

COUNCIL CORRESPONDENCE UPDATE TO MAY 29, 2024 (8:30 a.m.)

Correspondence

- (1) West Vancouver Chamber of Commerce, May 22, 2024, regarding Upcoming Events
- (2) 2 submissions, May 23 and 29, 2024, regarding Proposed Park Dedication Bylaw No. 5337, 2024 (Upper Lands)
- (3) May 24, 2024, regarding “2100 Union Court, West Vancouver”
- (4) May 24, 2024, regarding “Parking at Whytecliff”
- (5) 7 submissions, May 24-27, 2024 and undated, regarding Proposed: Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 4985, 2018, Amendment Bylaw No. 5301, 2024; and Zoning Bylaw No. 4662, 2010, Amendment Bylaw No. 5321, 2024 (Caulfeild Land Use Contract Area and Other Land Use Contract Sites) (Referred to the May 27, 2024 Public Hearing)
- (6) 4 submissions, May 25-26, 2024, regarding Proposed Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 4985, 2018, Amendment Bylaw No. 5291, 2024 (Ambleside Local Area Plan)
- (7) 5 submissions, May 25-26, 2024, regarding May 27, 2024, regarding May 27, 2024 Special Council Meeting Notification
- (8) 3 submissions, May 25-29, 2024, regarding Development in West Vancouver
- (9) 3 submissions, May 26-27, 2024, regarding Gleneagles Golf Course
- (10) G. Mclsaac, May 26, 2024, regarding “NATIONAL POST: Caroline Elliott: B.C.'s land reforms treat non-Indigenous people like uninvited guests”
- (11) May 27, 2024, regarding “Adding Support and Appreciation”
- (12) May 27, 2024, regarding “Urban Forest Plan”
- (13) 3 submissions, May 27, 2024 and undated, regarding Eagle Island Access Infrastructure (Received at the May 27, 2024 regular Council meeting)
- (14) B. Therriault, May 28, 2024, regarding “Lack of Shopping facilities for Seniors in Ambleside i.e. clothes, shoes. =+”
- (15) May 28, 2024, regarding “Listening to your residents =+”
- (16) D. Stewart, May 28, 2024, regarding “Repeated abuse of process by the city mayor councillors and planning department =+”

Correspondence from Other Governments and Government Agencies

No items.

Responses to Correspondence

- (17) Parks Stewardship Manager, May 23, 2024, response regarding “Cemetery weeds”
- (18) Senior Manager of Current Planning & Urban Design, May 27, 2024, response regarding “Proposed Zoning Bylaw Amendment Bylaw 5321, 2024 - Caulfeild LUCs - File: 1610-20”
- (19) Senior Manager of Parks, May 28, 2024, response regarding Gleneagles Golf Course

From: West Vancouver Chamber of Commerce <info@westvanchamber.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2024 2:59 PM
To: correspondence
Subject: 📅 TOMORROW! Spring Networking Social

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the organization from email address bounce-mc.us11_44199129.6367246-51979c12b5@mail141.sea101.rsgsv.net. 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.

Unsubscribe

It appears that you have subscribed to commercial messages from this sender. To stop receiving such messages from this sender, you can unsubscribe.

[Click here to unsubscribe](#)



West Vancouver Chamber of Commerce

[View this email in your browser](#)



Spring Networking Social at The Shed Cypress

Last chance to grab your tickets!

*Ticket includes Neapolitan style pizza and wine or beer. Cash bar.

Members \$10 ~ Non-Members \$25

[Tickets](#)

Date: **Tomorrow, May 23rd, 2024**

Time: 4:30pm - 7:00pm

Location: The Shed Cypress Village



Join us for an evening of networking with fellow business members in your community. Enjoy delicious wood-fired pizza and refreshing beverages while making valuable connections.

Sponsored by:

BRITISH PACIFIC PROPERTIES

Information Session: Cypress Village and Eagleridge

Wednesday, May 22 2024 - 6:00 to 8:00 pm

The proposed Area Development Plan for Cypress Village and Eagleridge and associated proposed bylaws and legal agreements are now ready to bring forward for Council's consideration.

If adopted, the proposed bylaws and legal agreements would govern:

- The phased development of a mixed-used, sustainable urban community in Cypress Village over the next 20 years or so; and
- The District's acquisition and protection of 262 acres of land in Eagleridge that are currently owned by British Pacific Properties and that have outstanding environmental and recreational value for the community.

[More information...](#)



Join now!

Develop valuable connections that lead to business growth and personal success. Access Chamber benefits only available to members.

[Membership pays for itself...](#)





SPONSORSHIP OPPORTUNITIES

Promote your business and help support the Chamber. Sponsor an event!

The West Vancouver Chamber of Commerce offers a variety of sponsorship opportunities that provide your business with the chance to be front and center in our community. Sponsors are an important part of our events! For further info: [SPONSORSHIP](#)

 Facebook

 Instagram

 Website

 LinkedIn

*Copyright © 2024 West Vancouver Chamber of Commerce, All rights reserved.
You are receiving this email because you opted in at our website.*

Our mailing address is:
West Vancouver Chamber of Commerce
2235 Marine Drive
West Vancouver, Bc V7V 1K5
Canada

[Add us to your address book](#)

Want to change how you receive these emails?
You can [update your preferences](#) or [unsubscribe from this list](#)

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2024 2:39 PM
To: Mark Sager; Nora Gambioli; Linda Watt; Peter Lambur; Sharon Thompson; Christine Cassidy; Scott Snider; correspondence
Subject: Proposed Park Dedication Bylaw No. 5337, 2024 (Upper Lands) - May 27, 2024, Special Council Meeting, Item #3

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.

Mayor & Council,

re: Proposed Park Dedication Bylaw No. 5337, 2024 (Upper Lands) - May 27, 2024, Special Council Meeting, Item #3

"A council may not by bylaw prevent a future council from repealing a bylaw."

While the composition of Council may change every fourth year, the Municipal Council is a continuing institution. It is a commonplace that bylaws passed by a current council can be and often are modified, amended and repealed by subsequent councils.

Dedicating municipal-owned parcels situated above the 1200-foot elevation contour can only be seen as a temporary expedient that lacks permanence. A future council, pressed for funds to finance needed capital and operating expenditures, could and probably will repeal the above captioned park dedication bylaw in order to raise those funds. All that is required of that council is obtaining the minister's concurrence.

In light of those truisms, permanent dedication of such land parcels as park land can only be had if those parcels are dedicated pursuant to the Park Act, [RSBC 1996] Chapter 334, or the Ecological Reserver Act, [RSBC 1996] Chapter 103. But, even then such dedications are not permanent because the boundaries of such dedicated areas can be modified, amended or removed, by order of the Lieutenant Governor in Council. Permanent dedication requires in addition that the lands so dedicated be listed under the Protected Areas of British Columbia Act [SBC 2000] Chapter 17.

The electors of this municipality should be under no misapprehension that a municipal bylaw dedicating lands as Park has any permanence. To achieve that desired level of permanence, those lands must revert to the Provincial Crown and be dedicated as Park or Ecological Reserve under the respective provincial statutes, and then be added to the list of parks and ecological reserves under the Protected Areas of British Columbia Act.

