

COUNCIL CORRESPONDENCE UPDATE TO AUGUST 21, 2024 (8:30 a.m.)

Correspondence

- (1) D. Marley, July 20, 2024, regarding “NSNA - Metro’s North Shore Wastewater Treatment Plant project - Timely OIM public inquiry required”**
- (2) 2 submissions, August 9 and 14, 2024, regarding Zoning Bylaw No. 4662, 2010, Amendment Bylaw No. 5351, 2024 (Small-Scale Multi-Unit Housing)**
- (3) 4 submissions, August 9-18, 2024, regarding Proposed Road Closure and Removal of Highway Dedication Bylaw No. 5342, 2024**
- (4) August 15, 2024, regarding “Fwd: parking at Lighthouse Park”**
- (5) August 16, 2024, regarding “Artificial Turf Fields”**
- (6) August 19, 2024, regarding Ambleside Local Area Plan Apartment Area**
- (7) August 19, 2024, regarding “Fwd: Dogs on seawall”**

Correspondence from Other Governments and Government Agencies

- (8) Metro Vancouver, August 20, 2024, regarding “Metro 2050 Type 3 Proposed Amendment – City of Surrey (7880 128 St)”**

Responses to Correspondence

No items.

From: David Marley <domarley52@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, July 20, 2024 11:42 AM
To: correspondence; Mark Sager, Mayor; Christine Cassidy; Nora Gambioli; Peter Lambur; Scott Snider; Sharon Thompson; Linda Watt
Cc: Ratepayers Association Ambleside and Dundarave; [REDACTED] s. 22(1); News NS; Seyd Jane
Subject: NSNA - Metro's North Shore Wastewater Treatment Plant project - Timely OIM public inquiry required

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the organization from email address domarley52@gmail.com. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. If you believe this e-mail is suspicious, please report it to IT by marking it as SPAM.

FYI, an e-mail received today from BCU leader, Kevin Falcon, expressing 100% support for the NSNA call for a "full independent audit" of this Metro Vancouver cock-up. On July 18th, I received an e-mail from BCC leader, John Rustad, saying "This is one project that definitely needs a review to find out what happened and no additional funding until we have answers."

So, both provincial Opposition leaders are now clearly and unequivocally on the record in support of an 'audit' or a 'review'. Mr. Rustad, who may well be premier in three month's time, has made further provincial government funding conditional on "answers" being provided about what went wrong.

The most effective mechanism by which to deal with this obvious need is a public inquiry to be conducted in a timely manner by the province's OIM pursuant to section 764 of the Local Government Act.

When will DWV Council step up and represent their community's property tax and utility ratepayers by adding their voice to this demand?

David Marley
 Chairman, NSNA

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

, West Vancouver, BC, [REDACTED] s. 22(1)

I hereby request that my name and contact information not be red@cited from my communication with the District.

From: "Falcon.MLA, Kevin" <Kevin.Falcon.MLA@leg.bc.ca>
Date: July 20, 2024 at 8:37:47 AM PDT
To: David Marley <domarley52@gmail.com>
Cc: "Kirkpatrick.MLA, Karin" <Karin.Kirkpatrick.MLA@leg.bc.ca>, [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
 [REDACTED] s. 22(1), News NS <editor@nsnews.com>, Seyd Jane <jseyd@nsnews.com>
Subject: RE: Metro's North Shore Wastewater Treatment Plant project - Timely OIM public inquiry required

Dear David,

Thanks for your letter and yes, we support you 100% in your call for a full independent audit of this latest MetroVan fiasco. Myself and my colleagues at BC United have been

demanding accountability for months now and are very appreciative you're adding your voice to the growing chorus.

Keep up the great work!

Best,
K

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: David Marley <domarley52@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 18, 2024 2:23 PM
To: Falcon.MLA, Kevin <Kevin.Falcon.MLA@leg.bc.ca>
Cc: Kirkpatrick.MLA, Karin <Karin.Kirkpatrick.MLA@leg.bc.ca>; [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
News NS <editor@nsnews.com>; Seyd Jane <jseyd@nsnews.com>
Subject: Metro's North Shore Wastewater Treatment Plant project - Timely OIM public inquiry required

The ADRA has added its voice to the NSNA demand for a thorough public inquiry into this fiasco to be conducted by the provincial OIM.

