

**Subject: Re: SVCA Financial Plan Input - on "Better, Not Bigger"**

**Date:** Mon, 08 Dec 2003 17:45:25 -0800

**From:** Maureen Bragg <m.bragg@shaw.ca>

**To:** systek@engineer.com, Corrie Kost <corrie@kost.ca>

**CC:** systek@engineer.com, Ernie Crist <ernie\_crist@dnv.org>, Elizabeth James <cagebc@yahoo.com>, Bill Maurer <billm@millsoft.ca>, "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>

In order to protect our greenspace we have to build on a smaller footprint. We cannot stop people wanting to come here, we cannot stop families expanding. We do have to do some careful planning for inevitable future growth. With this growth we have to plan all kinds of accommodation, for seniors, professional couples who want a nice apartment, young couples just married and setting up home, older couples who no longer wish to work the big house and garden but still do not want an apartment, singles who want their own apartment, rentals, in other words a community that provides certain types of housing for everyone as well as the three bedroom home with a picket fence. We have to start using our land more sparingly in order to keep our quality of life and that means building up in areas that are already built on and saving that land that is still natural and beautiful. Believe me I am deeply concerned at all times about the environment and our open spaces. It grieves me to see big houses crawling further and further up the mountains. regards Maureen

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

**From:** [Bill Tracey](#)

**To:** [Corrie Kost](#)

**Cc:** [systek@engineer.com](mailto:systek@engineer.com) ; [Ernie Crist](#) ; [Elizabeth James](#) ; [Bill Maurer](#) ; [FONVCA \(E-mail\)](#) ; [Cathy Adams](#) ; [Eric Andersen](#) ; [Maureen Bragg](#) ; [Corrie Kost](#) ; [Allan Orr](#) ; [Pat Higgs](#) ; [Brian Platts](#)

**Sent:** Sunday, December 07, 2003 11:25 PM

**Subject:** Re: SVCA Financial Plan Input - on "Better, Not Bigger"

Corrie,

The key is to make the distinction between simple "growth" and "higher density". We cannot stop growth itself (unless we lower the birth rate or severely restrict immigration), but we can manage it. My point is the densification is better than urban sprawl, and replacement of older single family homes with newer, denser construction is better than opening up more forest and park land for development. Land on the north shore is a greate asset, and becoming more costly all the time. We need to make good use of the land, and that, to me, means well-designed vertical growth rather than horizontal growth.

Bill

Corrie Kost wrote:

Much of what follows is from the book "Better Not Bigger".

As Edward Abbey said..."Growth for the sake of growth is the ideology of the cancer cell"

If you have read Eben Fodor's book "Better Not Bigger" or attended his talk when he was last on the North Shore you know all about the big myths connected with growth. Let's first have a test of your knowledge about growth (answers provided below - no cheating now!)

1. The bigger cities get, the lower local taxes are. T or F?
2. The faster cities grow, the lower local taxes are. T or F?
3. Police protection costs (per capita) are less in bigger cities. T or F?
4. Crime rates are higher in bigger cities. T or F?
5. The more cities grow, the lower the unemployment rate. T or F?
6. Bigger cities tend to have lower cost of living and housing. T or F?
7. Growth creates costs, but the new tax revenues more than offset the added expenses. T or F?

8. More business subsidies mean greater prosperity for local residents. T or F?
9. Environmental regulation is bad for the economy. T or F?
10. Developed land usually produces more net revenue for the city (tax revenues minus cost of public services) than undeveloped land. T or F?

It is increasingly acknowledged that keeping urban areas compact is better than allowing low-density urban sprawl. It is better to channel new growth to the existing urban area. However, given a choice it is even better to reduce growth! Growth has and can be effectively managed so that the quality of life is maintained and even improved over time.

Now for the 10 answers:

- 1 F
- 2 F
- 3 F
- 4 T
- 5 T
- 6 F
- 7 F
- 8 F
- 9 F
- 10 F

Yes urban sprawl is a killer BUT growth by higher density does not mean affordable housing and lower taxes (see #1 and #6). Studies, comparing housing prices in cities with and without growth controls concluded that "home prices need not be systematically higher or increase faster in growth control cities than in pro-growth cities" (page 45). It was the enactment of more affordable housing incentives in the growth controlled cities that likely accounted for this.

There is little doubt that the natural environment - the views, the beauty of our mountains and forests, contribute immensely to the desirability of living here. Densification often does irreparable damage to the very thing that we came here for. Small is beautiful. I for one want to keep it that way.

Corrie Kost

Bill Tracey wrote:

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

bafflegab 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](mailto: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