All other options are simply politically expedient measures.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

[REDACTED] West Vancouver, BC

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

From: Paul Hundal [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Wednesday, May 29, 2024 5:41 AM
To: correspondence; Mark Sager; Christine Cassidy; Linda Watt; Nora Gambioli; Peter Lambur; Scott Snider; Sharon Thompson
Subject: Dedication of Upper Lands as a 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.

To Mayor and Council,

The following comment is a post I placed on my Facebook site and shared with groups about the Upper Lands Park Dedication.

"This is a historic save for the North Shore. Most of the Upper Lands connecting to Cypress Provincial Park are now officially saved as a park. Myself and many others have been clamouring for this for many decades but this save was eventually made the old fashion way (that usually doesn't work). It was all about electing the right people to do the right thing for West Vancouver. Thank you Mayor Sager and Council!!!!"

Paul Hundal [Please do not redact name]

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

West Vancouver, BC

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

From: s. 22(1)
Sent: Friday, May 24, 2024 2:31 PM
To: correspondence
Subject: 2100 Union Court, West Vancouver

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.

Mayor & Council:

This development site is off Skilift Rd., West of 21st. Street.

Landscaping of the South slope of the site has remained unimproved, presenting a deplorable condition for the past several years.

Surely the Development Permit obliged the Developer to comply with a Landscape Plan that the Municipality would have approved and such work be carried out in a timely manner.

s.22(1) are fed up with the neglectful condition a seek prompt action by the Municipality to have whatever previously approved Landscape Plan be undertaken without further delay. It's present state is a blight and eyesore on our neighbourhood and the Municipality.

Respectfully,
s. 22(1)



From: s. 22(1)
Sent: Friday, May 24, 2024 12:09 PM
To: correspondence
Subject: Parking at Whytecliff

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.

Hello, my name is s.22(1), I am a s.22(1) on Vancouver Island and I sometimes meet lower mainland friends or s.22(1) s.22(1). A typical meeting includes Lunch at Trolls and a walk & discussion time at one of the local parks.

Whytecliff & Lighthouse Parks are my favorites.

s. 22(1) and went to Whytecliff park. I was not able to pay for parking because the *only* method of paying was on a cell phone. I do have a cell phone s.22(1) years old the technology can be somewhat confusing for me (& many folks of my age). Living on a pension I simply cannot afford to pay for data on my phone - this left me with no way to pay for parking. I did park, we had a wonderful time at the park and I got a \$93.00 dollar parking ticket. I phoned IMPark and explained my dilemma, they were extremely co-operative and reduced my fine to a \$20.00 dollar parking fee - a one time concession. I told IMPark I am happy to pay for parking but wanted to know for the future how I could pay without a cell phone - perhaps even pay in advance from my home computer. They were very understanding but said that cell phone - onsite, was the only way to pay. They suggested perhaps a friend or family member could help.

I subsequently dug a little deeper and was given two suggestions: the first was to avoid all parks operated by the municipality of West Vancouver. As a past resident of West Vancouver I found that disappointing because West Vancouver has some of the finest parks I have ever visited. Sadly, at this point, avoiding West Vancouver parks is the only option open for me. A second person suggested that this restrictive method of payment was not thought through well and bordered on discrimination of older people and/or poor people that can't afford cell phones or data coverage. Yikes, I have no intention of following up on such a course of action - but it certainly raised my eyebrows.

My request to you then, is, could please look into this dilemma that I and others face about parking at parks such as Whytecliff. I am happy to pay for parking - but with the present system I am not able to.

I am coming to s.22(1) and hopefully will be able to use one of your parks.

Thank you for your time in considering this matter, thank you for your beautiful parks that you run & maintain; I look forward to hearing from you,

Sincerely,

s. 22(1)

Port Alberni BC s. 22(1)

From: s. 22(1)
Sent: Friday, May 24, 2024 11:35 AM
To: correspondence
Subject: Proposed Zoning Bylaw Amendment Bylaw 5321, 2024 - Caulfeild LUCs - File: 1610-20

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.

My name is s.22(1) and I live at s.22(1) I am writing with a request regarding the zoning being proposed to replace the expiring Land Use Contracts, more specifically the expiring LUC governing s.22(1) Caulfeild.

My property and the other s. 22(1) would be adversely affected by the Zoning Bylaw changes currently being proposed.

I applaud Council's Feb 21, 2023 directive to prepare replacement zoning to generally ensure consistency with current LUC provisions. To a large degree the other draft provisions for the s. 22(1) are fairly consistent with what exists now. However, the proposed limit on the number of storeys (2 plus basement) is a significant reduction from the 3 storeys currently allowed and therefore is a very significant inconsistency with current LUC provisions.

My request: That the proposed number of storeys "maximum 2 plus basement" in the draft Zoning Bylaw be changed to "maximum 3 plus basement" for s. 22(1)

Thank you.

s. 22(1)
WV s. 22(1)
s. 22(1)



Virus-free www.avg.com

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Monday, May 27, 2024 7:33 AM
To: correspondence
Subject: Submission For Public Hearing - 1340 Duchess

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, Council, and City Planners,

We are reaching out to you on behalf of the residents of 1340 Duchess Ave regarding a matter of pressing concern that requires your attention. Our building has suffered from neglect, manifesting in leaks, rot, and mold due to years of deferred maintenance. The projected cost to fix the exterior siding amounts to a staggering \$2,000,000, a burden that weighs heavily on our community.

However, this financial strain is just the beginning. The impending repairs to essential infrastructure such as piping, elevators, roof, and parkade membrane threaten further financial crisis. Owners are already grappling with diminishing property values and a deteriorating quality of life. Shockingly, 2-bedroom units in the heart of Ambleside struggle to sell for even \$650,000, significantly below the regular market value.

Given these challenges, we strongly believe that our property is ripe for redevelopment. Our sentiments are echoed by many owners at 1363 Clyde, who are facing similar issues. However, the proposed floor area ratio (FAR) in the new LAP for our site(s) fails to provide sufficient incentive for owners or developers to pursue redevelopment. The proposed increase to 2 FAR, with a maximum of 3 for rental developments, would limit us to a mere 9 stories—a number incompatible with profitability given our small parcel of land. Extensive analysis shows that a minimum of 12 stories would be required to make redevelopment financially viable.

We urge you to consider the potential of our site and the broader community it serves. Neighboring structures already stand at 13 stories, setting a precedent for increased density that aligns with the evolving needs of our city. We envision a variety of development scenarios, ranging from rental buildings to mixed-use developments and affordable housing initiatives supported by government grants or programs like rent-to-own. Furthermore, we propose the possibility of land assembly across a substantial portion of the block, fostering a more cohesive and sustainable community.

These initiatives not only serve the best interests of property owners but also address the urgent demand for housing, aligning with the directives set forth by provincial and federal authorities. In conclusion, we urge you to reconsider the zoning density for our site and others like it, recognizing the potential to alleviate the financial burden on residents trapped in a cycle of unaffordable repairs. We are ready to collaborate with you to revitalize our community and bridge the missing middle in Ambleside.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Local West Vancouver [REDACTED] s.22(1)
& The 1340 Duchess Community

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Monday, May 27, 2024 12:37 PM
To: correspondence
Subject: Request to Increase Zoning Density of 1340 Duchess Ave

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, Council, and City Planners,

I am reaching out to you as [REDACTED] s.22(1) 1340 Duchess Ave regarding a matter of pressing concern that requires your attention. Our building has suffered from neglect, manifesting in leaks, rot, and mold due to 12+ years of deferred maintenance. Many of us only moved in over the last four years to discover all of these issues. The projected cost to fix the exterior envelope amounts to well over \$2,000,000, which is extremely burdensome to our current group of owners. Furthermore, we are anticipating more work related to domestic water piping, elevators, roof, and parkade membrane, which threaten further financial crisis. Owners are already grappling with diminishing property values and a deteriorating quality of life. Shockingly, 2-bedroom units in the heart of Ambleside struggle to sell for even \$650,000, significantly below the regular market value.