Will you support us in this demand?

David Marley
Chairman, NSNA
West Vancouver, BC

From: ADRA Ambleside Dunderave Residents Association
<adrawestvan@gmail.com>
Date: July 18, 2024 at 1:15:02 PM PDT
To: Mark Sager <mark@westvancouver.ca>, Christine Cassidy
<ccassidy@westvancouver.ca>, Nora Gambioli
<ngambioli@westvancouver.ca>, Peter Lambur
<plambur@westvancouver.ca>, Scott Snider
<ssnider@westvancouver.ca>, Sharon Thompson
<sthompson@westvancouver.ca>, Linda Watt
<lwatt@westvancouver.ca>,
correspondence@westvancouver.ca
Cc: Graham McIsaac [REDACTED] s. 22(1), sandi
leidl [REDACTED] s. 22(1), Barbara Shard [REDACTED] s. 22(1),
judy c [REDACTED] s. 22(1), Trudy Adair
[REDACTED] s. 22(1), Nigel Malkin
[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

Subject: North Shore Waste Water Treatment Plant

Dear Mayor and
Council,

We are writing to ask you to support the call for a full public inquiry to be conducted by the Inspector of Municipalities pursuant to the Local Government Act (section 764), given the circumstances as serious as in the case of the North Shore Waste Water Treatment Plant. North Shore taxpayers, who will be footing the bill for this extraordinary increase in costs, which will be added on to current and future property tax and utility fees, deserve such an inquiry. There has been no transparency for cost overruns and no accountability for the failure to control these expenses.

You are well aware that the cost of this project has gone from \$700 million to \$4 Billion and counting, with a completion date 10 years delayed. At the May 31st meeting, Metro Vancouver

board imposed a \$590 per year additional assessment for the next three decades on North Shore taxpayers. The current cost estimate does not include the cost of decommissioning the existing Lions Gate Treatment PLant, nor any soil remediation, which will likely be required at the site.

There is also the issue of deferrability of the additional tax assessment from the NSWWTP overruns. Will you please clarify if this assessment can be deferred as there are currently conflicting views. Is it a local government decision? Can all or part of the costs be deferred? Again, taxpayers are entitled to have this information.

ADRA directors respectfully request our WV elected officials join and support the request of Premier Eby for a public inquiry through the appointment of the Inspector of

Municipalities. We also look forward to the clarification of tax deferral on the NSWWTTP assessment.

Yours sincerely,

ADRA Directors

Heather
Mersey Graham
Mclsaac Sandi
Leidl Barb Shard

Trudy Adair Elaine
Fonseca Judy
Chalmers Nigel
Malkin

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Friday, August 9, 2024 6:49 PM
To: correspondence
Subject: Zoning for Small scale Multi Unit Housing

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the organization from email address [REDACTED] s. 22(1). Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. If you believe this e-mail is suspicious, please report it to IT by marking it as SPAM.

Regarding: [Proposed Zoning Bylaw No. 4662, 2010, Amendment Bylaw No. 5351, 2024 \(Small-Scale Multi-Unit Housing\)](#) (File: 1610-20-5351)

Hello,

I have been trying to educate myself in recent years so that I can be a more active participant in my community. I have been reading a lot about different civic issues so that I can be a better informed participant. I recently finished reading a book by Batya Ungar-Sargon entitled: **SECOND CLASS: HOW THE ELITES BETRAYED AMERICA'S WORKING MEN AND WOMEN**. In this book she talks about how society in the last 50 years the middle class has been squeezed out and that society has bifurcated into two main groups: Extremely wealthy elites and non-working poor. She explains how politicians and bureaucrats tend to prefer to cater to these two main groups because it ensures a large voting block for the politician in question. However it is the middle class that is the real driver of the "Real Economy" which is people who either make things or provided needed services. In chapter 7 of this book she highlighted how zoning bylaws have been a major contributor to this bifurcation. She recommends increased zoning for duplexes, triplexes and mid-rise multiplex housing would create more "On ramps" for more people to be able to get on the property ladder. I support West Vancouver finding a way to include these middle level style homes in West Vancouver.

