

Subject: Re: Policy for assent to un-dedicate dedicated parkland - Agenda item #7 Oct 18th

Date: Tue, 19 Oct 2004 17:56:28 -0700

From: Brian Platts <bplatts@shaw.ca>

To: Ernie Crist <ernie_crist@dnv.org>

CC: Mason Bell <sonbel@shaw.ca>, Corrie Kost <kost@triumf.ca>, Mayor and Council - DNV <Council@dnv.org>, Senior Management Committee <managecomm@dnv.org>, "FONVCA (E-mail)" <fonvca@fonvca.org>, Cagebc@yahoo.com, tcarolan@telus.net, "Chris Dorais (E-mail)" <cdorais@telus.net>, "Doug Hill (E-mail)" <dougrhill@hotmail.com>, "Glenn Henderson (E-mail)" <glenhenderson@telus.net>, "Jim Cuthbert (E-mail)" <jimcuthbert@telus.net>, "Joan Gadsby (E-mail)" <joangadsby@pacificcoast.net>, "Robin Hicks (E-mail)" <robinhicks@telus.net>, "Roger Bassam (E-mail)" <IMCEAEX-Roger+40millarsleague+2Ecom@dnv.org>, "Bruce Crowe (E-mail)" <mbr41@telus.net>, "Doug MacKay-Dunn (E-mail)" <macdunn@uniserve.com>, "Michael D. Molson (E-mail)" <formikemolson@aol.com>

Dear Councillor Crist,

The subject line of your e-mail refers to the "policy for assent to un-dedicate dedicated parkland." The subject you are discussing, however, is about park ZONING. These are two different topics.

I never suggested that Mrs. Neufeld's effort to rezone Bridgeman Park to "natural park" status was in vain. Indeed, park zoning is irrelevant to the discussion of the park dedication and un-dedication process. Please let me try again. The new Community Charter allows a municipal council -- through a counter-petition process -- to un-dedicate parkland that was previously dedicated by a referendum. West Vancouver has already used this new provision to un-dedicate parkland and then sell it.

Before the Charter, park "dedication" offered a much higher level of protection than zoning, because to change the dedication status (i.e. to "un-dedicate" a park) required another referendum. This is the reason why FONVCA recommended that Council adopt a policy that no dedicated park will be un-dedicated without the assent of the electors through a referendum.

Remember, under the Charter, even those dedicated parks like Bridgeman that are currently zoned "natural park", could hypothetically be un-dedicated by Council, re-zoned and sold off. The only real protection is to require a referendum.

Sincerely,
-Brian Platts

(dedication is done through approval of a referendum)

Ernie Crist wrote:

[MORE POLEMICS ON THE GREEN PARK THEME;](#)

The only person who really understood what this was all about it seems was Mrs. Pat Neufeld who came before Council to DEMAND that (her) Bridgman Park be designated a "natural park" - Council agreed and so did staff. They realized that a retreat on that issue was the better part of valor.

If you think that her efforts were in vain and would not save her park from the clutches of development to a different ("park related") purpose, then just try to build an ice rink and a parking lot to go with it on that site where there are now trees. She for one understood the meaning of allowing the camel to stick its head into the tent. She also knows how to defend (her) green park.

Why was the Parks Dedication Bylaw first raised some ten years ago held up time and time again and, in fact, never completed and why were we given one lame duck excuse after another for doing so. Is there a connection between this procrastination and the fact that developers have time and time again come forward and received or tried to receive pieces of parks to accommodate their developments?

Did it ever occur, that the purpose of parks in the concrete jungle is to maintain their Oxygen function now and even more so in the future? If you cannot see the wolf in sheep's clothing than I cannot help you. With the bylaw whereby parks are divided into different designations (I'm talking about the existing Parks) the camel's head is already in the tent.

Also, apparently it still has not sunk in that in the District one of the main functions of the District Heritage Fund was to use that Fund to acquire land when needed for certain purposes rather than using an existing green park for an ice rink complete with parking lot, by way of example. When I made a motion that all remaining parks be put into the natural category there was laughter. I can understand that - the laughers were told to do so by their developers and real estate friends and by people who prefer to play around with various designations - it makes their job easier. One such example might be the recent suggestion to sell a piece of parkland in the Delbrook area.

If you want more information on this subject go and ask Mrs. Pat Neufeld, Diana Belhouse or the Craver family living near Mountain View Park.

Ernie Crist

---Original Message-----

From: Mason Bell [<mailto:sonbel@shaw.ca>]

Sent: October 18, 2004 5:29 PM

To: Brian Platts; Ernie Crist

Cc: Corrie Kost; Mayor and Council - DNV; Senior Management Committee; FONVCA (E-mail); Cagebc@yahoo.com; tcarolan@telus.net; Chris Dorais (E-mail); Doug Hill (E-mail); Glenn Henderson (E-mail); Jim Cuthbert (E-mail); Joan Gadsby (E-mail); Robin Hicks (E-mail); Roger Bassam (E-mail); Bruce Crowe (E-mail); Doug MacKay-Dunn (E-mail); Michael D. Molson (E-mail)

Subject: Re: Policy for assent to un-dedicate dedicated parkland - Agenda item #7 Oct 18th

Dear Brian: You are absolutely correct!

Kevin Bell