

Subject: RE: Larco's Preliminary Application

Date: Sat, 27 Nov 2004 19:43:40 -0800

From: "Ernie Crist" <ernie_crist@dnv.org>

To: <cathyadams@canada.com>

CC: "Mayor and Council - DNV" <Council@dnv.org>, "James Ridge" <James_Ridge@dnv.org>, "Senior Management Committee" <managecomm@dnv.org>, "Ross Taylor" <Ross_Taylor@dnv.org>, "Jennifer Paton" <Jennifer_Paton@dnv.org>, "Donna Howes" <Donna_Howes@dnv.org>, <fonvca@fonvca.org>, <Cagebc@yahoo.com>

Hello Cathy:

There is absolutely nothing to prevent your dream from becoming reality. It is just a matter of vision and political will on the part of your community and compelling Council to provide the necessary leadership. The key is unity. I am sure Larco would be more than happy to build a community center at no cost to the District if the economics i.e. the density for the site is in his favour. This is the crux of the issue. It does not take a rocket scientist to figure out that this is what Mayor Harris was told by Larco.

The point I want to stress again is that the District can play the expropriation card provided it has the will to do so, but it may not have to do this. The District can use its resources to make your dream come true and with little cost to the community if modern development methods are applied.

As for Lynn Valley - it is a total fiasco. Don't be misled by the propaganda and by the dollar figures. The people of Lynn Valley are NOT getting a community center as promised. They were in fact cheated out of it. The fact that some politicians and some naïve and gullible community activists so called deny this is totally irrelevant. The facts speak for themselves and there is a lesson in this for the people of the District.

The community space was virtually eliminated. Did you know that the Museum and Archives project which was part of the original combined building as a \$ 1.5 million project is now \$ 4.2 million? It was supposed to be part of the combined Library - Community Center and Museum and Archives building of 70,000 square feet. It is now a library of 40,000 square foot only more or less. The 15,000 square foot community space is gone.

Just think for a moment - as of this moment the cost of the center is \$ 41 million and consists of nothing more than a replacement Library building and a 12,000 square foot cobble stone plaza. You cannot count the commercial building as community space however hard they are trying to tell you that it is. It would be like saying that Larco's office building at the proposed Larco site is community space. You would laugh your head off but that is exactly what they are trying to tell the people of Lynn Valley.

So tell me where the people of Lynn valley are going to meet?... where is the community space? .. where are the seniors going to gather? and where are the cultural and social events going to take place? Are they going to take place on the cobble stone plaza in the middle of the rainy season? Are lectures and small concerts and the chess and bridge players going to play on the plaza in the cobble stone plaza in the winter time? Maybe Zellers will provide the rain coats?

The fact is that this whole plan is a monumental hoax perpetrated on the people of Lynn Valley and was made possible with the acquiescence of gullible people and people with a giant ego unwilling to concede that they have been misled.

But instead of acknowledging that they were led up the garden path they joined in the parade stating that the emperor has beautiful clothes when in reality the emperor is naked. The truth is that this massive densification in the center of Lynn Valley called "pedestrian oriented town center" is not even paying for the cost of the infrastructure never mind for any community benefits unless you count more traffic, more pollution and more parking problems as benefits.

It is nothing more than a densification project for the benefit of developers without a single large amenity. And this is so whether so called leaders deny it or not. I hope your people will not fall into the same trap. I am sure you and your friends are to wise to fall for tricks like that.

As I said at the beginning, unity is the key, the rest is vision and political will.

Remember, if people lead sooner or later politicians will follow.

Ernie Crist

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

From: cathyadams@canada.com [<mailto:cathyadams@canada.com>]

Sent: Saturday, November 27, 2004 3:01 PM

To: Ernie Crist

Cc: Mayor and Council - DNV; James Ridge; Senior Management Committee; Ross Taylor;

Jennifer Paton; Donna Howes

Subject: RE: Larco's Preliminary Application

Ernie -

Thanks for your reply.

The point of this email was to clear up some of the difference of opinion people - community residents, staff, members of council, etc. - had as to what Larco was intending to contribute. It's hard to have a constructive conversation when people can't agree on "facts".

I was especially interested that Mayor Harris, in last Tuesday's financial planning meeting, said "we may have the Lower Cap Community Centre built for us." I really wondered whether there had been a big change on Larco's part. I, for one, wanted to know what was, or was not, behind that comment.

I also thought Art Phillips might be misspeaking when he put forward his suggestion of contributing in the same fashion as what Larco could expect were they in the City of Vancouver, and my research backs my suspicion on that.

His statements about Vancouver's CAC policy have been "incomplete" and therefore incorrect.

The Marine Drive Draft Plan advocates a Community Amenity Contribution. From their website, it looks like the City of Vancouver has had such a policy since 1990. The list of projects that have been funded is long and diverse.

As for acquisition of the former winter club site by the District, I have a really exciting vision for the lower Capilano area that encompasses not just that site, but to the east, including Capilano Road itself.

