

Critique of March 29/2018 Memo “Alternative Approval Process Fact Sheet”
by Corrie Kost April 1/2018

Note that the March 29th DNV staff memo (hereafter referred to as memo) was directed to the DNV public committee “OCP Implementation Monitoring Committee” and as such there may be members of the general public that are not aware of the contents.

Unmentioned is that the scope of an AAP applies not just to dedicated parkland but apply to a number of issues:

- Boundary extension
- Change municipal classification
- Disposal of certain utilities other than water or sewage system
- Exchange or other disposal of park land
- Grant a franchise
- Heritage property tax exemption lasting one to ten years
- Liabilities under agreement (including P3s)
- Loan authorization bylaw
- Regional district service area establishment bylaw
- Remove reservation or dedication of land (park, public square or heritage)
- Riparian property tax exemption lasting one to ten years
- Sale or lease of forest reserve
- Unexpended funds

It is noteworthy to observe that an AAP is most commonly used in relation to long term borrowing bylaws. This aspect was not even mentioned in the memo. As for the issue of “Scale – bullet 1” in the memo – no mention of this was made in the Council Policy 12-6130-1.

In the “Scale – bullet 2” section it notes that “AAPs require a 10% threshold compared to 50%+1 for assent voting” implying perhaps that it is much (implying 5 times) easier for the public to accomplish an AAP than assent voting (referendum). This is false. The AAP states that 10% =5,962 signatures on petitions. Since voter turnout is now typically 20-25% (of about current 59,617 eligible voters) the number of positive votes on a referendum need only be $59,617 \times 20\% \times 50\% + 1 = 5963$ which turns out to be almost the same number as for an AAP! –BUT, and this is the point that should be made – there is no one to

gather the signatures for an AAP, while the whole machinery – with many polling stations, is used to implement a referendum – a far less onerous task for the citizens of the district. There is some irony in the fact that the AAP, requiring the signature of at least 5962 electors (10% of the total DNV number of electors: 59,617), – exceeds the number of votes garnered to elect two of our current members of council (5871 and 5825 votes)!

As for “Accessibility & Convenience”

Unlike a district-wide referendum, by far, only local people are aware of an AAP. As for awareness time – municipal elections are far broader advertised and involve much more citizen participation – not just the 2-3 designated days to cast a ballot. The statement that AAP’s provide more time for community input has nothing to do with actual district-wide participation and is misleading.

As for “Cost” – AAP’s are perhaps more expensive to gauge public opinion than referendums run at the same time as general elections when one considers the time put in by private citizens to gather the 5,962 signatures.

The memo states that “The OCP and Lynn Valley Flexible Planning Framework identify an extension of Emery Place to facilitate the future road network in Lynn Valley”. However it failed to say that this may involve the undedication of some parts of Kirkstone Park!

The memo also mentions that “In response to concerns from the public about the loss of parkland, the developer identified an additional 6,828sq-ft adjacent to Kirkstone Park that will be contributed to the park”. This still falls short of the loss of 821.8 sq-m = 8,846sq-ft of dedicated park land. Detailed examination of the “deal” also shown that the new parts (which may or may not even be “dedicated”) are not as desirable – much of it being subject to shadows from the proposed development.

Figure 2 of the memo “Kirkstone AAP Timeline” does not actually show any times/dates! I wonder why?