

Subject: Re: Policy for assent to un-dedicate dedicated parkland - Agenda item #7 Oct 18th

Date: Sun, 17 Oct 2004 20:39:07 -0700

From: Brian Platts <bplatts@shaw.ca>

To: Ernie Crist <ernie_crist@dnv.org>

CC: Corrie Kost <kost@triumf.ca>, Mayor and Council - DNV <Council@dnv.org>, Senior Management Committee <managecomm@dnv.org>, "FONVCA (E-mail)" <fonvca@fonvca.org>, Cagebc@yahoo.com, tcarolan@telus.net, "Chris Dorais (E-mail)" <cdorais@telus.net>, "Doug Hill (E-mail)" <doughill@hotmail.com>, "Glenn Henderson (E-mail)" <glenhenderson@telus.net>, "Jim Cuthbert (E-mail)" <jimcuthbert@telus.net>, "Joan Gadsby (E-mail)" <joangadsby@pacificcoast.net>, "Kevin Bell (E-mail)" <sonbel@shaw.ca>, "Robin Hicks (E-mail)" <robinhicks@telus.net>, "Roger Bassam (E-mail)" <IMCEAEX-Roger+40millarsleague+2Ecom@dnv.org>, "Bruce Crowe (E-mail)" <mbr41@telus.net>, "Doug MacKay-Dunn (E-mail)" <macdunn@uniserve.com>, "Michael D. Molson (E-mail)" <formikemolson@aol.com>

Dear Councillor Crist,

With all due respect, you are off topic. You made exactly the same points in a previous September e-mail which I answered (see below).

At risk of repeating myself, this issue is not about what can be constructed under the various park zones, but rather, the threat that ANY parkland dedicated by referendum can now, under the Charter, be undedicated without obtaining the necessary assent of the electors (i.e. another referendum). Park ZONING is a separate issue entirely.

Even IF Council had approved your motion and rezoned all existing parks into the "natural parks category," the threat would be the same under the Charter for parks to be undedicated by Council without obtaining the assent of the electors through a mandatory referendum.

Your argument that people think of "parks" as only natural forested areas is not true. Parks like Delbrook, Eldon, Norgate Parks etc., are made up of playing fields for soccer, baseball, football, tennis and all have field house buildings. Griffin Park, another example, has skateboarding facilities, an artificial turf playing field -- and of course the huge Griffin Rec. centre. These parks are hardly natural and it wouldn't make any sense to deem them as such.

Sincerely,
-Brian

Dear Councillor Crist,

Thank you for your response. Actually FONVCA is very much aware of the various park zones, including the Community Park Zone (CP), Neighbourhood Park Zone (NP), and Natural Parkland Zone (NPL). In fact, FONVCA participated in a complete review of the park zones a few years ago.

Of course our parks provide for many uses beyond forest and green areas such as that designated in the NPL zone. Community Parks accommodate multi-purpose uses including facilities like community centres, swimming pools, parking, concession stands, skateboard bowls, tennis courts etc. Neighbourhood Parks often accommodate sports fields, playgrounds, field houses, washrooms, among other uses along the same lines. Both the CP and NP Zones can also include natural forest and water course areas as well. Those parks designated as Natural Park -- such as your example of Bridgeman Park -- are those parks which remain in their natural state, but still may accommodate interpretive facilities or public washrooms.

The request that FONVCA was trying to make was not about what could be constructed under the EXISTING Park Zones, but rather, the possibility provided by the Community Charter for Council to undedicate parkland without a referendum and then, through a simple rezoning process, put the land to a completely different use altogether.

To re-emphasize, what FONVCA is fighting for is the very survival of our dedicated parks. Already West Vancouver (see page 11 of today's *North Shore News*) has begun the process by selling off a chunk of park which was dedicated in 1979 to an adjacent owner without going through referendum. Please consider this matter as a high priority.

Sincerely,
Brian Platts
Federation of NV Community Associations

Ernie Crist wrote:

Dear Dr. Kost;

You may recall that following the third parks dedication Bylaw (the result of an original motion by Councillor Crist to dedicate ALL District parks but despite promises by staff never done) I submitted a motion that all parks be put into the "natural parks category" since in my opinion this is the only way to maintain their effective and intended use. I did this since in my opinion it makes little difference whether a park is dedicated or not if it may be changed from its natural and green state to "Park related purposes" including ice rinks and swimming pools which includes paved parking lots and do so without much ado.

However, of the 90.000 or so residents in the District only one residents namely Mrs. Pat Neufeld saw fit to support this motion albeit not to support Crist's motion (God forbid) but to secure (her) Bridgeman Park. This Council did. In effect this means that Bridgeman Park may not be used for purposes other than green space (no structures) as mentioned above. In all other cases structures may be built rather than acquire land for such purposes by way of utilizing the Heritage Fund.

After all, when people speak of "Parks" they usually mean green space. However, since nobody supported my motion including Councillor Muri and the "environmentalist" Harris, (I suppose they followed Don Bell's and staff's advice) I find it somewhat unconvincing to make a case for this motion since in effect it is ineffective in protecting parks. While I agree with the principle of the motion as I have done in the past, this bylaw is like locking the front door while leaving the back door open.

Yours truly,

Ernie Crist

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

From: Corrie Kost [<mailto:kost@triumf.ca>]

Sent: October 16, 2004 8:49 PM

To: Alan Nixon; Agnes Hilsen; Ernie Crist; Lisa Muri; Maureen McKeon Holmes; Mayor and Council - DNV

Subject: Policy for assent to un-dedicate dedicated parkland - Agenda item #7 Oct 18th

Your Worship & Members of Council,

Although the report by James Ridge mentions, as expected, that a policy that council use only assent (referendum) to undedicate dedicated park is neither binding on current nor future councils it is nevertheless still well worth adopting such a policy. Once in place it requires additional steps (and reflective consideration) council should take on the important issue of ever undedicating dedicated parkland.

I still find it highly unethical that the province has unilaterally undone all the important dedication DNV bylaws of the past. It is not like past generations had robbed future ones of their choices. Undedication should justifiably be done by referendum for any future generations.

Please support past "covenants" by at least adopting such a policy.

Your truly,

Corrie Kost

|