Acquisition of the site could go a long way towards solving the related problems of Cap Road width being too narrow to make improvements for vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists, and also a real concern by the Marine Drive Committee that the properties along the west of that block of Cap Road are not deep enough to achieve the pedestrian friendly revitalization we are looking for. Wouldn't it be exciting to see the area transformed into an enticing tourist environment, with shops and businesses that serve that group, as well as the surrounding community? We have a gem waiting to be uncovered.

The District could, in fact, recoup some of the acquisition cost through sale of land to Capilano Road property owners.

I have spoken to the head of the company who owns over half of that strip of commercial, and he is wanting to see a way for redevelopment, as well. With current conditions, it won't likely take place.

For this to happen will take real leadership from within the District itself. The question is, who might realize the opportunities presenting themselves right now, and act on them? The District has shown leadership in all other parts of the District - both Parkgate and the Lynn Valley Library are examples of that.

In lower Capilano, we have had land sales of over \$4 million dollars in the last year, and it's time to invest in this community.

Recent surveys by the District have shown that overall, residents of the entire lower Cap would approve siting our community centre on Fullerton, and in fact, many are opposed to it being built on Norgate Park. The residents around that site are now starting to get involved - they do not want the increased traffic and parking problems they foresee. (What a tragedy if we end up with NO site!)

I will be contacting councillors with more information about this vision. I will also be contacting senior staff.

Unfortunately, it has come to my attention that for all the talking about it I have done with staff I am in touch with all the time, it has likely not reached the ears of senior

staff.

I invite anyone to contact me about this - 987-8695.

Cathy Adams

On Sat, 27 Nov 2004 09:52:10 -0800, "Ernie Crist" wrote:


>
> Hello Cathy:
>
> I think you should keep in mind that staff was instructed
to
> include
> expropriation of the site as an option to be part of the forthcoming
> staff report to Council.
>
> Comprehensive development has long been a method of development in
> progressive communities around the world. It is a method which widens
> the options for comprehensive development by using the
total
> resources
> of a community including financial for large scale people oriented
> development and community objectives. It is a win win for
all
> participants - even the developers.
>
> Ernie Crist
>
> Incidentally, are you aware that it took Councillor Crist years and
> years before Council finally adopted a policy of charging DCC's? Are
> you aware of how many millions of dollars the District lost as
a
> result of
> Council refusing to implement such a policy year after year and at a
> time when the land sales market was hot? This is just by
the
> bye.
>
> Ernie Crist
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: cathyadams@canada.com [<mailto:cathyadams@canada.com>]
> Sent: Saturday, November 27, 2004 12:47 AM
> To: a.phil@telus.net
> Cc: Mayor and Council - DNV; valeriem@blaze.ca; wker@vcn.bc.ca; James
> Ridge; Ross Taylor; Jennifer Paton; Irwin Torry; alalji@larco.ca;
> talston@larco.ca; hmccutcheon@larco.ca
> Subject: RE: Larco's Preliminary Application
>
> Art -
> Thank you for your response. I hope it will serve to clarify things
> to the extent possible at this time, and contribute to a meaningful
> dialogue for all involved.
>
> In the couple of days since I sent the original email, I have had a
> chance to research the City of Vancouver's policy on Community Amenity
> Contributions, since you have been using their policy as a guideline
> for what you suggest should be Larco's contribution for thier
> proposal.
> You make an incorrect statement in your email:
>
> "As for the City of Vancouver Community Amenity Contribution,
> > the developer

> > pays the CAC on the net increase of the FSR after the
> rezoning. He
> > does not pay on the gross FSR of the new zoning. Larco,
> however, is
> > proposing to pay on the gross square footage and not the
> net
> > increase."
>
> In fact, their policy states that "... rezonings that
change
> the use
> from commercial to residential without increasing total floor area -
> in this case the flat rate (\$3) applies to the increase in residential
> floor space."
>
> So, for the proposal under discussion, the \$3. per
buildable
> would apply
> to all of the project, not just any uplift.
>
> The City of Vancouver policy also states that for a large site
> rezoning such as Larco's proposal, the CAC is actually negotiated,
> taking into account a list of issues such as adequacy of neighbourhood
> facilities, etc. The only example I could find was for \$4. per square
> foot, in a specific area. I could not determine any other negotiated
> amounts from sources on their website.
>
> Again, thank you for your response. I hope my research
will
> also
> contribute.
>
> Cathy
>
>
> On Fri, 26 Nov 2004 17:32:26 -0800, "Art Phillips" wrote:
>
> >
> > Good evening Cathy.
> >
> > To answer your questions, Larco is volunteering to
provide
> the
> > following contributions to the community and District:
> >
> > 1. Dedication of 1.35 acres for park and/or community
> centre.
> > 2. Dedication of extension and construction of laneway
> along
> > the east
> > property line. (separate from the 1.35 ac. for parks)
> > 3. Dedication and construction of the widening of Curling
> > Road adjacent
> > to the property. (separate from the 1.35 ac. for parks)
> > Construction of
> > off-site improvements as determined by the District
> engineering
> > department.
> > 4. Dedication and construction of a bicycle path along
the
> > western
> > property line. (separate from the 1.35 ac. for parks)
> > 5. Design and construction of a new traffic signal at
> > Curling Avenue.
> > 6. Synchronization of the traffic lights at Fullerton,

