

1. What practical experience and accomplishments qualify you for the position you are seeking?

My experience as Vice-Chair of the Seymour Community Association, including extensive attendances at Council meetings for the last year has given me insights into how Council works. My experience interacting with DNV Staff getting traffic and safety improvements in my neighbourhoods has given me insights into how to get things achieved. My experience in purchasing a home in the District, built under the same Building Code as all the leaky condos, and then deciding to demolish that house due to mold, and then having to fight through reconstruction, has given me overwhelming insight into how this District has treated its citizens. My experience in my working life – both in business in the District and other municipalities has given me insight into the challenges and also the responsibilities of business within a community. There I worked on financial planning and forecasting, process management and customer service and also some exposure into facilities building and planning. Finally, my experience volunteering for a local church, as a board member, and also volunteering on several political boards has given me experience into that process as well. All in all, the sum of all my experiences has given me this passion: I care more about the people, the citizens, than I care about myself. And I believe that our local government ought to think and behave that way as well.

2. What three major issues are you most concerned about in the DNV, and how can they be addressed?

The biggest three issues in my mind are as follows: 1) Traffic Congestion and its effect on people's lives including the effect on North Shore businesses and Port Operations. 1a) the Pace and Nature of Development – we have been building too much of one type of housing and not nearly enough family and rental housing. I met with Mr. Lancaster of the Planning Department and reviewed with him the "Housing Continuum" chart he presented to Council and I worked with him to reconcile it to the NVCAN database of over 9,000 units "in the pipeline". He and I agreed that if we include a) Built already, b) Approved, c) before the current Council AND d) submitted but not before the CURRENT Council, then the number is over 9,000 – where we differed was the opinion I held that once approval is given then the District loses control – His opinion was that "we wouldn't expect all of this to be built out by 2030". Fellow citizens, you decide who you want on Council holding people to account over this number? Lastly, I feel that District Culture needs to improve. I constantly talk about a "TRIPLE A DISTRICT" – ACCESSIBLE (you can find out who to speak to) ACCOUNTABLE – (they call you back or respond to written queries) and ADDING VALUE to citizens' lives (because if Government doesn't ADD VALUE then what do we need it for?). These will be my first priorities and I have a great number of specific ideas to make these things happen.

3. What role do you think community associations should play?

I feel that Community Associations should and can play a significant role in our future community. Too much, I feel, Community Associations have been ignored by this Current Council. Even when we have reached out and interacted with them, they have been ignorant of our pleas. Along with that, Committees have equally ignored. I have tabled a concept that I call the "Community Benefit Index" – we would first assemble a panel of planning professionals, industry and Community Association Representatives to create a "scorecard" for evaluating development proposals. Items like "has 2.25 parking stalls per residential unit" might get a Plus-1 point... items like "has <40% 1 bedroom or studios" might get a point, and items like "has truly affordable housing" would get many points. Acceptance by Community Associations would be an integral step both in developing such a tool AND afterwards, a scoring item in evaluating each proposal.

I also believe that all Community Associations MUST be engaged and contacted/kept informed as a regular process item when ANY development or even repair work is scheduled in their own, or their neighbouring community. This is to say, that when, for example, road work is planned on Mount Seymour Parkway, as it was all summer, that the Seymour and Blueridge Community Associations are copied on all public communication and are engaged in consulting. In order to facilitate this I recommend that the District have a email distribution list for each Community Association, with the specifics of that list to be decided by each C.A. Board, to ensure all Board Members are copied on key information.

4. What is your understanding of the terms “non-market” and “affordable” housing?

Here is my understanding of these terms: Non-market is any housing that is priced intentionally below what the District policies have identified as the prevailing market at the time. Affordable Housing is housing that is priced within the definition of STASCAN/CMHC guidelines of “30% of gross household income” – I have lobbied Council extensively this past year in this regard... because it’s important how you measure “household income”! Do you measure “total income of the household of the people you HOPE will live here”? If you do, then I could argue that a \$10,000 per month waterfront penthouse could be declared “AFFORDABLE”, if I could just find the couple collectively earning \$400,000 that somehow magically want to rent and not purchase. No, we need to set a clear benchmark – and it is Council’s job to do so. I argued that DNV’s definition of “AFFORDABLE” ought to be 30% of the gross income for the MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD IN METRO VANCOUVER (\$73,000 leading to rents of \$1,825/month) – not just District of North Vancouver (\$104,000 leading to rents of \$2,600/month). If we truly to bring back “the missing middle”, then we can’t use as a benchmark the income of the people who, by definition (2016 Census) can already afford to live here. I completed an 88 slide analysis and presentation to Council during the Emery Village battle that explained this. Feel free to contact me about this for details!

