

## **Additional questions from Lynn Valley Community Association All Candidates Meeting**

1) How would you help the long-time residents of DNV who are being demovicted from purpose-built rentals in order to make way for market condominiums when no alternative rental housing is available?

Here are some of my short-term and long-term ideas:

Short term:

- 1) Assess the empty housing units available in the District that developers are sitting on but not developing yet. I would work with the residents & these developers to see if we could reach a short-term housing agreement for these residents.
- 2) I would stop the demoviction of purpose-built-rentals unless they are unsafe or at the end of their physical life. This would be determined by an independent assessor.
- 3) I would prioritize all new purpose-built-rental developments to get them built as soon as possible.
- 4) I would enforce current maintenance by-laws immediately for these buildings.
- 5) I would use District land to put up some immediate temporary housing for residents that have been renovicted until they can find alternative housing or move back to the new development built at their original site.

Long term:

- 1) Get Provincial and Federal governments to get back into the building industry like they were in the 1950's to the 1970's. They need to provide programs, monies, and incentives like tax credits to the developers.
- 2) I would make sure that the District gets its share of support from governmental opportunities.
- 3) I would work with non-profit developers like Habitat for Humanity. For every \$1 spent with them \$4 makes it way back into the community. Also, this group provides a way for residents to start building an equity fund while they live in these "affordable" homes and when they leave they have a nest egg to use towards their next housing choice.
- 4) The District needs to build more diverse housing to meet the needs of our community at all stages of their lives. Such as lane homes, duplexes, triplexes, row houses, co-ops etc. Some of these options would be affordable.

These are some of my ideas.

2) The Lynn Valley Flexible Framework contains provisions for density bonusing. Do you support the proposal for further density bonusing in the Lynn Valley Town Centre?

No. Density bonusing in the Flexible Framework was to be used only in exceptional cases where the community received an exceptional feature. The majority of the present Council allowed developers to start at the exceptional level (with no exceptional feature to the community) and then add density on from this point. While I do support the idea of density in town centers, close to transportation and services but the OCP said it would be affordable. Lynn Valley's town center is far from affordable to the average resident in Lynn Valley and the community did not want these \$1.5m units in towers/

3) Change takes a lot of work and a lot of planning, where would you start? What is top of your must do list?

I would slow down development and reassess where we are currently. Did we build what we needed and what we wanted? Did we sacrifice our infrastructure, yes? We need to upgrade or if necessary build new infrastructure to meet the level of developments that have already been approved. This would just be a start.

4)Are you receiving union support? No

5)Are you receiving financial contributions from any unions? No

6)Do you believe increased density and ongoing development will provide affordable housing?

No, we can't build our way out of affordability (unless we start with what is described in question #1) or our transportation problems. Increased density will just add to these issues unless we stop to fix some of our problems now before it is too late.

7)Have you received financial donations from family members or employees of a developer?

Only family members and friends that are not employees of any developer or real estate agency or union. I have received no financial donations from a developer and would not accept any offered.

8)Are you aware that Emery Village residents have been given notice of a rent increase effective January 1, while they received their eviction notice?

As of today, I am aware of them receiving a rent increase but not of receiving their eviction notice officially. Council has approved Mosaic's development permit which means they will get their eviction notices any day. I think this rent increase is incredulous, unnecessary, mean, and a money grab given that this landlord is evicting them out into a .5% vacancy rate (a healthy rental climate is 3 – 5%) and was unable to find them replacement housing in North Vancouver that would be only 10% above their current rent as per their agreement with the tenants. Mosaic knows full well what the ability of these tenants is to pay rent.

9) What is your position on this increase? Mosaic is within its legal right to give a rent notice currently. I would like the District to pass a by-law that states that no rent increases are allowed after a developer has received his permit.

10)Why do we see more police traffic enforcement in West Vancouver than in North Vancouver?

West Vancouver has its own police force, not R.C.M.P. as does the City and District of North Vancouver. Also, the population of City and District is approximately ~135,000 compared to the District of West Vancouver of ~45,000. Our R.C.M.P. are covering a much larger community.

11)Do you support making municipal government more transparent by putting councillor's voting records on an easily accessible web site?

Absolutely. I would also like to see added on the minutes of Council meetings the names of who voted for and who voted against a motion.

12) If elected will you continue to implement the 25-year growth plan at the current accelerated rate or will you support a slower rate of growth?

We must have a slower rate of growth as we are already sitting in traffic, can't move within our community never mind over any bridges. We are almost at are 2030 goal of 10,000 new units now with 12 years left on the OCP timeline of 20130. We need to slow it down and access where we are at. I would like a review of the OCP in 2019.

13) Would you support a complete revamp of the OCP in light of the changing economics in our community? If yes, what section or policy in particular needs a revamp?