Thank you for reading my comment,

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)
[REDACTED] s. 22(1), West Vancouver
[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Wednesday, August 14, 2024 4:26 PM
To: correspondence
Cc: Mark Sager, Mayor; Linda Watt; Sharon Thompson; Christine Cassidy; Peter Lambur; Scott Snider; Nora Gambioli
Subject: Constitutional Experts Appear Agreed: "creatures of the province" is legal fiction. and Bill 44

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the organization from email address [REDACTED] s. 22(1). Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. If you believe this e-mail is suspicious, please report it to IT by marking it as SPAM.

Good Afternoon Mayor and Council,

I wanted to quickly add the below citation to my previous citation after reading an opinion article in the *North Shore News today* and another letter writer repeating what is, according to constitutional experts, the legal fiction that municipalities are "creatures of the province" i.e. merely an administrative arm of the provincial government who can override any and all municipal decisions at will.

This seems to be a very critical point in this moment.

"The constitutional doctrine of "creatures of the provinces" is a legal fiction. The fact that municipalities are included under provincial jurisdiction in Section 92 of the Constitution Act, 1867, need not imply a subordinate status."

**The University of
Toronto, Munk School, 2019**

Very difficult decisions are having to be made because of the provincial Bill 44 housing/land use/zoning overreach which is, as I understand it according to these constitutional experts, rooted in legal fiction.

Time will tell if Bill 44 was a one off or only the start of what the provincial government has planned; or if a new government will be elected in October and reverse the damage. Needless to say, municipal governments are critical to our democracy, freedom and way of life.

Also, great interview by Mayor Sager on *Global News*.

Sincerely,
[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Friday, August 9, 2024 8:14 PM
To: Linda Watt; Mark Sager, Mayor; Scott Snider; Christine Cassidy; Nora Gambioli; Sharon Thompson; Peter Lambur; correspondence
Subject: Sale of Public Beach Access at 30th Street

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the organization from email address [REDACTED] s. 22(1). Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. If you believe this e-mail is suspicious, please report it to IT by marking it as SPAM.

Hello,

I am opposed to this sale of beach access at the foot of 30th Street and Park Lane, West Vancouver. I believe that public access to our shoreline is priceless. The shoreline access points that remain in West Vancouver are a vital part of our community's character, inviting all community members to explore, to cherish, and to protect our fragile coastline. These are not undervalued assets to be sold into the private real estate market, but rather, a beloved part of the environment and heritage of West Vancouver.

Respectfully,

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

West Vancouver, [REDACTED] s. 22(1)

Sent from my iPhone

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Saturday, August 10, 2024 11:29 AM
To: correspondence; Mark Sager, Mayor; Nora Gambioli; Sharon Thompson; Scott Snider; Christine Cassidy; Peter Lambur; Linda Watt
Cc: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
[REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Subject: PUBLIC PETITION REGARDING THE ALTAMONT BEACH PARK PUBLIC ACCESS

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the organization from email address [REDACTED] s. 22(1). Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. If you believe this e-mail is suspicious, please report it to IT by marking it as SPAM.

Hello Mayor and Councillors,

Attached please find a public petition that is being circulated regarding the Altamont Beach Park Public Access that is under threat of being sold to a private buyer.

Thank you for taking the time to read the petition commentary.

Best regards,

--
[REDACTED] s. 22(1)
West Vancouver [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

Begin forwarded message:

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Subject: Save our Public Shoreline
Date: August 6, 2024 at 7:35:57 PM PDT
To: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)

Hi friends and family,

TLDR: Sign our petition to protect West Van's public beach access.

West Van Council recently voted to **sell our public beach access path at the foot of 30th Street** in Altamont. It is so disappointing that Council would contemplate selling off such an incredibly valuable public asset, and one that is a vital part of West Van's special character and beauty. Do we all have memories of the delight in making one's way on a quiet residential street, through the brambles, and emerging into the magic of a west coast shoreline?

