

Subject: Re: CD54 - BC Rail lands

Date: Tue, 04 Oct 2005 08:55:57 -0700

From: Corrie Kost <kost@triumf.ca>

To: Cathy Adams <cathyadams@canada.com>

CC: dncouncil@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, cagebc@yahoo.com

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*

>

>