I have been on the Official Community Plan Implementation Monitoring Committee for the past year. The OCP has been by bedside reading for that year. We have made our final report to Council on October 1, 2018. Please go to DNV website to see this report.

Generally, the OCP is a good document. It is a fluid document and is not written in stone. However, I have watched as the majority of current Council used it to rezone and amend when it suited their purposes. When it didn't fit their purposes we saw many, many rezoning's and amendments on every Council Agenda. I would continue to use the OCP as a guiding document while looking at the local area plans and listening to the community when deciding what changes may be appropriate.

14) If interest rates were to double, would you cut expenses or increase taxes?

First, I would have to see what the amount of the District's debt liabilities are, that would be affected by interest rates, to know what costs need to be covered. Then I would look at the District's potential to benefit from increased interest rates with its investments. My next step would be to look for possible cost savings with the annual budget. This may result in some varying changes in some services, either services less often or perhaps increased fees like DCC's and CAC's. My last option would be, if still necessary, to look at taxes. In the end it would probably be a mixture of all the above.

15) Do you support more bike lanes?

I support completing the bikes lanes that go nowhere.

I support safer, completed, separated bike lanes.

16) Would you support more roundabouts to improve traffic flow?

I would support roundabouts on non-emergency vehicle routes. I would also support raised crosswalks, curb butt outs, and bumps, pedestrian activated crosswalks, and enforcement on all other roads

17) How will you work with Translink who want to see density in order to increase service?

I would lobby Translink for a different formula for North Shore as we are restricted by the amount of buildable land unlike Surrey and Vancouver. I believe we should try to get all stakeholders that use the North Shore to come together as one voice. This would include City of NVan, District of WVan, District of NVan, Squamish Nation, Tslah-Watuth Nation, the Port of Vancouver, Squamish sea to sky

communities, Bowen Island, the BC Ferries Corp. I would also lobby for an RLT from Phibbs to a skytrain station over the bridge. We also need more busses to run more often and have more efficiencies. Such as a B-Line up Lonsdale, and smaller, dedicated shuttle busses for heavily used short runs like from Phibbs to Capilano University, and Marine Drive to Suspension Bridge on Capilano.

18) What local solutions do you have for tackling climate change?

I have spent the last year on the OCP Implementation Monitoring Committee which included climate action. The need to reduce CO2 emissions from all sources is very important. Corporations and individuals can play a role in achieving this. I know that the District currently has some electric cars and provides a couple of electric charging stations at the District Hall. I would support that as each vehicle owned by the District is scheduled to be replaced, that it be replaced by electric vehicles if such available options exist. I would also support the increase in charging stations for staff & public vehicles.

Encouraging all forms of transportation – transit, walking, biking, rail, waterways, and auto.

Give incentives to businesses & residents to use things like heat pumps, solar, wind.

The OCP speaks to Climate Change in Section 10. 10.1) Energy Efficient Buildings 10.2) Alternative Energy Supply Options, 10.3) Waste Management, and 10.4) Climate Change Adaptation all of which I support.

My particular concern is our new wastewater plant being built off of Pemberton. I wrote the article below on September 3<sup>rd</sup> when the shovels went in the ground.

### [Betty Forbes](#)

September 3

Originally posted September 3, 2018

#### WE SHOULD DO BETTER

Although this is a step up from Primary Effluent wastewater treatment to Secondary Effluent wastewater treatment, it is still not the best we can do. Please see the map here that shows that all of Metro Vancouver wastewater treatment plants are either the bottom level of Primary Effluent or one up to Secondary Effluent. There are no top of the line technology, currently, such as Tertiary Reuse wastewater plants in Metro Vancouver. Please see attached info explaining the difference between these 3 standards of build. The District of North Vancouver just broke ground today by politicians and stakeholders on a new wastewater plant off of Pemberton Ave. This plant is scheduled to be completed by 2020 at a present-day cost of \$700 million dollars.

Victoria, B.C. is building a Tertiary Reuse wastewater plant that is also scheduled to be finished by 2020. This is the best system that can be built currently. The present-day cost of this plant, a step above the District of North Vancouver's, comes in at \$765 million.

The municipal level of government (DNV) has a limited amount of control as to what is built, therefore the argument for not building the best standard might be money. DNV will have a new wastewater plant in 2020, the same time that Victoria will have a new plant, but at a lesser standard. However, a step up from our 1961 wastewater plant.

Why can't we build to the latest technology as these plants will need to serve the future community for at least 60 years.

This is why, with climate change, we have had our beaches closed this past summer because of E-coli and will continue to have them closed because we are still flushing sewage twice a day under the Lions Gate Bridge and so is the rest of Metro Vancouver.

As a member of the OCP Implementation Monitoring Committee I signed a letter requesting this upgrade for our wastewater plant that was sent to the Provincial Government. To be fully transparent, not all members of the committee signed the letter for their own reasons.

