

**Subject: RE: FW: Agenda Item #8 - April 4/2005 - Commercial Dog Walking**

**Date:** Mon, 4 Apr 2005 10:10:00 -0700

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

**To:** "Corrie Kost" <kost@triumf.ca>

**CC:** "Mayor and Council - DNV" <Council@dnv.org>, "James Ridge" <James\_Ridge@dnv.org>, "Norm Nikkel" <Norm\_Nikkel@dnv.org>, "Senior Management Committee" <managecomm@dnv.org>, <fonvca@fonvca.org>, <Cagebc@yahoo.com>

Dear Dr. Kost

You are right - I was not thinking when I called you the president of FONVCA. Having said that, don't you think it is totally absurd that in a municipality of nearly 90,000 people there is no organisation to speak on behalf of the taxpayers, especially when the people whom LEO TOLSTOY would have called the bad people have no problem in forming a civic party out of the blue when it comes to pursuing people hostile policies such as was the case with the CCA? Don't you think the time has come to form an organisation that is willing to speak up on behalf of the public interest?

Ernie Crist

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

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

Sent: Monday, April 04, 2005 9:11 AM

To: Ernie Crist

Cc: Mayor and Council - DNV; James Ridge; Norm Nikkel; Senior Management Committee; fonvca@fonvca.org; Cagebc@yahoo.com

Subject: Re: FW: Agenda Item #8 - April 4/2005 - Commercial Dog Walking

Dear Councillor Crist,

I want to ensure everyone that I my input to council is always as a private citizen (unless otherwise specified) and that I am not, nor has there ever been , a president of the Federation of North Vancouver Community Associations. I have always been an active participant in the latter organization but on this issue I was certainly not speaking on their behalf. I trust this clears up any misconceptions about my representation on this issue.

Yours truly,

Corrie Kost

Ernie Crist wrote:

>  
>  
>-----Original Message-----

>From: Ernie Crist

>Sent: Sunday, April 03, 2005 10:53 PM

>To: 'hotdiggity@telus.net'

>Subject: FW: Agenda Item #8 - April 4/2005 - Commercial Dog Walking

>  
>Ms Hall;

>  
>I don't make decision based on whether I am going to win the next  
>election or not. No use threatening me. The issue is far more complex  
>than I think you realize. For one thing you may not be aware of the  
>legal implications for the District. If you have not already done so  
>you might do well to read the staff report which is what I as an  
>elected official have to go by. However, I will pass the message from  
>the President of the Federation of North Vancouver Community  
>Associations FONVCA (see below) on to you.

>  
>You may find that there is more to the issue than traditional thinking.

>The world has changed.

>  
>Yours truly,

>  
>Ernie Crist

>  
>  
>-----Original Message-----

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

>Sent: Sunday, April 03, 2005 8:33 PM

>To: Ernie Crist; Mayor Harris; Lisa Muri; Maureen McKeon Holmes; Alan

>Nixon; Richard Walton; Agnes Hilsen; Jim Cuthbert

>Cc: James Ridge; fonvca@fonvca.org

>Subject: Agenda Item #8 - April 4/2005 - Commercial Dog Walking

>  
>Your Worship & Members of Council,

>  
>Of the three staff options mentioned on page 147 of the Council package  
>I urge council to consider Option 3 - "That Council not approve  
>Commercial Dog Walking in the District of North Vancouver".

>  
>The primary rationale is based on three aspects:

>  
>1. The substantial majority (2/3 in 2005) of such business would come  
>from outside the District.

>  
>2. The Commercial use of our parkland is contrary to their permitted  
>use. A rezoning - with associated public hearing would be required to  
>allow such use.

>  
>3. Increased conflict with existing park users.

>  
>On (1) - see page 143 of council package.

>  
>On (2) - see for example the recent document - Lynnmour / Inter-River  
>Local Plan Bylaw as well as section 9 of District Zoning Bylaw stating  
>allowed uses in the various designated parks.

>  
>On (3) - The measures/definitions adopted do not adequately protect  
>other park users. For example - the definition of "under control"  
>described in the staff report on page 145 lacks the usual, and obvious  
>requirement, that off-leash dogs stay within eyesight of the handler  
>(and be no more than say 30 ft from the handler). The requirement of  
>having all dogs on leash when a horse approaches is not a credible  
>solution since in practice there is often little warning and rounding  
>up/ leashing the stray dogs in time is impractical.

>  
>If council still wishes to go forward with allowing commercial dog  
>>walking in our parks then:

>  
>- please hold the required public hearings

>  
>- please restrict the hours /days when this is allowed.

>  
>- please restrict all dogs to on-leash - as these dogs are  
> often not as familiar with their handlers as they are to  
> their owners. As well, the mix of on-leash / off-leash for a  
handler

>is potentially a bad mix.

> It is not hard to imagine the consequences of handlers attempting to  
>run after an errant dog - especially down-hill with leashed dogs in  
>tow.

>  
>It should be noted that for over 25 of the 33 years our family has  
lived

>in the District we owned a dog.

>

>In summary, this bylaw could have serious consequences on the future  
>commercialization of our parks and the enjoyment of them by local  
users.

>I urge you to chose wisely.

>

>

>Yours truly,

>

>Corrie Kost

>2851 Colwood Dr.

>North Vancouver

>V7R 2R3

>

>

>