> > Curling and
> > Marine. It is our understanding that the District has
> > issued an RFP for
> > a Corridor Transportation Study for Marine Drive from
> > Capilano Road east to
> > MacKay and Larco's traffic consultant will work with the
> > successful
> > proponent in coordinating the improvements proposed by
> > Larco.
> > 7. Community Amenity Contribution of \$3.00 per gross
> > buildable square
> > foot of residential building.
> > 8. As with all developments in the District, the payment
> of
> > the
> > Development Cost Charge. We have suggested that Larco
> will
> > work with the
> > District in determining how the parks component of the
> > DCC, which
> > equates to \$5.13 per gross square foot, can be applied
> > directly to the
>
> > community centre.
> >
> > As for the City of Vancouver Community Amenity
> > Contribution,
> > the developer
> > pays the CAC on the net increase of the FSR after the
> > rezoning. He
> > does not pay on the gross FSR of the new zoning. Larco,
> > however, is
> > proposing to pay on the gross square footage and not the
> > net increase.
>
> > As
> > we
> > have discussed
> > on numerous occasions, the FSR that currently applies to
> > the
> > property is
> > based on Commercial Recreational and it does not include
> > any
> > residential
> > component.
> >
> > The total financial contributions to be paid by Larco
> > cannot
> > be determined
> > until such time as a formal development plan is created
> > and this will
> > be done in consultation with the community, if Council
> > agrees that
> > there is an opportunity for Larco to work in partnership
> > with the
> > community.
> >
> > If you have any other questions, please do not hesitate
> > to
> > contact me.
> >
> > Have a great weekend.
> >
> > Art
> >

> > -----Original Message-----
> > From: cathyadams@canada.com
> > [<mailto:cathyadams@canada.com>]
> > Sent: November 25, 2004 12:40 AM
> > To: a.phil@telus.net
> > Cc: council@dnv.org; valeriem@blaze.ca; wker@vcn.bc.ca;
> > James_Ridge@dnv.org; Ross_Taylor@dnv.org;
> > Jennifer_Paton@dnv.org;
> > Irwin_Torry@dnv.org
> > Subject: Larco's Preliminary Application
> >
> > Hello Art
> >
> > I need some clarification on the issue of any financial
> > contribution
> > Larco proposes to make as part of the current application
> > the District
> >
> > has received.
> >
> > I have a copy of the letter from you dated November 8th,
> > 2004 to the Planning Department. Unfortunately, a lot of
> > that letter
> > seems to deal with the prior three scenarios presented by
> > Larco. With
> >
> > that, and as a result of the meeting last week held with
> > Larco reps,
> > neighbourhood reps, and staff,- and also what I am
hearing
> > from
> > different sources, it does not seem anyone is really
clear.
> >
> > The question is, what financial contribution does Larco
> > propose to
> > make to the District in conjunction with their current
> > proposal?
> >
> > When previously discussing the original three scenarios,
> > now
> > abandoned, you stated, in writing, that Larco proposed to
> > contribute
> > "\$3.00 per buildable square foot of residential building
> > that is over
> > 284,229 square feet in area." That square footage seems
> > to be based
> > on a proposal to
> > contribute
> > over and above any development above 1.5 fsr. (Larco
> > disregards the fact that they are permitted to build - 0
-
> > square feet
> >
> > of residential.)
> >
> > The \$3.00 per square foot contribution seems to be based
> > on the City
> > of Vancouver's Community Amenity Contribution.
> > From
> > page 5 of your letter to the District "the City of
> > Vancouver
> > has an adopted CAC bylaw that requires every developer
> > that achieves a
> >

> > rezoning, to make a contribution of \$3 per gross
buildable
> square foot
>
> > for the net increase in density."
> >
> > Are you saying, in Vancouver at least, that developers
are
> charged \$3
>
> > for any square feet over the base amount of fsr permitted
> on a site?
> > It is not payable on the entire development?
> >
> > Page 5 of your letter seems to be the point where you
> begin addressing
>
> > Larco's Preliminary Development Proposal. From that
point
> on,
> > however, no mention is made of any financial
contribution.
> Some
> > people have taken remarks you've made
> as
> > Larco intending to make a Community Amenity
Contribution.
> > However, I know from listening to you at our meeting last
> week, that
> > you refer to DCC's as a contribution. If
> someone
> > does not know differently, they could take you to mean
> those
> > fees as an amenity contribution. They might not know to
> ask
> > that clarifying question.
> >
> > Art, I'd appreciate your answers to the questions I've
> raised. I find
>
> > it frustrating that every one is not on
> "the
> > same page" when it comes to an understanding of what
Larco
> proposes.
> > It is not at all clear to me, when I hear different
things
> from
> > different people who have talked or met with you.
> >
> > Cathy Adams

| | |
|---|--|
|  winmail.dat | Name: winmail.dat Type: application/ms-tnef Encoding: base64 Download Status: Not downloaded with message |
|---|--|