

Subject: Re: CD54 - BC Rail lands

Date: Tue, 04 Oct 2005 12:51:43 -0700

From: Cathy Adams <cathyadams@canada.com>

To: Elizabeth James <cagebc@yahoo.com>, Corrie Kost <kost@triumf.ca>, Cathy Adams <cathyadams@canada.com>

CC: dnvouncil@dnv.org, corrie@kost.ca, James_Ridge@dnv.org, hunterjohn@telus.net, wrtracey@telus.net, fonvca@fonvca.org, pat45@shaw.ca, allandorr@shaw.ca, macdunn@uniserve.com, Irwin_Torry@dnv.org, Donna_Howes@dnv.org, andersen@sagafc.com, m.bragg@shaw.ca, valeriem@blaze.ca, bplatts@shaw.ca

Liz , and other.

In response to some of your points:

The Lloyd Avenue site.

My understanding is that, even if it were to be expanded to other DNV land adjacent and across the street, next to the tennis centre, there is not enough land for all North Shore buses. The land itself may be unsuitable - it is swampy and would have to be worked on, may be environmentally unwise, etc. Don't know about that. Long ago the question was asked about the possibility of closing Lloyd to through traffic at the south, to gain additional space for a combined depot, but I don't believe that idea was ever fully explored. The initial reaction was that the businesses in the area would be opposed. BTW - I trust everyone knows that West Van leases the property from the District - that land is owned by DNV.

Mayor Harris was quite incorrect when she stated last night that the West Van depot is closer to the Norgate neighbourhood than the proposed BC Rail location. She was making the point that complaints have not been made about that depot. In fact, I am aware that the tennis centre users have complained a lot about the bus fumes, and would like to have some outdoor tennis to the south of their building, but are not pursuing that due to the pollution problem. They have also voiced strong opposition to any consideration of expansion of the West Van depot site, and bringing more buses close to them. As for resident complaints about the West Van facility - I think it's likely many people may think "What's the point - it's not like they can get rid of the depot itself", which would be the only real solution to noise and pollution concerns.

The BC Rail Site.

I specifically asked the question as to whether this site would be large enough for both Translink and West Van blue buses. The Translink rep told me that it would not be large enough, even if "union issues" could be worked out. I also asked the Translink rep about the natives interest in closing access to the area from the west, as some of their plans for the area show. Ken Hardie said he had never heard of such a suggestion. This is another example of an issue that needs to be explored, as it affects the area's suitability for (2?) bus depots. I was not impressed that Translink has not done their homework in this regard. Their traffic consultant tries to use this as an argument in favour of the depot's location, but it is not explored, at least in the summary document online. It is only dealt with as a partial closure of access to the west.

Councillor Cuthbert's suggestion that Translink may need to have two sites on the North Shore had been what I was thinking, so I'm glad someone brought it up. They could still have one place for the maintenance, and maybe even the washing of the buses. I'll bet there are examples of such a setup in other areas.

As for the argument of this being the only location ever identified as a suitable site for a bus depot - that's not correct. It's just that the City of North Vancouver and Squamish Nation, and even West Vancouver, have never considered any large sites in their areas for such a use. They prefer to use their lands for tax generating uses that their community wants to make use of. Let the District have all of it, hopefully.

As for the current depot site on Third Street, it is owned by Translink, so they are likely working with the City on a rezoning of it that will greatly benefit both those parties.

Hope some of these points are useful to the discussion.

Cathy

At 10:03 AM 10/4/2005, Elizabeth James wrote:

Corrie:

It's a distinct possibility that there is a typo in your otherwise very helpful rundown.... and your suggestion about Burnaby has given me another idea.....[duck!]

Supposing, as you suggest, T-Link put its depot in Burnaby and, concurrently, the West Van Blue Bus system was to expand to take up the slack on the North Shore - would there be enough room on Lloyd Avenue to house the additional number of buses required? Has the question been asked and answered already?

I realize that does not address the issue of the need to deploy buses eastward, and it does not address the issue of additional pollution and noise, but I haven't heard any complaints about the existing Lloyd facility....is anyone else aware of any?

Lastly, to be fair to all sides, I have spoken with a couple of people who feel that the BC Rail lands "are at least industrial already and not in a residential neighbourhood." I don't agree but thought I should put it forward anyway.....

Liz

Corrie Kost <kost@triumf.ca> wrote:

To say the least, I was disappointed with council's decision on this item. I am not aware of any district resident who favours including the depot use in this area, much less a groundswell of our residents who want to see a depot placed in such a non-central location. Certainly the local community seems rather strongly opposed. The threat of tax exemption, although perhaps not currently proposed, is a district (and likely) possibility in the future. Unlike private uses which evolve with time the depot is a rather static business - likely locking down land uses there for 50 years or more. We have to think long-term and to me there are better uses of these lands than a bus depot.

However the real danger is that the proposed (bad) bylaw may be adopted because of the fact that its defeat would set us back to square one. Make no mistake - council cannot simply remove a use and adopt the rest of the bylaw - as much as council may wish to do so.

The way out of this may be for council to reconsider what happened last night. Timing is critical here.

Bottom line: I see no particular advantage to having more buses serviced/stored on North Shore. If we are cut off from mainland by a catastrophic event then the buses would be of limited use anyway. Storage with centralized servicing in Burnaby makes sense, albeit a little inefficient on fuel to get them to the North Shore periodically. However, considering the buses run all day (and night?) that overhead is minor.

Cathy Adams wrote:

- > Dear Mayor and Council
- >
- > It was interesting, to say the least, to listen to the debate on the
- > issue of forwarding this property to a public hearing to consider
- > rezoning it for the purpose of accommodating a transit centre.
- >
- > In reading the actual bylaw, the Principal Use Regulations state that
- > "Nothing shall be done on the property which is or may become a
- > nuisance or annoyance to the surrounding area ..." It goes on to list
- > these potential annoyances as items such as fumes, noise, glare,
- > odours, etc.
- >
- > So I question how a transit depot on the site would adhere to this
- > provision for the CD54 zoning. This is not a rhetorical question - I
- > really do hope someone can answer it!
- >
- > The Lower Capilano OCP has been quoted in the discussion of this
- > rezoning. I sat on that OCP committee. One provision in the OCP not
- > spoken of to date is the section that deals with the protection of

> liveability for the neighbourhoods of Lower Capilano.

>

> Cathy Adams

>

>

How much free photo storage do you get? Store your holiday snaps for FREE with Yahoo! Photos. [Get Yahoo! Photos](#)