

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

Subject: Fwd: Agenda item for January FONVCA meeting
Date: Sun, 5 Jan 2014 08:18:44 -0700 (MST)
From: DOUGLAS CURRAN <dougcurran@shaw.ca>
To: fonvca@fonvca.org

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: "DOUGLAS CURRAN" <dougcurran@shaw.ca>
To: kost@triumf.ca
Cc: mail@fonvca.org, ellis7880@shaw.ca
Sent: Sunday, January 5, 2014 7:15:22 AM
Subject: Agenda item for January FONVCA meeting

Hi Corrie,

I will not be able to attend the January meeting as I am travelling to Baja, Mexico to do some writing on my book.

It would be a useful items for discussion for FONVCA members present, particularly those from Lower Capilano, to explore the basis of the current DNV intention for 3.5 FSR density on the current motel sites, on the east side of Capilano Road.

It has been stated by members of Council that they deem it a suitable interpretation of the CAC policy to allow the motel owners to build to 3.5FSR and allow the entire additional CAC (many millions worth by my estimation) that would have normally accrued to be swallowed up as "retaining budget motel use".

Essentially Council is offering a subsidy to the motel owners to build what is determined to be uneconomical motel use, on the basis that there is a "need to retain budget accommodation". It is difficult for me to see this as either within the proper area of responsibility of Council, nor to offer this as a legitimate CAC, which is meant to realize community amenities to offset needs for parks, recreation and other resident uses.

The specious origin of the motel CAC idea came about from resident comments made during the OCP that there could be no change of the motels as they performed a necessary function as low cost accommodation for sports teams and possible emergency shelter during natural disasters.

One needs to question if Council, having granted such a subsidy to motel owners, is attaching a convenient that would control prices charges for any units, stretching into the in determinant future - similar to the timeline that would be envisioned for local parks space and needs. In another light, the policy, if implemented, could be viewed as a subsidy for distant rugby teams from across Canada, although again, I question if that should be the intent and effect of CACs.

I would be interested in learning the thoughts of other FONVCA members on the subject - particularly as the idea of CACs as a vehicle to service owner development options is not one that arose anywhere during the OCP process or open public policy discussion.

I've copied Dan Ellis on this matter as i believe it should be of interest to the OCPIC.
cheers, Doug