremely

uneven
section of
pavement
which
appears to
be a
temporary
patch. Will
they be
repaving
this section
of road?
When will
they apply a
permanent
patch? Is
anyone at
the district
monitoring
this?
Enabling
community
associations
to better
monitor
damage
done to
road
surfaces by
external
agencies
will make it
much less
likely that
the district
and
property tax
payers will
be on the
hook for
their
eventual
repair. Thank
you for
giving us
the
opportunity
to provide
this
feedback.
We are
willing to
provide our
community
as a model
to assist you
in
developing
this process
should you
require it.
Visit our
community

association
website at
SeymourValley.ca
to see
details of
the projects
we are
currently
working on.

Want to chat instantly with your online friends?
[Get the FREE Yahoo! Messenger](#)