Given these challenges, we strongly believe that our property is ripe for redevelopment. Our sentiments are echoed by many owners at 1363 Clyde, who are facing similar issues. However, the proposed floor area ratio (FAR) in the new LAP for our site(s) fails to provide sufficient incentive for owners or developers to pursue redevelopment. The proposed increase to 2 FAR, with a maximum of 3 for rental developments, would limit us to a mere 9 stories—a number incompatible with profitability given our small parcel of land. Extensive analysis shows that a minimum of 12 stories would be required to make redevelopment financially viable.

We urge you to consider the potential of our site and the broader community it serves. Neighboring structures already stand at 13 stories, setting a precedent for increased density that aligns with the evolving needs of our city. We envision a variety of development scenarios, ranging from rental buildings to mixed-use developments and affordable housing initiatives supported by government grants or programs like rent-to-own. These initiatives not only serve the best interests of property owners but also address the urgent demand for housing, aligning with the directives set forth by provincial and federal authorities.

In conclusion, we urge you to reconsider the zoning density for our site and others like it, recognizing the potential to alleviate the financial burden on residents trapped in a cycle of unaffordable repairs. We are ready to collaborate with you to revitalize our community and bridge the missing middle in Ambleside.

Sincerely,
[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

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

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Monday, May 27, 2024 1:23 PM
To: correspondence
Subject: PUBLIC HEARING AGENDA MAY 27, 2024

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, Council, and City Planners,

I am reaching out to you on behalf of the residents of 1340 Duchess Ave regarding a matter of pressing concern that requires your attention. Our building has suffered from neglect, manifesting in leaks, rot, and mold due to years of deferred maintenance. The projected cost to fix the exterior siding amounts to a staggering \$2,000,000, a burden that weighs heavily on our community.

However, this financial strain is just the beginning. The impending repairs to essential infrastructure such as piping, elevators, roof, and parkade membrane threaten further financial crisis. Owners are already grappling with diminishing property values and a deteriorating quality of life. Shockingly, 2-bedroom units in the heart of Ambleside struggle to sell for even \$650,000, significantly below the regular market value.

Given these challenges, we strongly believe that our property is ripe for redevelopment. Our sentiments are echoed by many owners at 1363 Clyde, who are facing similar issues. However, the proposed floor area ratio (FAR) in the new LAP for our site(s) fails to provide sufficient incentive for owners or developers to pursue redevelopment. The proposed increase to 2 FAR, with a maximum of 3 for rental developments, would limit us to a mere 9 stories—a number incompatible with profitability given our small parcel of land. Extensive analysis shows that a minimum of 12 stories would be required to make redevelopment financially viable.

We urge you to consider the potential of our site and the broader community it serves. Neighboring structures already stand at 13 stories, setting a precedent for increased density that aligns with the evolving needs of our city. We envision a variety of development scenarios, ranging from rental buildings to mixed-use developments and affordable housing initiatives supported by government grants or programs like rent-to-own. Furthermore, we propose the possibility of land assembly across a substantial portion of the block, fostering a more cohesive and sustainable community.

These initiatives not only serve the best interests of property owners but also address the urgent demand for housing, aligning with the directives set forth by provincial and federal authorities. In conclusion, we urge you to reconsider the zoning density for our site and others like it, recognizing the potential to alleviate the financial burden on residents trapped in a cycle of unaffordable repairs. We are ready to collaborate with you to revitalize our community and bridge the missing middle in Ambleside.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED] s.22(1)

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Monday, May 27, 2024 2:06 PM
To: correspondence
Subject: Regarding Your Town Hall Tonight on Matters That Are of Concern to the Owners of 1340 Duchess Avenue

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.

Mr Mayor, Councillors and Staff:

I know that you have received at one e-mail from [REDACTED] s.22(1), and perhaps others as well. I will not reiterate the points that [REDACTED] s. 22(1) has put forward to you, as they are well made, and from someone who has broader knowledge of real estate and re-development matter than I.

However, I would like to point out that this municipality faces the challenge of affordable housing, such as homes and stratas, or even affordable rentals. Houses in this community are now well past \$2,000,000 for a home or even \$1,000,000 for a condo/townhouse!

As I understand it rent for 2 bedroom apartments are, currently, in the \$3,000 to \$4,000 range per month. Now, if you were to follow the old personal budgeting practice of keeping the cost of accommodation to not more than ¼ one's budget, one would need to have a monthly gross salary of over \$12,000, or \$144,000 per year. Methinks it is a rare few who earn these salaries, and I'm pretty sure that people such as teachers, police officers, nurses, municipal staff (other than managerial level) don't fall into these heady income categories, and yet these are the very people who are necessary to the proper functioning of our community as a whole!

If one were to buy a home in West Vancouver, and if one might assume a down payment of 25% of a home being bought for, at minimum, \$2,000,000.00, the monthly mortgage would amount to \$9,340.00 per month, which would mean that people purchasing in West Vancouver needs to have a combined household income of \$37,360.00 per month or \$448,320 per year. Again, it is a rare few who have this kind of income, and I'd be very shocked if the aforementioned groups of people are in that category, much less their supervisors/managers, such as school principals, chiefs of police, MDs (excluding specialists) or municipal government department managers.

West Vancouver, in my humble opinion, has a problem with having an ageing population of home/strata owners and thus has really only two options open to it:

either accept the fact that most of the current real estate (homes) will be owned by foreign owners who may not even live in this community full-time, which is not a plus for local independant businesses, and certainly if, for geopolitical reasons or world economic reasons, such people pull their money out of Canada, which would create a potential crisis in this community (remember back in the late 1980s when Whistler suffered such a loss due to foreign owners pulling money out of that community almost overnight), or it must create homes/strata properties that are affordable to people such as the ones I've mentioned earlier in this e-mail.

Now, the property at 1340 Duchess Avenue may, for various reasons, be available for redevelopment, and perhaps it may provide an opportunity that might persuade those looking for an affordable starter home (condo) or affordable rental to those, such as those I've outlined, who might want to work in this community. But, of course, what transpires is

something that developers will have to weigh in the balance as they do not proceed on such ventures with the spirit of enlightened charity...they are business people!

If things do not change in West Vancouver, and we carry on as things have always been, then there will be no young people or young couples with families living here; those who age out, will die, and you get a ghost town of homes or strata properties that stand empty! Not a pleasant prospect, but one that is entirely possible. As I understand it, Denver Colorado saw this in the 1970s. No one could afford to buy or rent in the city, and as a result the city was a ghost town after office hours because everyone commuted back to their homes in outlying communities. Not a pretty picture, and most certainly not one showing, as one of our former mayors, Derrick Humphreys, who used to refer to West Vancouver, as a place of excellence!

