

Subject: RE: CD54 - BC Rail lands

Date: Tue, 4 Oct 2005 12:12:30 -0700

From: "Ernie Crist" <ernie_crist@dnv.org>

To: "Cathy Adams" <cathyadams@canada.com>, "DNVCouncil" <DNVCOUNCIL@dnv.org>, "Senior Management Committee" <managecomm@dnv.org>

CC: <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>

Dear Mrs Adams:

You will by now have read my response regarding this issue. I believe that you and other community activists, after Council has spent millions of dollars on Community planning should ask why was this crucial issue not addressed as part of that process?

Opposing this site now because this is "not the right place" as is being done by some members of Council and the public is easy and so was killing any and all attempts made by members of Council including Pat Munroe and myself who urged that this issue be addressed in the past. I made more than one attempt and made more than one motion to that effect. Never at any time did a single person come forward and support any of these efforts or motions.

At least the matter is now on the agenda.

Yours truly,

Ernie Crist

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

From: Cathy Adams [<mailto:cathyadams@canada.com>]

Sent: Tuesday, October 04, 2005 1:20 AM

To: DNVCouncil

Cc: 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: CD54 - BC Rail lands

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