(1) Please **sign our petition** to get the attention of Council and halt this sale. We aim to gather 4,000 signatures.

(2) Contact one of the four Councillors who support the sale, and let them know why preserving this public access matters to you:

Mayor Mark Sager - 604-925-7001 - mark@westvancouver.ca.

Coun. Nora Gambioli - 604-653-8823 - ngambioli@westvancouver.ca.

Coun. Sharon Thompson - 604-209-4621 - sthompson@westvancouver.ca.

Coun. Scott Snider - 604-218-2597 - ssnider@westvancouver.ca.

(3) Let all your West Van friends, acquaintances , and complete strangers know that we need to stand up and protect this land from being sold into private hands. Talk about it over dinner tonight!

Details:

District's Public "[Notice of Road Closure](#)"

[Council Report](#) outlining the proposed closure and sale, with detailed maps.

Video of July 22nd [Council meeting](#) discussing the sale - Item 8.

Thank you!

s. 22(1)

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Wednesday, August 14, 2024 1:00 PM
To: correspondence
Subject: Sale of Public Beach Access in Altamont

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the organization from email address [REDACTED] s. 22(1). Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. If you believe this e-mail is suspicious, please report it to IT by marking it as SPAM.

Dear Mayor Sager and Councillors,

We are writing this letter in regards to the sale of the public beach access at Altamont beach on 30th street. We attended the council meeting on August 12th, 2024 to understand the reasons for the sale of this public access and to hear from other community members. It is now understood that the land of our public beach would go to a private owner wanting to purchase the adjacent property. In return, the funds from this sale would go towards the purchase of the remaining home in Ambleside to complete the forty year vision for this public space. We have serious concerns about this proposal.

We have lived in Eagle Harbour for [REDACTED] s. 22(1) years and have recently moved to the Caulfeild area. We have raised our [REDACTED] s. 22(1) in this beautiful district and greatly appreciate the public access to trails and small beaches along our shoreline. Although we love and appreciate the development in Ambleside, the benefits of a larger public park do not override the benefits of more secluded trails and beaches. The need for quieter smaller spaces are key to the fundamental well being of all community members. I am also [REDACTED] s. 22(1) for the [REDACTED] s. 22(1), having taken various positions as a [REDACTED] s. 22(1). We have many [REDACTED] s. 22(1) individuals in our communities where large public settings are not a comfort. Even without special needs, just looking for parking in the larger parks, where many people come from around Greater Vancouver, can be anxiety-inducing. I know families who now avoid the bigger parks such as Ambleside, Lighthouse, and Whytecliff. These large parks are not for everyone. Selling smaller trails and beach access for the benefit of Ambleside is like taking a thread from our community to create what you see as a bigger and better quilt. But we all know how things unravel when one thread is pulled.

Our by-laws state that public beach access must be given every 200 metres. Why was it so important to include this by-law?

This by-law was created to ensure our access to nature, now and in the future. Many years ago, some intelligent people had the foresight to see that our communities would grow and that our trails and beach access points would be at risk. And here we are, years later, and our beach access is at risk. **The by-laws are in place to ensure that decision-makers do not make a devastating permanent mistake.** Although the Ambleside vision is to be commended, the sale of the Altamont beach access is being pursued with blinders on. There is such a focus on the completion of Ambleside Park that the risks of the FIRST sale of public beach access are being ignored. I have highlighted the word "first" because once this sale is complete, other beach-front property owners will pursue the same privatization when they witness that our by-laws can be ignored. The unimaginable low price for the Altamont beach access land puts our other beaches and public trails at great risk.

At this moment, you as a Mayor or Councillor may be thinking, "No, this is the only time this will happen. This is for a specific purpose for the greater good". But some time will pass, new Mayors and Councillors will take their positions, and another need will arise. The quick earnings from the sale of beach access will be tempting once again. The sale of our public trail and beach access is setting a dangerous precedent.