Regards,

s. 22(1)

s. 22(1)

West Vancouver

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Monday, May 27, 2024 2:42 PM
To: correspondence
Subject: 1340 Duchess ave. Zoning request to increase density to 13

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, Council, and City Planners,

We are reaching out to you on behalf of the residents of 1340 Duchess Ave regarding a matter of pressing concern that requires your attention. Our building has suffered from neglect, manifesting in leaks, rot, and mold due to years of deferred maintenance. The projected cost to fix the exterior siding amounts to a staggering \$2,000,000, a burden that weighs heavily on our community.

However, this financial strain is just the beginning. The impending repairs to essential infrastructure such as piping, elevators, roof, and parkade membrane threaten further financial crisis. Owners are already grappling with diminishing property values and a deteriorating quality of life. Shockingly, 2-bedroom units in the heart of Ambleside struggle to sell for even \$650,000, significantly below the regular market value.

Given these challenges, we strongly believe that our property is ripe for redevelopment. Our sentiments are echoed by many owners at 1363 Clyde, who are facing similar issues. However, the proposed floor area ratio (FAR) in the new LAP for our site(s) fails to provide sufficient incentive for owners or developers to pursue redevelopment. The proposed increase to 2 FAR, with a maximum of 3 for rental developments, would limit us to a mere 9 stories—a number incompatible with profitability given our small parcel of land. Extensive analysis shows that a minimum of 12 stories would be required to make redevelopment financially viable.

We urge you to consider the potential of our site and the broader community it serves. Neighboring structures already stand at 13 stories, setting a precedent for increased density that aligns with the evolving needs of our city. We envision a variety of development scenarios, ranging from rental buildings to mixed-use developments and affordable housing initiatives supported by government grants or programs like rent-to-own. Furthermore, we propose the possibility of land assembly across a substantial portion of the block, fostering a more cohesive and sustainable community.

These initiatives not only serve the best interests of property owners but also address the urgent demand for housing, aligning with the directives set forth by provincial and federal authorities. In conclusion, we urge you to reconsider the zoning density for our site and others like it, recognizing the potential to alleviate the financial burden on residents trapped in a cycle of unaffordable repairs. We are ready to collaborate with you to revitalize our community and bridge the missing middle in Ambleside.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

Mr. Mayor, Members of Council and District of West Vancouver Staff:

Thank you for the opportunity to address you in person, particularly with respect to two items set out in your Council Report dated April 15, 2024. Both of these agenda items relate to the cancellation of the Land Use Contract which applies to the Caulfeild area. And both are before you tonight for 2nd and perhaps 3rd reading.

My name is

s. 22(1)

s. 22(1)

one of the sites included within the new Caulfeild Zone 86 referenced in Appendix B of your April 15 Report and, more specifically, within the new Development Permit Area set out in Appendix C of your report.

I speak on my own behalf, although I have consulted with several of my immediate neighbours.

My main point tonight is that I am very supportive of the Amending Bylaws set out in both Appendix B and Appendix C. I commend staff for the opportunities they created for public input – to ensure there was a clear understanding of what is important about the LUC to the residents of the area. The subsequent Bylaw, while complex and challenging to understand, I believe essentially does the job. I particularly want to thank Michelle McGuire for making herself available for follow up questions for clarification.

A few comments regarding Appendix B of your report - as I read Appendix B, it reflects what was heard by DWV staff in the public input process. There are two items that were particularly important to me.

1. Firstly, what I call the “grandfathering” provisions in Appendix B – grandfathering of the setbacks and other structural limitations that were lawfully in place on the properties as of June 30, 2024. It was important to me and to some of my neighbours that, should a current or future owner wish to re-build or re-configure their home, they will be allowed to do that provided they adhere to the minimum and maximum measurements and limitations that applied to the lot on June 30, 2024. Of particular concern here was the risk of fire – especially given the amount of green space that surrounds us. It is comforting to know we could re-build as is or with some re-configurations within the current limits.
2. And secondly, I am particularly assured by the provisions in Appendix B that clearly limit the use of the Greenspace and Parks in the neighbourhood to “Parks and Playgrounds and Park accessory uses”.

Appendix C:

With respect to the Bylaw set out in Appendix C – this section establishes a new Development Permit Area covering attached housing in the new Caulfeild Zone 86. It sets out comprehensive Guidelines for Building and Landscape design for any new attached housing development within this specific Area – including rebuilds,

renovations and small additions to existing attached housing. Comprehensive in subject areas, but very general and without detail on specifics. As I understand it, they are intended to be applied with flexibility. Intended to ensure new development integrates with existing site features and character of the area. I would have appreciated more precision on what that means, but for the time being – as I said – I support the adoption of this Appendix C Bylaw.

One thing I do note is that this Appendix C and the Design Guidelines were a surprise and not part of the earlier public engagement process. Their first appearance was at page 155 of the April 15 Council Report. Simply stated, the Guidelines, being so very comprehensive, would have benefitted from an opportunity for earlier public input.

My final comment is with respect to the current state of Greenspace and Parks in the neighbourhood. They are an important and integral part of what is so special about the new Caulfeild Zone 86. I would say that **their** appearance and management is **at least** as important as the building and landscape designs that apply to our homes. They are both critical to the unique and special character of this neighbourhood.

It seems to me that these Greenspaces have not been adequately maintained over the last several years. My concern is not only with their **appearance**, but also (and more importantly) the exposure they create to the risk of fire.

To that end, I suggest the District give some consideration to forming a **landscape advisory committee** composed of DWV staff and local homeowners. I believe there are several in my neighbourhood who could help. Any precedents or thoughts that staff may have regarding this suggestion would be welcome.

Thank you!

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Saturday, May 25, 2024 12:08 PM
To: [REDACTED] s. 22(1); Christine Cassidy; Linda Watt; Nora Gambioli; Peter Lambur; Scott Snider; Sharon Thompson; Mark Sager; correspondence
Subject: Ambleside plan = +

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
[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

25 May 2024

Dear Mayor Sager and Councillors
District of West Vancouver

Ambleside plan

My name is [REDACTED] s. 22(1) and I am a resident of West Vancouver.

This is not enough time to read all the pertinent information.

Thank you.

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Saturday, May 25, 2024 3:34 PM
To: [REDACTED] s. 22(1); Christine Cassidy; Linda Watt; Nora Gambioli; Peter Lambur; Scott Snider; Sharon Thompson; Mark Sager; correspondence
Subject: Ambleside LAP =+

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 Vancouver BC

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

25 May 2024

Dear Mayor Sager and Councillors
District of West Vancouver

Ambleside LAP

My name is [REDACTED] s. 22(1) and I am a resident of West Vancouver.

Voting to approve this Bylaw is premature and unnecessary. Its passing will have a devastating impact on West Vancouver as we know it.

It requires much more consultation and collaboration with the owners, taxpayers and residents who will be impacted by it. It is too much too soon.

It could lead to the demolition of the Pink Palace an iconic symbol of our waterfront City. It will lead to overcrowding and congestion on our streets and tax City infrastructure to beyond its maximum capacity.

This Bylaw needs much more study and deliberation.

Build out the lands above Highway 1 before ruining our waterfront with towers and densification.

