

**Subject: FW: Subdivision application Williams Road ;District of North Vancouver Council agenda District Council agenda Feb. 9,2004**

**Date:** Wed, 18 Feb 2004 22:49:52 -0800

**From:** "Ernie Crist" <ernie\_crist@dnv.org>

**To:** <Kost@triumf.ca>

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Ernie Crist

> Sent: February 18, 2004 5:18 PM

> To: James Ridge

> Subject: RE: Subdivision application Williams Road ;District of North Vancouver Council agenda District Council agenda Feb. 9,2004

>

>

>

>

> Dear Mr. Ridge:

>

>

> While I appreciate your response in clarifying staff's interpretation of this issue, this does not mean that I agree with this interpretation ( the emperor has beautiful clothes) and/or those policies and bylaws which, in my opinion, are at best meaningless and at worst misleading. My particular problem is the use of the word "recommend" as a tool to influence Council. I consider this to be a form of disrespect not only to the elected representatives but first and foremost to the electors.

>

> You have explained that the existing environmental protection Bylaws, for practical reasons, do not have the same validity within developed areas as they have in undeveloped or new areas. That is a fact of life and is understood. However, you will undoubtedly agree that the spirit and the moral force which has guided efforts to protect the environment in new areas cannot, at will, be ignored in developed areas. If it is a matter of choice and you cannot in good conscience at the same time promote the protection of the environment in one area while at the same time RECOMMEND that policies serving the same objective be violated in other areas albeit you may have the discretionary power to do so.

>

> I find it curious to say at the very least, that on one hand we state that we wish to protect fish bearing streams, creeks, have guidelines to that effect including setbacks etc. based on "Federal guidelines" and in addition have a whole slew of "environmental" staff in our employ and on the other hand "RECOMMEND" to Council approval of subdivisions DVP's etc. that are against the very essence and spirit of such professed objectives.

>

> By way of example, there is something wrong with the recent finger pointing between the District and the D.F.O. as to who is responsible for forcing an individual to demolish a structure built adjacent to the Seymour River in clear violation of any and all bylaws and policies, both federal and municipal.

>

> As far as I am concerned every decent and self-respecting citizen should be ashamed of such shenanigans. I wonder what the press would say were they to find out. And I don't think it sets a good example for the young people who found out and reported this violation to the District. My question is why did our staff NOT inform us before that our existing bylaws, are not adequate as they now claim. Why did we go through an expensive process and pay out taxpayers money if, in the end, it turns out to be a hoax more or less?

>

> Did it ever occur to anybody that there is something wrong that on one hand we are paying people to help us promote protecting the environment and on the other hand we are allowing those very same people to RECOMMEND approval of bylaws that are in clear contradiction of those very same objectives? Under these circumstances threats do not frighten me. You may wish to inform those people that I am quite willing to accept the consequences. I am quite willing to take this to the people directly. I wish you to know that during the next election I will do so in any case.

>

> You also stated that if you chose to take this further, more or less, this would mean "another formal Positive Workplace Policy/Code of Ethics complaint" against me. I must remind you that the first complaint still belongs in the category of "alleged" and has never been proven. Neither will it ever be proven for the simple reason that it was a lie from beginning to end - District PAID LAWYERS notwithstanding.

>  
> My reply to these threats is, take me to court - I will be more than happy to explain to a judge and /or jury my side of the story. Indeed, I can hardly wait. I will make sure that the public knows every detail including that the CODE of Ethics in the District applies to> elected officials only and not to staff. In case anybody is not clear about the meaning of all this - in the final analysis, the issue is about the use of the word RECOMMEND - explain that to the public.

>  
> Yours truly,  
>  
> Ernie Crist

> -----Original Message-----

> From: James Ridge  
> Sent: February 18, 2004 10:14 AM  
> To: Ernie Crist  
> Subject: RE: Subdivision application Williams Road ;District of North Vancouver Council agenda District Council agenda Feb. 9,2004

> Councillor Crist,

> I'm glad my e-mail outlining the history of the various riparian protection policies was useful.

> I fear that your comments in the email below may precipitate another formal Positive Workplace Policy/Code of Ethics complaint against you from staff. This would in turn require another investigation by a lawyer, etc. Some of the staff who authored the report have contacted me about your e-mail. They are professional engineers and feel that your comments impugn their professional reputations, and suggest that they have violated their professional oaths. The phrase "completely unprofessional" and the suggestion that staff misled council are the types of comments that cause considerable concern to staff who are governed by professional ethics bodies.

> You may wish to consider taking the appropriate steps to prevent another complaint.

> James Ridge  
> CAO

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Ernie Crist  
> Sent: Tuesday, February 17, 2004 8:51 AM  
> To: James Ridge  
> Cc: Richard Zerr; Irwin Torry; Mayor and Council - DNV  
> Subject: Subdivision application Williams Road ;District of North Vancouver Council agenda District Council agenda Feb. 9,2004

> Mr. Ridge;

> I am obliged to make the following comments regarding the subdivision application, Williams Road, Council Agenda Monday, February 9,2004. The key issue of this application was the vicinity of a fish bearing stream and/or creek and the corresponding environmental protection bylaws which guide development adjacent to such bodies.

> As I understand it no development may take place within 30 meters of a fish bearing stream and/or creek. However, this crucial fact and this crucial information was never revealed in the staff report. There was not a single mention to this effect that I am aware of.

> As such the report was not only incomplete but it was completely unprofessional  
> if not misleading. What we got was not only a biased report but recommendations to  
> approve as well.

>  
> I suggest that henceforth staff desist from making any kind of recommendations  
> when it comes to subdivision applications and /or Development variance applications. I  
> suggest that henceforth staff merely provide Council with the relevant (professional)  
> FACTS and list options.

>  
> Yours truly,

>  
> Ernie Crist

>  
>