Community access to nature is crucial to our well-being. It is the reason why most residents choose to live in West Vancouver. We understand the vital importance for community members to have access to trails and beaches without the use of a car. Having a walkable community is vital to mental and physical health. Our communities are made up of teenagers who do not yet drive, seniors who may no longer drive, and individuals who do not have a car or do not wish to drive daily. We understand how the residents of the Altamont community feel. We witnessed the effect in our Eagle Harbour community when the pedestrian bridge leading to the beach was closed due to its refurbishment. This temporary blockade prevented many residents from walking to Eagle Harbour beach and we felt the distress it caused in our small community. I cannot imagine the devastating effect to our community had this been a permanent blockade. Having lived on [REDACTED] s. 22(1), we also understand how perilous walking can be in some areas. We used to [REDACTED] s. 22(1) and [REDACTED] s. 22(1) just so we could walk our children to school. So it is not feasible to simply say that other beach access points are available further down the road, as they cannot be safely reached without a car. In addition, parking is usually limited to a couple of spots.

In addition to beach access, the trail leading to the Altamont public beach is lined with mature trees and offers a beautiful walking experience. If this land is sold, it is guaranteed that these trees will be clear-cut for the development of this land. This will be another devastating effect in this area. This can be seen throughout our district, including at a public beach access trail near Whytecliff where the beach-front landowners cut down all the trees along the adjacent trail. Do we have to keep enduring this for privatization and greed?

Before each of your council meetings, you proudly display the Indigenous acknowledgement and state: "We acknowledge that we are on the traditional, ancestral and unceded territory of the Squamish Nation and the Musqueam Nation. We recognize and respect them as a nation in this territory, as well as their historic connection to the lands and waters around us since time immemorial." Have any Indigenous leaders been notified about this beach privatization? What is their perspective? What respect are you showing in this instance? This is the time to use the indigenous way of knowing and to put in practice the ancient Seventh Generation Principle, where one is to think of the seven generations coming after us in our words, works and actions. What will our grandchildren think about the privatization of trails and beach access? There is such an immense focus by Mayor Sager to complete the Ambleside vision within this imaginary forty year timeline that basic principles are being pushed aside. But as a community member mentioned after the council meeting, "What if it takes forty-one or forty-two years, when the appropriate opportunity arises for the purchase of the remaining Ambleside home?"

Thank you for all the work you do for our communities. We understand the difficult decisions that need to be made on a daily basis. We also understand the importance of completing the Ambleside waterfront vision. However, the sale of our beach access is not the way to accomplish this goal. If this sale is approved, Mayor Sager and the Councillors will be remembered as the first individuals to sell off our access to public trails and beaches.

Thank you for your time and consideration on this important matter. We look forward to the development of Ambleside Park while maintaining our public trail and beach access in Altamont.

With Much Respect,
[REDACTED] s. 22(1) and Family

[REDACTED] s. 22(1), West Vancouver, BC, [REDACTED] s. 22(1)

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Sunday, August 18, 2024 1:25 PM
To: correspondence; Mark Sager, Mayor; Christine Cassidy; Linda Watt; Sharon Thompson; Peter Lambur; Scott Snider; Nora Gambioli
Subject: Question - 3000 Park Lane

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the organization from email address [REDACTED] s. 22(1). Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. If you believe this e-mail is suspicious, please report it to IT by marking it as SPAM.

Good Afternoon Mayor and Councillors,

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to speak at the Council Meeting last Monday August 12th and for our phone conversation last Friday, Mayor Sager.

Requesting clarification - is the property at 3000 Park Lane sold?

Looking forward to your feedback. Thank you.

Best regards,

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Thursday, August 15, 2024 6:18 AM
To: correspondence
Subject: Fwd: [SUSPECTED SPAM] parking at Lighthouse Park

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the organization from email address [REDACTED] s. 22(1). Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. If you believe this e-mail is suspicious, please report it to IT by marking it as SPAM.

Hello,

I would like to register a complaint about the pay parking system at Lighthouse Park. I originally contacted the Parks Department but was directed to send my feedback to Council.