5. What is your position on subsidizing housing of any type?

My position on subsidizing housing is that this is a very complex question. There are those advocating, even seeking approval for developments where we create specific housing that is only for special groups – such as local workers. While I have a heart and mind that says this is a good solution to traffic and employee retention, I’m not sure the citizens of the District want tax dollars go to workers while their own children can’t afford to remain here. However, subsidy in the form of leasehold agreements where title remains with the District yet developments provide truly affordable housing, I am in favour of. I would tie this into my idea of the “Community Benefit Index” where low scores on the index would garner full rates for Development Costs and CAC’s, but high scores would qualify for reduced DCC’s and CAC’s or waiver of same. District Owned lands could be leased out to build truly affordable housing (set by accepted specific definition).

6. What should the District’s role be relating to subsidized housing?

This District’s role related to subsidized housing should be along the lines I mentioned in question 5 above – The District should set the definitions of Affordable, Subsidized and Social/Supportive Housing and then be prepared to reduce DCC’s and CAC’s, offer leasehold land use agreements and also, in specific circumstances, even waive property taxes.

7. Will you support a full public review of the OCP in 2019?

Without a doubt I will be calling for exactly that – a full review and update, now several years over-due, of the OCP including re-definition of local community plans.

8. Under what circumstances are you willing to relinquish publicly owner or public assembly zoned lands?

I would only be prepared to relinquish title of publicly owned lands in exchange for title to other, similar use lands. There may some day be a scenario which I do not currently foresee, but this would be my guiding principle.

9. Are you willing to defer further development until the required transportation infrastructure is in place?

I am willing to defer further development of mostly market purchase development until infrastructure is improved. I would note I believe there are pressing gaps in our spectrum (family, purpose-built-rentals and supported/social housing) that do need supply that should probably be sooner. This policy should be reviewed regularly because I, for one, do not believe that the Marine Drive B-Line and Lower Lynn Interchange are going to “solve all our problems”.

10. What is your view on mobility pricing?

I am completely 100% against mobility taxing. Feel free to ask me about this [☐](#). The only way I would ever support the MECHANISM of this (the tool, not the tax) is to measure travel in order to work out cost-sharing agreements between municipalities... for example – what share of people using the new Mountain Highway onramp (soon to be built) are from the District as opposed to the City (so that each can share proportionately in maintenance costing. But I do not support INCREMENTAL TAXATION of road use over and above gasoline taxes.

11. What is your view on how effective the proposed B-Line will be?

I believe that the new B-Line (The one along Marine Drive) will be a marginal increase in speed for transit riders and I believe that the B-Line’s effect on vehicular traffic will be calamitous. Marine Drive will be largely impassable for automobiles (except local area traffic). A B-Line from Lynn Valley or Phibbs to the Skytrain network would be a benefit however.

12. What is the source of your campaign funding?

My campaign financing (so far) is from the following sources: myself, my mother (a DNV resident), several neighbours and a couple friends. I was offered one \$50 donation from a friend who resides outside BC and I therefore returned it. Total raised so far: \$3,720.00.

13. What is your position on density bonuses or density transfers?

My position on density bonusing or Transfers is this: that we need more room between the FSR’s in Local Area Plans and the maxima detailed in the OCP. Too often those two numbers are the same or too close. The default would be to build to the Local Area Plan with any bonusing (in order to increase Community Benefit) would be only to the maximum allowed in the OCP. The ability to use any density bonuses or transfers would only be allowed in accordance with the Community Benefit Index I referred to above. Of particular concern here is maximum height restrictions. Once these are set in the OCP I can’t imagine a scenario where I would agree that we allow encroachment of that limit.