

Subject: [Fwd: NVD IN-CAMERA DISCUSSIONS]

Date: Mon, 22 Jul 2002 18:00:33 -0700

From: Brian Platts <brian_platts@telus.net>

To: Corrie Kost <kost@triumf.ca>

Subject: NVD IN-CAMERA DISCUSSIONS

Date: Mon, 22 Jul 2002 16:41:54 -0700

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

To: "Agnes Hilsen" <ahilsen@district.north-van.bc.ca>,
"Mayor and Council - DNV" <Council@district.north-van.bc.ca>

CC: "FONVCA" <fonvca@fonvca.org>

Dear Agnes Hilsen:

I continue to question whether certain issues qualify to be discussed by District Council in-camera and whether the public would be better served by having them debated in a regular District Council meeting instead.

I site two recent examples:

1) The decision to delay/postpone the Lower Capilano Community Centre until February 2003 which was approved by referendum in 1996. Although I agree that certain aspects of this proposal qualified as being confidential, the discussion/debate to delay did not. This decision will prove to be a disappointment to the Lower Capilano community & as such, they deserve better than a curt one line in-camera decision.

2) The discussion as to whether a retired director of the NVRC should be sent to a conference at a cost of \$3000. This is a very simple policy decision. Moreover NVCity, our partner in the NVRC did not feel it qualified to be discussed in-camera but in an open council meeting.

I feel the District is taking too liberal an interpretation of what is allowed to be discussed in-camera. I believe issues which legitimately qualify to be discussed in-camera are expanded upon once behind closed doors to include particulars which do not qualify.

Once again I request that the District's policy regarding in-camera items be reviewed.

Yours truly, Dave Sadler