My family and I were visiting from out of town and decided to go to the park for a hike on Thursday, August 8. We tried to pay by scanning the posted QR code but the app would not load on our phones (we tried for 20 minutes). We then tried the paybyphone option but that didn't work either. When it asked me to register and select a PIN number it would not accept any PIN numbers I provided. I hung up and tried again, but the next time it would not accept my phone number. I tried a third time, and again, it rejected my phone number, saying it was invalid. The phone number was automated and there was no option to speak to an actual person to remedy the problem.

There were two other groups of people in the parking lot trying to get the app and phone number to work but not having any success when we were there, so I know it was not an isolated problem with our phone. After a total of 30 minutes of trying to pay for parking, and feeling increasingly frustrated, we gave up, and went for a short hike.

When we returned, we had a ticket for \$98. I then spent a further half hour on the phone to IMPARK to dispute the charge. I told them that we had tried to pay but the options provided at the park were not working. I also said that we would gladly pay the regular fee for parking over the phone with them but that we did not think it was fair to be penalized for something that was not our fault. The agent was completely inflexible, telling me that since there was no record of payment from us they had to issue the ticket. I repeatedly pointed out the absurdity of that reasoning; of course there was no record of payment, since their payment options were not working! In the end he offered to reduce the charge to \$81 but would not adjust it to the amount I would have paid for our hour-long visit if the payment options were working.

The whole experience left us feeling extremely annoyed and exploited. What should have been an enjoyable hike in a beautiful park turned into an unpleasant ordeal. It does not seem right that honest people who try to follow the rules are punished with exorbitant charges when the parking system is faulty.

I am not sure if the District of West Vancouver is aware of this problem, but I hope you consider implementing a better, fairer system so that this doesn't happen to other innocent people. I would add that trying to follow up with IMPARK is impossible-- I was told by the IMPARK agent to go to their website to register a complaint, but when I did that there were no options to reach them under the 'Contact Us' section.

After this experience we will be avoiding West Vancouver parks in future.

Sincerely,

s. 22(1)

s. 22(1), Utterson, ON s. 22(1)

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **West Vancouver Parks (westvanparks)** <westvanparks@westvancouver.ca>

Date: Wed, Aug 14, 2024 at 1:38 PM

Subject: RE: [SUSPECTED SPAM] parking at Lighthouse Park

To: s. 22(1)

Cc: West Vancouver Parks (westvanparks) <westvanparks@westvancouver.ca>

Hi s. 22(1),

Thank you for your feedback regarding Destination Parks Pay Parking program in West Vancouver.

At their regular meeting on May 8, 2023, Council received the Destination Pay Parking Program Implementation report and directed staff to begin the initial phase of a pay parking program.

To share your feedback with Council please write to correspondence@westvancouver.ca

Regards,

Karen

Karen Peterson

Parks Administration | District of West Vancouver

t: 604-925-7132 | westvancouver.ca



We acknowledge that we are on the traditional, ancestral and unceded territory of the Squamish Nation, Tsleil-Waututh Nation and Musqueam Nation. We recognize and respect them as nations in this territory, as well as their historic connection to the lands and waters around us since time immemorial.

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Friday, August 16, 2024 11:25 AM
To: correspondence
Cc: Mark Sager, Mayor
Subject: Artificial Turf Fields

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the organization from email address [REDACTED] s. 22(1). Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. If you believe this e-mail is suspicious, please report it to IT by marking it as SPAM.

I have lived on the North Shore for over 30 years and I love it! One of my favourite walks is the West Vancouver seawall, unfortunately before I get there, I have to pass a toxic mess. The artificial turf field adjacent to the West Vancouver SPCA is that place.

This field has been allowed to degrade horribly over the years. The field's rubber pebbles endlessly leech to the surrounding area, including the wetland area to the east of the field which is rich with wildlife.

Additionally, the off gases from the field are horrible. In all honesty I would not want any one playing on this site, let alone young children.

I am wondering what plans the city has for this field. It is obviously well used and I fully support having playing fields in that area. However, the environmental impact of a poorly maintained field on the surrounding area can't be justified. If the city builds the structure, it is obligated to maintain it. As it stands now, it is obvious that the city has been negligent in its responsibilities. I can't imagine the cost of the clean-up.

