

**Subject: RE: CD54 - BC Rail lands**

**Date:** Tue, 4 Oct 2005 11:31:54 -0700

**From:** "Ernie Crist" <ernie\_crist@dnv.org>

**To:** "Corrie Kost" <kost@triumf.ca>, "Cathy Adams" <cathyadams@canada.com>

**CC:** "DNVCouncil" <DNVCOUNCIL@dnv.org>, <corrie@kost.ca>, "James Ridge" <James\_Ridge@dnv.org>, <hunterjohn@telus.net>, "Council Remuneration" <wrtracey@telus.net>, <fonvca@fonvca.org>, <pat45@shaw.ca>, <allandorr@shaw.ca>, <macdunn@uniserve.com>, "Irwin Torry" <Irwin\_Torry@dnv.org>, "Donna Howes" <Donna\_Howes@dnv.org>, <andersen@sagafc.com>, <m.bragg@shaw.ca>, <valeriem@blaze.ca>, <bplatts@shaw.ca>, <cagebc@yahoo.com>

I TOLD YOU SO - A MESSAGE FROM ERNIE CRIST

I too am disappointed in the lack of leadership for countless years. How can you have a community plan without knowing where the main traffic corridors are going to be or where the main transit depot is going to be? The situation here is exactly the same as it is with the Recreation issue including the continued subsidy to the City. One of these days the Councillors who are responsible for the facilities being beyond repair will lament their loss when all the time they have ignored any and all efforts to deal with this issue even though they were warned countless times.

The matter of the Depot should have been tackled years ago as part of the community planning process rather than allowing it to simmer on the "do nothing burner" for 20 years. I said so repeatedly.

Like the staggering mess in Lynn Valley, this is the result of lack of comprehensive community planning which is supposed to give staff the tools, including using the Heritage Fund, to do things on a comprehensive scale such as land exchanges etc. The members of District Council who have been on Council the longest and now lament that this is the wrong place for the Depot are also largely the ones who have voted against any and all efforts to address this issue in the past. They have done so either directly or indirectly.

Kowtowing to the CCA, a special interest party to prevent the implementation of the Waterfront Task Force recommendations allowing public access to the foreshore which belongs to the public is obviously easier than dealing with vital issues such as planning for a Bus Depot. You know the story and I won't repeat it here. Let us just say that apathy, lack of leadership, or just plain political opportunism exact a price. In the meantime this is an issue which can no longer be postponed.

I have voted for this bylaw to go forward because the issue needs to be tackled. It needs to be brought to the attention of more than just a few people who are directly affected and have now discovered, probably for the first time, that there is such a thing as a local government or even a Community Association NOT TO MENTION A COMMUNITY PLANNING PROCESS WHERE SUCH ISSUES SHOULD BE ADDRESSED ON A LONG TERM BASIS.

The matter is on the agenda.

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

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

Sent: Tuesday, October 04, 2005 8:56 AM

To: Cathy Adams

Cc: DNVCouncil; corrie@kost.ca; James Ridge; hunterjohn@telus.net;

Council Remuneration; fonvca@fonvca.org; pat45@shaw.ca;

allandorr@shaw.ca; macdunn@uniserve.com; Irwin Torry; Donna Howes;

andersen@sagafc.com; m.bragg@shaw.ca; valeriem@blaze.ca;

bplatts@shaw.ca; cagebc@yahoo.com

Subject: Re: CD54 - BC Rail lands

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  
>  
>

---

 winmail.dat	<b>Name:</b> winmail.dat <b>Type:</b> application/ms-tnef <b>Encoding:</b> base64
--	---