Vote no.

Thank you.

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Saturday, May 25, 2024 5:42 PM
To: correspondence
Cc: Mark Sager; Nora Gambioli; Peter Lambur; Sharon Thompson
Subject: May 17, 2024 Council Report - Ambleside Apartment Area

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 and Council,

I am a resident of West Vancouver and would like to express my support for the proposed Ambleside Apartment Area amendments and staff recommendations as specified in the May 17, 2024, Council Report. I urge the Council to approve the second reading of "Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 4985, 2018, Amendment Bylaw No. 5291, 2024."

I would also like to commend the District Staff for the extensive and informative Council Report.

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

Located on the traditional, ancestral, and unceded territories of the x^wməθk^wəyəm (Musqueam), Sḵwxwú7mesh (Squamish), and Səlilwətaʔ (Tseil-Waututh) nations

From: s. 22(1)
Sent: Sunday, May 26, 2024 4:51 PM
To: Mark Sager; Christine Cassidy; Nora Gambioli; Peter Lambur; Scott Snider; Sharon Thompson; Linda Watt; correspondence
Cc: David Hawkins; Jim Bailey
Subject: Proposed Amendments to OCP Bylaw -- Pink Palace Site

Mayor Sager and Members of Council:

PLEASE LISTEN TO THE PEOPLE WHO ACTUALLY LIVE IN AMBLESIDE.

Tomorrow's Special Council Meeting agenda includes proposed amendments to the Official Community Plan Bylaw relating to the Ambleside Apartment Area.

Our neighbourhood has significant concerns about one particular aspect of the proposed OCP Bylaw amendments – that is, the proposed policy with respect to the Pink Palace site at 2222 Bellevue Avenue.

As proposed, the OCP Bylaw amendments would anticipate an increase in density on the Pink Palace site from the current 1.75 FAR to up to 3.0 FAR, a potential increase of more than 70%.

Based on the site size of 67,500 sq. ft., an increase in FAR of 1.25 would appear to accommodate the addition of up to 85,000 sq. ft. of floor area. Such an addition would dramatically change the use of this site.

As visualized in the 3-dimensional modelling included in the May 17, 2024 staff report, the “infill” on the Pink Palace site could take the form of a new 10-storey tower (page E.6 of Appendix E).

While there is certainly scope for infill on the Pink Palace site, to replace some of the existing surface and above ground parking, it is important that:

- it be “sensitive” infill, that respects the iconic nature of the Pink Palace, and
- it maintain the view corridors from the Seawalk and from Bellevue Avenue and beyond, so that there is not a visual “barrier” next to the waterfront.

The amendments to the OCP Bylaw should:

- **limit the maximum potential FAR for the Pink Palace site to 2.5**, rather than 3.0 (recognizing that all other high-rise sites on the 2200 block of Bellevue will be limited to a maximum FAR of 2.0); and
- **limit the height of any infill to a maximum of 3 to 4 storeys**, consistent with other infill developments on Bellevue Avenue, such as the recent Hollyburn Gardens infill development at Bellevue and 21st Street.

An FAR of 2.5 would permit an increase in floor area of 43% relative to the present FAR, rather than over 70% with a maximum FAR of 3.0, which should be sufficient to accommodate a reasonable and sensitive infill on this site.

If the OCP Bylaw amendments were to proceed as currently drafted and establish a policy to permit a rezoning application for the Pink Palace site with an FAR of up to 3.0, it may be very difficult for the present or a future Council to reject a rezoning application that complies with that policy.

We strongly suggest that Council, at Mondays' Special Council Meeting, reflect these suggested changes in modifying the OCP Bylaw amendments as described in Appendix A of the May 17, 2024 staff report, before giving second reading to the OCP Amendment Bylaw.

It would be better still if Council voted only on the Zoning Amendment Bylaw and the proposed “Rental Replacement and Tenant Assistance Policy” at tomorrow’s Special Council Meeting, and defers any decisions on the OCP Amendment Bylaw until the public has had time to be informed about, digest, understand and provide input on the very detailed proposed OCP amendments and their implications (both intended and unintended). Giving only three days’ notice of this proposed OCP Amendment Bylaw (including the most recent modifications) is unacceptable.

Respectfully submitted,

s. 22(1)

A black rectangular redaction box covers the signature area, obscuring the name and any handwritten notes.

From: Dawson Campbell [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Saturday, May 25, 2024 12:56 PM
To: dawsoncampbell44@gmail.com; Christine Cassidy; Linda Watt; Nora Gambioli; Peter Lambur; Scott Snider; Sharon Thompson; Mark Sager; correspondence
Subject: Abuse of process! = +

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.

Dawson Campbell
#8 111 18th St.,
West Vancouver
V7V3V3

25 May 2024

Dear Mayor Sager and Councillors
District of West Vancouver

Abuse of process!

My name is Dawson Campbell and I am a resident of West Vancouver.

I feel you're trying to pull the wool over our eyes.
There are definitely councillors with a specific agenda.

Please **do not redact** my name or my home address or my email address.

Thank you.

Dawson Campbell
dawsoncampbell44@gmail.com

From: Candice Hunter [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Saturday, May 25, 2024 2:10 PM
To: candicehunter@telus.net; Christine Cassidy; Linda Watt; Nora Gambioli; Peter Lambur; Scott Snider; Sharon Thompson; Mark Sager; correspondence
Subject: More time is needed for residents! =+

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.

Candice Hunter
6625 Madrona Crescent
West Vancouver BC V7W 2J7

25 May 2024

Dear Mayor Sager and Councillors
District of West Vancouver

More time is needed for residents!

My name is Candice Hunter and I am a resident of West Vancouver.

Come on Council! You can do WAY better than giving residents 8 hour notice of a special council meeting! Did you really think that residents wouldn't care or maybe not notice? We expect way better from our council, and all of you should expect way better of yourselves.

Please **do not redact** my name or my home address or my email address.

Thank you.

Candice Hunter
candicehunter@telus.net

From: Gillian Shipman [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Sunday, May 26, 2024 4:29 AM
To: gillianshipman@outlook.com; Christine Cassidy; Linda Watt; Nora Gambioli; Peter Lambur; Scott Snider; Sharon Thompson; Mark Sager; correspondence
Subject: What's the hurry?! = +

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.

Gillian Shipman
1013 Sinclair Street
West Vancouver
V7V3W1

26 May 2024

Dear Mayor Sager and Councillors
District of West Vancouver

What's the hurry?!

My name is Gillian Shipman and I am a resident of West Vancouver.

How on earth is a resident able to properly prepare to attend such an important Council Meeting within the ridiculously small amount of time provided? Especially seniors such as my husband and myself, who are not great on computers? It makes one suspicious - as in "what are you trying to slide under the table?"!!!

Please **do not redact** my name or my home address or my email address.

Thank you.

Gillian Shipman
gillianshipman@outlook.com

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Sunday, May 26, 2024 4:12 PM
To: [REDACTED] s. 22(1) Christine Cassidy; Linda Watt; Nora Gambioli; Peter Lambur; Scott Snider; Sharon Thompson; Mark Sager; correspondence
Subject: Short notice for big decisions =+

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 Vancouver, B.C.

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

26 May 2024

Dear Mayor Sager and Councillors
District of West Vancouver

Short notice for big decisions

My name is [REDACTED] s. 22(1) and I am a resident of West Vancouver.