I truly hope that the city has a plan for this site - to revitalize the field, and most importantly, to clean up the surrounding wetland.

Kind regards, [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
[REDACTED] s. 22(1) North Van
[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

From: s.22(1)
Sent: Monday, August 19, 2024 12:29 AM
To: correspondence
Cc: s.22(1)
Subject: Ambleside LAP- Opinions from s.22(1)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the organization from email address s.22(1). Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. If you believe this e-mail is suspicious, please report it to IT by marking it as SPAM.

Dear Mayor and Council members,

We are the owners of s.22(1). We're writing to share our opinions about the proposed changes to our properties as mentioned in the LAP for Ambleside. We have shared our input with the planning department.



As you know, s.22(1) is one of the busiest streets in West Vancouver, and the area south of s.22(1) has many high-rise buildings, consisting of one of the busiest and most lively corridors in West Vancouver. Our properties are located s.22(1) and our terrain is relatively low, which seriously affects the lighting of our house, even the plants in our front yard have trouble blooming due to the lack of sunlight all year round. Under the proposed LAP, the properties s.22(1) will also be allowed for 6 to 8-storey apartments. Our already limited daylight will be further reduced, which will seriously affect our lives. We request the City to s.22(1) the Apartment Area and allow 6-8 story apartments to be built, same as the properties s.22(1).

In addition, from a planning perspective, buildings on both sides of the same corridor often maintain equal heights, which look more standardized and have better visual effects.

We ever lived in the city of Vancouver, which has seen a significant increase in residential height or density and is working hard to provide more affordable housing. We believe this LAP is an important and positive change for Ambleside and our city, and we also believe it will greatly energize our community and have a long-term and great impact on our community and the city of West Vancouver as a whole. We fully support it.

Thank you. We look forward to hearing from you.

Best regards,
s.22(1)

s.22(1), West Vancouver,
BC s.22(1)

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Monday, August 19, 2024 12:02 PM
To: correspondence
Subject: Fwd: Dogs on seawall

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the organization from email address [REDACTED] s. 22(1). Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. If you believe this e-mail is suspicious, please report it to IT by marking it as SPAM.

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

WEST Van

August 19/2024

Mayor and West Van City Council

Dear Members of the City Council,

I am writing to express my disappointment that dogs were allowed on the seawall during the busy summer months.. While I understand the importance of accommodating our community's needs, I see that so much money has been spent on bike paths, playgrounds, dog walks etc but you do not seem to be prepared to have just one walk available for the safety of the elderly, As a [REDACTED] s. 22(1) who walks the seawall almost every day, tripping over the the thin leads that stretch across the path is of great concern

Also the path in question is frequented by a diverse group of people, including families with young children, as well as the elderly residents, and individuals with mobility challenges. The presence of dogs, could pose a safety risk. The unpredictability of animals and potential for aggressive behavior, even from well-trained dogs, could lead to accidents or distress, particularly for those who are apprehensive around dogs.

Additionally, the path is a popular spot for those seeking a tranquil environment for walking, jogging, or enjoying nature. The introduction of dogs, with their barking and potential for disturbances, could disrupt the peaceful ambiance that many residents appreciate and seek from this path.

I urge the City Council to carefully consider these issues before making a final decision on this matter. Perhaps alternative solutions could be explored, such as letting dog walkers use the bicycle paths that are usually empty! Please ensure that the needs of all community members are met without compromising safety and enjoyment.

Thank you for your attention to this matter and I trust that the Council will weigh these concerns thoughtfully and make a decision in the future that will reflect the best interest of our community.

Sincerely

s. 22(1)

From: Ruth Teka <Ruth.Teka@metrovancover.org>
Sent: Tuesday, August 20, 2024 12:40 PM
To: Mark Sager, Mayor; correspondence
Cc: Scott Findlay; Chair Hurley; Jerry Dobrovolny; Heather McNell; Maureen Trainor
Subject: Metro 2050 Type 3 Proposed Amendment – City of Surrey (7880 128 St)
Attachments: Metro 2050 Type 3 Proposed Amendment – City of Surrey (7880 128 St) - Outgoing to District of West Vancouver.pdf

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the organization from email address Ruth.Teka@metrovancover.org. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. If you believe this e-mail is suspicious, please report it to IT by marking it as SPAM.

