

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

Date: Mon, 4 Apr 2005 08:12:43 -0700

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

To: "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>

-----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



[winmail.dat](#)

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