

**Subject: Re: CD54 - BC Rail lands**

**Date:** Tue, 4 Oct 2005 16:07:07 +0100 (BST)

**From:** Elizabeth James <cagebc@yahoo.com>

**To:** Cathy Adams <cathyadams@canada.com>, dnvCouncil@dnv.org

**CC:** corrie@kost.ca, James\_Ridge@dnv.org, hunterjohn@telus.net, wrtracey@telus.net, fonvca@fonvca.org, pat45@shaw.ca, allandorr@shaw.ca, macdunn@uniserve.com, Irwin\_Torry@dnv.org, Donna\_Howes@dnv.org, andersen@sagafc.com, m.bragg@shaw.ca, valeriem@blaze.ca, bplatts@shaw.ca

4 October 2005

Dear Mrs. Adams:

In view of the utter confusion into which this discussion descended, I believe the item should be returned to Council at the next meeting.

Last night was not a night to be debating the merit or otherwise of a particular use. It was an Agenda item, containing a straightforward recommendation that Council decide whether or not the matter should be referred to a Public Hearing for citizen comment. Yes, No. Clr. Muri suggested an amendment, which also did not need extensive discussion about the details of Bus Depot vs other. It required only a brief rationale and a Yes we include it, No we don't answer.

As it was, following rambling discussions about what each councillor thought might be appropriate for the site, and about how TransLink might feel after "five years of hard work", it became apparent that few knew for sure what it was they were actually voting on. The item needs to be revisited - this time just sticking strictly to the Staff recommendations, as they may or may not be amended.

As for Clr. Muri's proposed amendment - while I, too, would like to see the Bus Depot eliminated from the options, unless and until Council tells TransLink that the BC Rail lands are not an option, that it will not even be considered for the site, that use will always be hanging over any discussion, public or otherwise. Therefore, I think it is pointless to try to eliminate it from discussion at the Public Hearing....it won't work.

On the other hand, it might be a test of the issue, if Clr. Muri would put forward a motion THAT Council advise TransLink that it is not prepared to rezone the BC Rail lands to accommodate use of the site for a bus depot but THAT Council is prepared to work immediately and closely with TransLink to identify an alternate site for a depot operation in the Eastern portion of the District --- which is where TransLink has indicated most of its fleet needs to travel in any event.

Further, it's my belief that this agenda item, the Fern Street neighbourhood disruption, the highway changes and the proposed Squamish developments are all inter-related and that Council needs to be looking at the entire picture, rather than this one quadrant. The only reason that this has become "urgent" is that the City and TransLink - I believe for purely political reasons - has decided it wishes to "jam" District Council into an immediate, easy for them, decision.

The "jamming technique" is a relatively new phenomenon, developed by the government in Victoria, and eagerly honed by every elected and unelected body that wishes to have its way without following due process and with little or no regard for future vision or consequences.

I'm with Clr. Muri - all for courteous cooperation.....just so long as we know there are times one must bite the bullet and stand up for ourselves. Now is the time for the bullet.

Thx Cathy, for opening the discussion.....

Liz

*Cathy Adams <cathyadams@canada.com> wrote:*

Dear Mayor and Council

It was interesting, to say the least, to listen to the debate on the issue of forwarding this property to a public hearing to consider rezoning it for the purpose of accommodating a transit centre.

In reading the actual bylaw, the Principal Use Regulations state that "Nothing shall be done on the property which is or may become a

nuisance or annoyance to the surrounding area ..." It goes on to list these potential annoyances as items such as fumes, noise, glare, odours, etc.

So I question how a transit depot on the site would adhere to this provision for the CD54 zoning. This is not a rhetorical question - I really do hope someone can answer it!

The Lower Capilano OCP has been quoted in the discussion of this rezoning. I sat on that OCP committee. One provision in the OCP not spoken of to date is the section that deals with the protection of liveability for the neighbourhoods of Lower Capilano.

Cathy Adams

---

To help you stay safe and secure online, we've developed the all new [Yahoo! Security Centre](#).