

Subject: Opposed to Agenda items 8 and 9 on Secondary Suites

Date: Sun, 02 Oct 2005 22:52:58 -0700

From: Corrie Kost <corrie@kost.ca>

To: Ernie Crist <ecrist@dnv.org>, Janice Harris <jharris@dnv.org>, Lisa Muri <lmuri@dnv.org>, Maureen McKeon Holmes <mmckeonholmes@dnv.org>, Alan Nixon <anixon@dnv.org>, Richard Walton <rwalton@dnv.org>, Agnes Hilsen <HilsenA@district.north-van.bc.ca>, Jim Cuthbert <jcuthbert@dnv.org>, council@dnv.org

CC: fonvca@fonvca.org

Your Worship & Members of Council,

I disagree with both motions 8 & 9.

I disagree with the motion of Agenda item #8 on the basis the Home Owners Grant, being substantially higher for seniors, already compensates seniors for reduced services they impose on the District. Since the extra services imposed by a secondary suite is independent of whether the home is owned by a senior or not waiving of such the utility fee is not justified. Alternatively, if council believes that senior should have a break on their **utility portion of their taxes** then consideration should be given to further reduce taxes for all seniors who own a home.

I disagree with the motion of Agenda item #9 on the basis that the principle that secondary suites should only be allowed in owner occupied homes. This original requirement was strongly supported by the community and their associations as it provided the necessary accountability to ensure neighbours are not excessively impacted by having a secondary suite in homes in their neighbourhood. It is a contradiction to state that someone can be vindictive and have unfounded motives in reporting what is clearly a violation of district policy when the primary suite is also rented (and not occupied by the owner as required by policy).

Yours truly,

Corrie Kost

Corrie Kost <kost@triumf.ca>