Dear Mayor Mark Sager and Council:

On behalf of Maureen Trainor, Executive Assistant to Chair Mike Hurley, please find attached correspondence regarding Metro 2050 Type 3 Proposed Amendment – City of Surrey (7880 128 St).

Regards,

Ruth Teka
Office Coordinator
CAO Executive Office
t. 604.432-6212
c. 604.364-8642
a. 4515 Central Boulevard, Burnaby, BC V5H 0C6



August 20, 2024

File: CR-12-01
Ref: RD 2024 07 26

Mayor Mark Sager and Council
District of West Vancouver
750 17th St
West Vancouver, BC V7V 3T3
VIA EMAIL: mark@westvancover.ca; correspondence@westvancover.ca

Dear Mayor Mark Sager and Council:

Metro 2050 Type 3 Proposed Amendment – City of Surrey (7880 128 St)

Metro 2050, the regional growth strategy, is the regional federation's plan for managing growth coming to Metro Vancouver in a way that: protects important lands like agriculture, ecologically important and industrial lands; contains growth within an urban containment boundary and directs it to transit oriented locations; and supports the efficient provision of utilities and transit. *Metro 2050* contains six regional and parcel based land use designations that support those objectives. By signing on to *Metro 2050*, if a member jurisdiction aspires to change the land use designation for a site then, as a first step, they have agreed to have the Metro Vancouver Board consider regional implications of the proposed amendment. *Metro 2050* outlines the process for proposed amendments.

The City of Surrey is requesting a Type 3 Amendment to *Metro 2050* for a 1.3-hectare site comprising one property located on 128 Street in the Newton area. The proposed amendment would redesignate the regional land use of the property from Industrial to Employment to accommodate commercial uses, including retail, office space, and a childcare facility. There would be no change to the Urban Containment Boundary.

69664173

At its July 26, 2024 regular meeting, the Board of Directors of the Metro Vancouver Regional District (MVRD) passed the following resolution:

That the MVRD Board:

- a) initiate the Metro 2050 amendment process for the City of Surrey's requested regional land use designation amendment from Industrial to Employment for the lands located at 7880-128 Street;*
- b) give first, second, and third readings to Metro Vancouver Regional District Regional Growth Strategy Amendment Bylaw No. 1392, 2024; and*
- c) direct staff to notify affected local governments as per section 6.4.2 of Metro 2050.*

The proposed amendment is a Type 3 amendment to *Metro 2050*, which requires that an amendment bylaw be passed by the MVRD Board by an affirmative 50%+1 weighted vote. For more information on regional growth strategy amendment procedures, please refer to Sections 6.3 and 6.4 in *Metro 2050*. Enclosed is a Metro Vancouver staff report dated June 3, 2024, titled "Metro 2050 Type 3 Proposed Amendment – City of Surrey (7880 128 St)" providing background information and an assessment of the proposed amendment regarding its consistency with *Metro 2050*.

You are invited to provide written comments on the proposed amendment. If you have any questions or wish to comment with respect to the proposed amendment, please contact Jonathan Cote, Deputy General Manager, Regional Planning and Housing Development, by phone at 604-432-6391, or by email at jonathan.cote@metrovancover.org by **October 11, 2024**.

Yours sincerely,

s.22(1)



Mike Hurley
Chair, Metro Vancouver Board

MH/HM/vc

cc: Scott Findlay, Municipal Manager, District of West Vancouver
Jerry W. Dobrovlny, Commissioner/Chief Administrative Officer, Metro Vancouver
Heather McNell, Deputy Chief Administrative Officer, Policy and Planning, Metro Vancouver

Encl: [MVRD Board report dated June 3, 2024, titled "Metro 2050 Type 3 Proposed Amendment – City of Surrey \(7880 128 St\) \(pg. 498\)](#)