

Subject: OH GOODY! A SURVEY!

Date: Thu, 4 Dec 2003 00:48:24 +0000 (GMT)

From: Elizabeth James <cagebc@yahoo.com>

To: Cathy Adams <cathyadams@canada.com>, Eric Andersen <eric_g_andersen@hotmail.com>, Maureen Bragg <m.bragg@shaw.ca>, Corrie Kost <kost@triumf.ca>, Allan Orr <allandorr@shaw.ca>, Pat Higgs <patroberta@telus.net>, Brian Platts <bplatts@shaw.ca>, Bill Tracey <wrtracey@telus.net>, HunterJohn@shaw.ca

CC: fonvca@fonvca.org, "James Ridge, For information only James Ridge" <James_Ridge@dnv.org>

3 December 2003

Good Afternoon!

Like all good political aficionados these days, I thought I'd do a survey!

This one is about the Agenda for District of North Vancouver Council meetings and a few aspects only of the way in which Council meetings are conducted and/or evolve. So.....

1. Do you feel that, in general, agendas/meetings serve District citizens:
 - Well
 - Fairly well
 - Poorly
 - Badly
2. Do you feel that agenda items are appropriately prioritized?
 - Always
 - Sometimes
 - Almost never
3. Do you feel that options for Staff resolution of DVP applications have been exhausted before the DVP arrives on the Council table?
 - Always
 - Most of the time
 - Not often enough
 - Almost never
4. If you indicated "Not often enough" or "Almost never" what do you believe to be the reason?
 - District policies need to be clarified
 - Council needs to take a firmer stand with developers
 - Council needs to send clearer instructions to the community
 - Changes need to be made to the application process
 - District needs to employ, or sub-contract a trained arbitrator
 - "Politics"
 - Other
5. Do you feel DVP's should be removed altogether from the agenda of "regular" council meetings?
 - Yes
 - No
 - Maybe
 - Other
6. If you answered "yes" or "maybe", do you think that holding a regular "DVP Meeting" would improve service to the community? If so, assuming that applicants have complied with all preliminaries, [such as hosting a meeting of affected neighbours/citizens], should applicants be given formal appointments, akin to the way in which assessment appeals are dealt with? If so, should meetings be held:
 - Monthly
 - Twice a month
 - As required
 - During the evening
 - Saturday mornings

With respect to other aspects of agenda items.....

7. Do you feel the rules should be tightened up regarding raising items for discussion which have previously been discussed?
 - Yes
 - No
8. If you answered "yes" how much time should elapse before an item can be considered again?
 - 3 months
 - 6 months
 - 1 year
 - Next council term
 - Only when fundamental aspects of the issue have changed
 - When Staff/Council agree that an emergency exists
9. Because I find it difficult to phrase as a question which will allow a broad enough answer, could you just comment on the current 4-minute/2-minute protocol and offer suggestions about how this policy could be improved? If you think it's OK as-is, that's fine too.

If any of you know other people in the District who might be willing to participate, that would be excellent!

Once all the answers are in, I can write up the results to send to Mr. Ridge and to Council for their information. If any of you would like your response to be included but anonymous, I will absolutely guarantee your name will not be mentioned....as is the policy with CAGE.

Lastly, do you feel this type of exercise is (a) useful; or, (b) a waste of your time? Only polite comments, please; "raspberries" will be ignored!

Regards,

Liz

[604] 988-2066

P.S. If you think other questions should be included, or other topics could benefit from this type of exercise, please let me know and I'll prepare an addendum and/or another question sheet.

[Download Yahoo! Messenger](#) now for a chance to [WIN](#) Robbie Williams "Live At Knebworth DVD"