

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

**Date:** Tue, 4 Oct 2005 11:38:38 -0700

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

**To:** "Corrie Kost" <kost@triumf.ca>, "Elizabeth James" <cagebc@yahoo.com>

**CC:** "Cathy Adams" <cathyadams@canada.com>, "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>

It means people are reading your stuff - you are lucky.

Ernie

---

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

**Sent:** Tuesday, October 04, 2005 10:13 AM

**To:** Elizabeth James

**Cc:** Cathy Adams; 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

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

Yes, the word "district" should be "distinct" (which is as it should be!)

Corrie

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 simple

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](#)