For a mayor and council who assured citizens there would be consultations, this meeting on May 27 allows very little time for citizens to inform themselves so they can make meaningful contributions to the final decision.

Thank you.

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

From: Shabnam Rashid [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Sunday, May 26, 2024 6:47 PM
To: shabmeena@hotmail.com; Christine Cassidy; Linda Watt; Nora Gambioli; Peter Lambur; Scott Snider; Sharon Thompson; Mark Sager; correspondence
Subject: Abuse of Council Power =+

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.

Shabnam Rashid
294 Stevens Drive
West Vancouver, BC
V7S1C6

26 May 2024

Dear Mayor Sager and Councillors
District of West Vancouver

Abuse of Council Power

My name is Shabnam Rashid and I am a resident of West Vancouver.

Giving residents only 8 working hours notice for special meeting on Monday 27 at 10am is ridiculous. This does not give residents sufficient time to read or question any documentation. What a joke!

Please **do not redact** my name or my home address or my email address.

Thank you.

Shabnam Rashid
shabmeena@hotmail.com

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Saturday, May 25, 2024 3:43 PM
To: [REDACTED] s. 22(1) Christine Cassidy; Linda Watt; Nora Gambioli; Peter Lambur; Scott Snider; Sharon Thompson; Mark Sager; correspondence
Subject: Too much development = +

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)

25 May 2024

Dear Mayor Sager and Councillors
District of West Vancouver

Too much development

My name is [REDACTED] s. 22(1) and I am a resident of West Vancouver.

I believe there is too much development by far in West Vancouver. I believe Trudeau has let too many immigrants into Canada and is pushing municipalities into accepting too many people too quickly. Just slow down the development. We used to be a wonderful place with a slower pace. But the traffic is awful. We do not have the infrastructure to absorb so many people. I will not vote for most on council again.

Thank you.

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Tuesday, May 28, 2024 3:12 PM
To: [REDACTED] s.22(1); Christine Cassidy; Linda Watt; Nora Gambioli; Peter Lambur; Scott Snider; Sharon Thompson; Mark Sager; correspondence
Subject: Traffic on Taylor Way. =+

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

28 May 2024

Dear Mayor Sager and Councillors
District of West Vancouver

Traffic on Taylor Way.

My name is [REDACTED] s. 22(1) and I am a resident of West Vancouver.

As a [REDACTED] s. 22(1) resident of West Vancouver I am most concerned to see our West Vancouver community now being controlled by a dictatorial mayor who is not listening to the voice of the local population. How can it possibly be considered a sensible solution to plump up the high rise density along our westbound Marine Drive, effectively destroying the ambiance of entering our unique waterfront community, with total disregard for a solution being first needed for the already horrendous daily bottleneck of ferry and local traffic at the convergence of Taylor Way and Marine Drive!? It's blatantly obvious it is all about the potential tax dollars at any cost ... our current mayor has his priorities all wrong.

Thank you.

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Wednesday, May 29, 2024 3:26 AM
To: [REDACTED] s.22(1) Christine Cassidy; Linda Watt; Nora Gambioli; Peter Lambur; Scott Snider; Sharon Thompson; Mark Sager; correspondence
Subject: development =+

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 Vancouver
[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

29 May 2024

Dear Mayor Sager and Councillors
District of West Vancouver

development

My name is [REDACTED] s. 22(1) and I am a resident of West Vancouver.

Kindly reconsider keeping our Marine Drive of our small community as we all seem to want it - LOW RISE 3 flrs

Taylor way is the busiest street in our community and lots of us use it daily. Already congested with Ferry, Sea to Sky and out of area school families, we don't need more traffic PLEASE

Thank you.
[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

From: s. 22(1)
Sent: Sunday, May 26, 2024 12:35 PM
To: correspondence
Subject: Gleneagles Golf Course

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.

To: District Council and staff

I have been a West Vancouver resident for the s. 22(1) years and have golfed at Gleneagles golf course throughout those years. I have sometimes had to stay up late in order to book tee times as soon as they become available on line. While I may not get been my first choice, never before have I been unable to find an available tee time. Until now. Recently, I tried to make a booking the minute the website opened to me. I had a long wait and then a message that the course was fully booked. No times available at all for the day I had planned to golf. I heard later that all tee times were gone in under 5 minutes!

I understand that there is more interest than ever in playing golf. And all courses are extremely busy. However, Gleneagles is different. To my knowledge, it is the only nine hole course in the Lower Mainland. A half-size course can only accommodate half the number of golfers as the other courses. Ergo, double the wait time than on all other courses. Or longer, if some of the golfers decide to do a full 18-hole game (i.e. go around twice). It seems to me that this situation is unfair to West Vancouver residents and needs to be remedied.

One possible solution to this dilemma might be to allow West Vancouver residents to reserve a day before other golfers. I understand that this would require some changes to the current booking system to enable it to recognize those eligible for pre-booking. It would likely require a one-time registration -- including proof of residence -- of West Van golfers. However, as the system already recognizes different golfing groups, I have no doubt these changes could be made fairly easily.

Thank you for your consideration. I look forward to being able to golf at my neighborhood golf course again!

s. 22(1)

s. 22(1)

West Vancouver, B.C.

s. 22(1)

s. 22(1)

From: s. 22(1)
Sent: Monday, May 27, 2024 12:14 PM
To: correspondence
Subject: Gleneagles Golf Course

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.

I have been a West Vancouver resident for the s. 22(1) years and have golfed at Gleneagles golf course throughout those years. Although I have sometimes had to stay up late in order to book my desired tee times, never before been unable to get a booking. Until now.

I understand that there is more interest than ever in playing golf. In that, Gleneagles is as overrun as all the other courses in the Lower Mainland. However, Gleneagles is different. It is the only nine hole course and therefore can only accommodate half the number of golfers as the other courses. Ergo, double the wait time than on all other courses. Or longer, if some of the golfers decide to play 18-holes (i.e. go around twice). It seems to me that this is an unfair situation that needs to be remedied. Gleneagles Golf Course is not 18 holes and does not belong in the same category as the 18-hole courses.

One possible solution might be to allow West Vancouver residents to reserve a day before other golfers. I understand that this would require some changes to the current booking system to allow it to recognize those eligible for pre-booking however, I'm sure that could be set up fairly easily.

Thank you for your consideration on this matter.

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

From: s. 22(1)
Sent: Monday, May 27, 2024 12:20 PM
To: correspondence
Subject: Golfing in West Vancouver

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.

I have been a West Vancouver resident for the s. 22(1) years and have golfed at Gleneagles golf course throughout those years. Although I have sometimes had to stay up late in order to book my desired tee times, never before have I been unable to get a booking. Until now.

I understand that there is more interest than ever in playing golf. In that, Gleneagles as overrun as all the other courses in the Lower Mainland. However, Gleneagles is different. It is the only nine hole course and therefore can only accommodate half the number of golfers as the other courses. Ergo, double the wait time for all other courses. Or longer, if some of the golfers decide to play a full 18-hole game – which requires that they go around the course twice.

It seems to me that this is an unfair situation that needs to be remedied. Gleneagles Golf Course is not 18 holes and does not belong in the same category as the 18-hole courses.

