

**Subject: Re: A Liberal Affair?**

**Date:** Wed, 21 Apr 2004 13:12:29 -0700

**From:** Maureen Bragg <m.bragg@shaw.ca>

**To:** Elizabeth James <cagebc@yahoo.com>, Brian Platts <bplatts@shaw.ca>, Mayor Bell and Council <council@dnv.org>

**CC:** James Ridge <James\_Ridge@dnv.org>, Richard Zerr <ZerrR@district.north-van.bc.ca>, Irwin Torry <Irwin\_Torry@dnv.org>, FONVCA <fonvca@fonvca.org>, "Allan Orr" <allandorr@shaw.ca>, Bill Tracey <wrtracey@telus.net>, "Cathy Adams" <cathyadams@canada.com>, Corrie Kost <kost@triumf.ca>, Eric Andersen <andersen@sagafc.com>, john hunter <hunterjohn@telus.net>, Kevin Bell <sonbel@shaw.ca>, "Andrew McCredie, Don Fiorvento" <newsroom@northshoreoutlook.com>, Bill Yager <billyager@shaw.ca>

Two very good letters, like the writers I am thoroughly disillusioned. This is not the first time a structure has been built first and permission asked for and granted afterwards. This could be considered as a form of discrimination, as only those who can afford to take the risk of maybe having to pull something down after it has been built, can ignore the laws of the community.

The homeowner who only has enough money to build a structure once, cannot afford to gamble and build without a permit.

This seems to me to be similar to the frustration experienced by the police, when they catch and charge a criminal with illegal activities, only to see them just as quickly back on the streets doing the same thing again. I believe it is called the "revolving door system".

If we cannot trust Council to uphold the laws they helped to write, who can we trust.

Sincerely Maureen Bragg

I believe we can all quote incidences where permission has been asked, after the deed has been done with very little in the way of a penalty. A small fine to a person with money is not a deterrent.

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

**From:** [Elizabeth James](#)

**To:** [Brian Platts](#) ; [Mayor Bell and Council](#)

**Cc:** [James Ridge](#) ; [Richard Zerr](#) ; [Irwin Torry](#) ; [FONVCA](#) ; ['Allan Orr'](#) ; [Bill Tracey](#) ; ['Cathy Adams'](#) ; [Corrie Kost](#) ; [Eric Andersen](#) ; [john hunter](#) ; [Kevin Bell](#) ; [Andrew McCredie, Don Fiorvento](#) ; [Maureen Bragg](#) ; [Bill Yager](#)

**Sent:** Wednesday, April 21, 2004 10:43 AM

**Subject:** Re: A Liberal Affair?

21 April 2004

Dear Mr. Platts:

You are to be commended for your letter and for your support of the position taken by Clrs. Muri and Crist on the Capilano Suspension Bridge matter.

To add to your introductory quote and related comments, I would like to remind Council of recent staff assertions, made during an exchange on the matter of another DVP - I *believe* on the DVP application that gave rise to Clr. Nixon's comment - viz. **"A District permit is required, even if the proposed work is only the moving of an electrical socket. If Staff visits a premises on another matter and finds evidence that work has been performed without a permit, Staff can require the whole thing to be removed and redone. Further, the permit for the replacement work will be double the normal fee and Staff may impose an additional fine"**

I have no doubt that the intention is that District code and safety practices should be obeyed, and I do not believe Staff wishes to be unreasonably punitive. Nevertheless, as you point out, it is far more likely that the District would chase down an individual homeowner to 'shape up or pay the considerable fines' than appears to be the case with the more influential owners of the Capilano Suspension Bridge operation.

What action can be/should be taken on this Council vote?.....

1. Mayor Bell should exercise his LGA/CC authority and return this matter to Council's agenda for immediate reconsideration; and,
2. If the follow-up vote still works to the benefit of the CSB and the offending construction, then I suggest that Council becomes, in effect, an *accomplice after the fact*, by enabling the continued existence of *significant* structures built without permit and outside District by-laws.

To be even more blunt, District taxpayers pay members of Council - and Staff - to develop zoning and safety by-laws

which *foster the economic, social and environmental well-being of the community*. In a case such as this, where District by-laws have been flagrantly and knowingly disobeyed, what message does Council convey to members of a professional staff when, by the raising of a hand or the stroke of a pen, all of their work is just swept aside? It just is not good enough.

All we can hope for at this point is that Mr. Ridge will review the matter closely and, should he agree with the points made in your letter, counsel the Mayor to return the vote for reconsideration at the earliest opportunity. In this regard, it will be interesting to see whether the LGA/CC can offer citizens any relief to this decision. If these pieces of legislation do not deem such a vote to be illegal *under the law* then, in my opinion, the legislation needs to be changed.

Lastly, whatever may develop from hereon, I am appalled at the ongoing actions of this corporation; it is to be hoped that other businesses will not regard them as a role model whose precedent example should be followed.

Sincerely,

Liz James  
[604] 988-2066

---

**Brian Platts** <[bplatts@shaw.ca](mailto:bplatts@shaw.ca)> wrote:

*"Ignorance of the law is no excuse for ignoring it or breaking it. It remains the citizen's responsibility to be aware of laws that govern our lives."* -  
**Coun. Alan Nixon, April 11th. North Shore News article on rejected DVP application.**

Mayor & Council:

Councillors Muri and Crist deserve full marks for their principled, honest, open, and ethical stance in response to the Capilano Suspension Bridge's blatant violation of the development process with respect to the unauthorized construction of the tree-top canopy walkway.....

---

[Yahoo! Messenger](#) - Communicate instantly..."Ping" your friends today! [Download Messenger Now](#)