

Subject: [Fwd: Distirct Misleading Advertising]

Date: Sat, 01 Dec 2001 11:54:56 -0800

From: Brian Platts <brian_platts@telus.net>

To: Corrie Kost <kost@triumf.ca>

Subject: Distirct Misleading Advertising

Date: Sat, 1 Dec 2001 09:00:24 -0800

From: "Dave Sadler" <davesadler@telus.net>

To: "Ernie Crist" <CristE@district.north-van.bc.ca>, "Mayor and Council - DNV" <Council@district.north-van.bc.ca>, "Directors Team" <managecomm@district.north-van.bc.ca>, "FONVCA (E-mail)" <fonvca@fonvca.org>

Dear Councillor Crist: I've brought the issue of misleading & confusing advertising to the attention of the Clerk's Department on previous occasions. My most serious complaint regarded the Nov.20/99 Referendum Question #3.

I believe any referendum question should be able to stand alone as to its true meaning or intent. This was not the case with Question #3 which asked "are you in favour of the Cutter Island Park Dedication Bylaw, Amending Bylaw 1"?

Without reading the fine print, I believe the public were deceived into assuming that parkland was being protected, when in actual fact the very opposite is true. Parkland was being "undedicated" so it could be used for the Dollarton bridge expansion. I believe this 'trickery' was done deliberately by the District to gain electorate approval.

A more recent example of confusing advertising concerned Big Box stores. The District somehow expected the public to know the size of a 40,000 square foot store which is unreasonable. By rights, well known retail locations should have been provided as examples ranging for 20, 30, 40, 50, & 60,000 feet so the public could have a handle on what was being proposed.

Yours truly, Dave Sadler

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

From: "Ernie Crist" <CristE@district.north-van.bc.ca>

To: "Mayor and Council - DNV" <Council@district.north-van.bc.ca>; "Directors Team" <managecomm@district.north-van.bc.ca>; "FONVCA (E-mail)" <fonvca@fonvca.org>

Sent: Friday, November 30, 2001 11:21 PM

> *A message from Ernie Crist:*

>

> *I believe we made some progress at last Tuesday's public meeting on*
> *"trespasses of District land", still I do not believe that the*
> *advertising*

> *in the District Dialogue as printed in the OUTLOOK on Nov 22-2001 did*
> *justice to the importance of the issue of "Upcoming Meetings - Authorized*
> *Occupations and Trespasses - District owned Lands". No wonder one*
> *Councillor was moved to state that judging by the turnout he did not*
> *think*

> *the general public thought this issue to be too important.*

>

> *I suggest that the ad should have read "Are you in favor that some people*
> *in*

> *the District are getting a special discount for occupying District lands*
> *as*

> *the case may be while others have to pay the going market rate? Or are*

you

> *in favor of subsidizing one section of the District population at the
> expense of the rest? - something to that effect.*

>

> *You want to bet that the turnout would have been quite different. The
> question is was this small worded ad a coincidence? Indeed, I suggest
that*

> *the heading itself was misleading. This is quite apart from the miniscule
> print of the ad itself, not to mention that this important matter
should*

> *have been published in the North Shore News as well. There should also
have*

> *been a press release.*

>

> *In any case I believe that the taxpayers were entitled to an appropriate
> level of advertising commensurate with the importance of this issue and
> not just in the "Outlook".*

>

> *Ernie Crist.*

>