One possible way to overcome this disadvantage to West Vancouver residents might be to allow us to reserve a day before other golfers. I understand that this would require some changes to the current booking system to allow it to recognize those eligible for pre-booking. However, I have no doubt that such a system could be set up fairly easily.

Thank you for your consideration on this matter.

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

From: Graham Mclsaac [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Sunday, May 26, 2024 11:45 AM
To: correspondence; Mark Sager; Peter Lambur; Sharon Thompson; Christine Cassidy; linda.watt@westvancouver.ca; Scott Snider; Nora Gambioli
Subject: NATIONAL POST: Caroline Elliott: B.C.'s land reforms treat non-Indigenous people like uninvited guests

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.

Caroline is running as the United BC candidate in the upcoming Provincial election.

This thoughtful and cautionary article is well worth reading and clearly points out the slippery slope endless land acknowledgements are taking this Province.

Caroline Elliott: B.C.'s land reforms treat non-Indigenous people like uninvited guests

Read in National Post: [BLOCKEDapple\[.\]news/AotS2h0K3QpahowBBrxBoegBLOCKED](#)

Shared from [Apple News](#)

Graham Mclsaac

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

West Vancouver,

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

Please do not redact my name and ensure the article itself is printed in full in the correspondence file.

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Monday, May 27, 2024 10:07 PM
To: correspondence
Cc: Mark Sager; Linda Watt; Christine Cassidy; Sharon Thompson; Peter Lambur; Scott Snider; Nora Gambioli
Subject: Adding Support and Appreciation

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 and Council,

For all the reasons made in your discussion, I just wanted to add my wholehearted support and appreciation for your standing for Democracy, West Vancouver, and common sense housing development in voting against the provincial housing bylaws tonight; and for the incredible protection of our environment re: dedicated park lands. Future generations will be thanking you.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)
[REDACTED]

West Vancouver

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Monday, May 27, 2024 10:27 AM
To: correspondence
Cc: Mark Sager; Christine Cassidy; Nora Gambioli; Peter Lambur
Subject: Urban Forest Plan
Attachments: UFP.pdf

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.

Please see the attached.

Sent from my iPad

s.22(1)

Vancouver, BC

s. 22(1)

Dear Mayor and Councillors:

Re: Urban Forest Plan

I was pleased to see that Council referred the draft Urban Forest Plan for further community discussions. While I recognize the benefits and support the idea of increasing the canopy, I also recognize the need to ensure that we plant the right trees, in the right areas for the health and wellbeing of the canopy and our communities.

The Issues

1. The proposed Urban Forest Plan had input from 279 community members, which is not a statistically appropriate sample size for public engagement and/or decision making.
2. The draft Urban Forest Plan states:

“There is a 49% gap between West Vancouver’s neighbourhood with the biggest canopy cover Sunset Beach (68%) and it’s lowest canopy cover neighbourhood Ambleside 10 (19%). Growing canopy cover in those neighbourhoods will be important to distribute urban forest benefits more equitably”.

These are two very different neighbourhoods and this comparison should not be used to set goals. Rather each neighbourhood should have their own targets based on what is an appropriate canopy for an urban or rural setting.

3. The existing Tree bylaw 4892 needs to be amended and this must become an integral component of the Urban Forest Plan. If private property owners are going to be part of the solution in creating the urban forest, there needs to be criteria that ensures appropriate trees are planted within the community. This came to light in Ambleside, when a homeowner/developer in the 1100 block of Duchess Avenue removed one tree and replaced it with 12 Aspens. The neighbourhood wondered how the landscape plan got approved given the fact that Aspens are not drought resistant, they were planted to close together, they grow 60’- 80’ tall, Aspen trees were not on the West Vancouver list of approved replacement trees, and the Aspens have an invasive root system which is known to cause issues with infrastructure. Moreover, the location of the Aspens, effectively created a wall which blocked the views of the neighbours to the north. Sadly, the district seemed to approve this landscape plan because Ambleside needs more trees! To this end, we must have an amendment to the Tree Bylaw that provides guidance for staff/homeowners/landscape architects on the best practices regarding types and sizes of trees that can be planted on private property.
4. This will be even more important as we look to private property owners to support private voluntary planting. Not every tree is right for every location. Several municipalities provide information on tree heights (small, medium, large) and encourage property owners to, “plant small trees on small lots”.
5. Dead Cedar Hedges -while the major thrust of the Urban Forest Plan is on planting trees to build the urban canopy, we all know the impact on climate change from dead trees and

hedges releasing Co2 into the atmosphere. In recent years, we have seen an increase in the number of dead cedar hedge trees. Not only are they an issue for climate change but they also pose a significant fire risk. Yet currently, there is no bylaw that requires property owners to remove these dead trees.

The biggest challenge with the proposed Urban Forest plan is not what is included in the plan, but what is missing. There is more work that must get done before this draft plan gets approved. As pressure increases to create more density, we must ensure plans and bylaws are in place so that we maintain, preserve, enhance and restore the urban forest in each of our neighbourhoods.

Sincerely,

s. 22(1)

(13)(a)

27 May 2024

Mayor and Council - My name is s.22(1) and I live at s.22(1) We've been here s.22(1) We support action that will ensure that District dock usage is limited, such that each legal lot may park only one barge at a District-owned dock at one time.

s. 22(1) and this gives us a special perspective. Every day we see the comings and goings from the mainland and island docks. For decades, families of various sizes and circumstances have made do with a single barge and one (sometimes 2) row boats.

It's been 2 years since the EIRA requested that the District develop a bylaw to regulate dock usage, and the slow pace of this process is disappointing. Further, I am disappointed that the Staff Report released last week fails to clearly state that the ~~that~~ intended action is to limit each legal lot to parking only one barge at a District-owned dock at one time. It merely says that regulation should be considered.

Tonight, I would like to emphasize the following points:

1. ~~We are NOT here tonight to discuss a lack of dock space. We are here regarding an issue of equity. One lot should NOT be advantaged over all the others and be allowed to use the District-owned docks to park 2 barges. That said, if other lots start acquiring 2nd barges, then there will be a dock space issue.~~
2. This is not an issue about "need". Need is subjective and can change. Anybody can argue that they need a 2nd barge. No one should expect that Council & Staff are willing or able to legislate need.
3. A permit system could be a simple, minimum cost way to regulate dock usage. Ideas such as increasing the dock size, dredging, installing a ferry system or employing shared barge arrangements are distractions. These have high capital cost, are complicated to implement, have maintenance issues and are unnecessary to address what is a simple problem.
4. The District has no legal or moral obligation to respect grandfathering of the offending 2nd barge. It needs to go. And it certainly needs to go before regulations are put on others.
5. Let's not forget that the second barge that gave rise to this situation is also over-sized and this exacerbates the offence. You have heard that there is not enough dock space for each lot to have 2 barges. To give you some perspective, there would not be enough dock space for even each lot to have 1 jumbo-sized barge. We all know why they acquired a 2nd barge (to accommodate their s.22(1) but I don't understand why they chose a jumbo? It was unnecessary, it further complicates things and really shows a lack of community regard.
6. s.22(1) and I would certainly prefer that EI was off the radar and that Council & Staff could focus on larger issues affecting West Van. If a new bylaw does come to pass that regulates dock usage, it will be the result solely of the offending household's actions. If their second over-sized barge was removed tomorrow, then this problem would go away and no action by Council & Staff would be required. Those standing up for fair dock usage shall NOT be blamed as the cause of any added bureaucracy.
7. Finally, we all know that EI has uniquely peculiar access issues. The development of a bylaw or some alternative direction needs to have substantial input from the residents to ensure it works as designed.

(13)(b)

May 27, 2024 – City of West Vancouver Council Mtg.

RE: E.I. Second Barge Issue Notes

Dear Mayor & Council:

I am [REDACTED] s.22(1) from [REDACTED] s.22(1)

1. Thank you for the opportunity to provide my personal feedback regarding concerns, of an Eagle Island owner adding a second personal use barge almost 2 years ago, contrary to the long standing Eagle Island "Social Contract" guideline of one barge per legal lot. At that time, the DWV was alerted to the potential "Life / Safety" and liability issues related to the extra congestion and inconvenience created by the 2nd over-sized barge.
2. As noted in the Engineers Report, under Finance, Option #2 "User Fee, I have concerns over this option being considered by City Council for the following reasons:
 - A) **Eagle Islands Property Tax Rate** is the same as all other "mainland" residential properties in West Vancouver, but we do not receive all of the same services. These non-inclusions are as follows:
 1. The need for the DWV having to build, replace or maintain any roads, plus the interior circle access pathways are not maintained for any repairs or cleaning of debris.
 2. Do not receive road side garbage pickup, and there is no organic pick up even on the mainland.
 3. Any direct Ambulatory or Fire Dept. services. This is an ever present issue for all residents.

The amount of money the DWV saves annually, in not providing the same services as for the rest of West Vancouver, is much greater than the current stated \$15,000. / year dock maintenance amount. The original budgeted amount of \$3,000.00, as noted, is apparently too little to maintain the 2 docks, and should be reviewed by Engineering to come in line with today's actually costs for future years.

To ask private residents to now start to pay to maintain an "Essential Service / Amenity" is not appropriate, and should not be considered as an option. A By-Law to limit the number of barges per legal lot, has nothing to do with, as the Report states: "*Were the District to introduce a bylaw to regulate the Eagle Island access infrastructure, it could impose a user fee as part of a permitting scheme to help recover some or all of the routine maintenance costs associated with providing vessel moorage service.*"

I would like to ask the Engineering Dept. why at this time they felt it would be appropriate to consider possibly passing on the maintenance cost of the docks directly to the users? E.I. Residents do not have an option whether to use or not use the dock amenity to access their homes. The docks are essential if one wants to live on Eagle Island, and the maintenance costs should remain the responsibility of the District.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

Barge 3

(13)(c)

Good Evening Mayor and Council. My name is [REDACTED] s.22(1). I am a resident [REDACTED] s.22(1). I'm here to offer my thoughts on the Eagle Island Docks

I am mindful that this Council is aware of Eagle Island's infrastructure constraints and is seeking to exempt the 34 lots on Eagle Island from new Provincial rules requiring greater density.

So i'll get right to the point. We don't have the docking space for everyone to tie up two barges. That's why the Island has operated for decades under a social contract limiting the number of barges to one per lot. It's not that you can't buy more barges. It's that you can only tie one up at any one time on either of the District's two docks. Allowing others to have a space to park their barges.

So when one resident purchased a second oversize barge two years ago it created quite a problem because both barges ended up moored to the Island dock every evening. Multiple letters, meetings and other interactions with staff followed. It was like breaking a golden rule, and residents much inconvenienced and offended.

The Dock Infrastructure Report prepared for this meeting concludes with a recommendation that a By Law be enacted to regulate the use of the Eagle Island docks that are owned by the District.

It is difficult to accept that our social contract has failed to the point where we need the district to come in with formal legislation involving permits, fees, insurance and other requirements. But that is what this matter has come to.

I'm hoping Council can consider an escalating approach to resolve this issue. Perhaps a declaration that the docks are intended for the exclusive use of Eagle Island residents who may berth no more than one barge per per legal lot at any one time on any one of the District docks, such barge to be sized to fit within one set of the mooring stanchions fixed to the docks.

Council might also preauthorize staff to proceed to the next level of enforcement should residents fail to abide by this declaration.

This concludes my remarks.

Thank you

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

From: Betty Therriault [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Tuesday, May 28, 2024 12:18 PM
To: bbettytherriault@gmail.com; Christine Cassidy; Linda Watt; Nora Gambioli; Peter Lambur; Scott Snider; Sharon Thompson; Mark Sager; correspondence
Subject: Lack of Shopping facilities for Seniors in Ambleside i.e. clothes, shoes. =+

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.

Betty Therriault
2108 Argyle Ave.
V7V1A4

28 May 2024

Dear Mayor Sager and Councillors
District of West Vancouver

Lack of Shopping facilities for Seniors in Ambleside i.e. clothes, shoes.

My name is Betty Therriault and I am a resident of West Vancouver.

I am 92 years old. My Son took me to his home in Qualicum in order I could buy shoes and a summer wardrobe. Qualicum, Courtney and Nanaimo provided ample opportunity for shopping. Do we not have enough Seniors living in West Vancouver that our only chance is a shopping mall?

Please **do not redact** my name or my home address or my email address.

Thank you.

Betty Therriault
bbettytherriault@gmail.com

From: [Redacted] s. 22(1)
Sent: Tuesday, May 28, 2024 4:08 PM
To: [Redacted] s.22(1); Christine Cassidy; Linda Watt; Nora Gambioli; Peter Lambur; Scott Snider; Sharon Thompson; Mark Sager; correspondence
Subject: Listening to your residents =+

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 Vancouver ,
[Redacted] s. 22(1)

28 May 2024

Dear Mayor Sager and Councillors
District of West Vancouver

Listening to your residents

My name is [Redacted] s. 22(1) and I am a resident of West Vancouver.

Thank you for giving the residents more time to read about Your proposed changes .
The lawyer that has been disbarred should be retaking is law degree or dropping the initials of this profession from his name
Thank you

Thank you.

[Redacted] s. 22(1)

From: Dave Stewart [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Tuesday, May 28, 2024 9:52 PM
To: davestewart53@gmail.com; Christine Cassidy; Linda Watt; Nora Gambioli; Peter Lambur; Scott Snider; Sharon Thompson; Mark Sager; correspondence
Subject: Repeated abuse of process by the city mayor councillors and planning department = +

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.

Dave Stewart
2395 Queens ave
West Vancouver
V7v2y7

29 May 2024

Dear Mayor Sager and Councillors
District of West Vancouver

Repeated abuse of process by the city mayor councillors and planning department

My name is Dave Stewart and I am a resident of West Vancouver.

I voted for Sager on the basis of his statements to listen and react on the rate payers concerns
I am very concerned that nothing has changed and the systemic abuse of power by the Planning department especially as regards fait accompli planning is concerned
The rate payers have been completely ignored and this has not changed at all with the election of the current Mayor Sager and it is just business as usual

Please **do not redact** my name or my home address or my email address.

Thank you.

Dave Stewart
davestewart53@gmail.com

From: Corinne Ambor
Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2024 10:10 AM
To: s. 22(1)
Cc: correspondence; Cemetery Office
Subject: Cemetery Weeds
Attachments: DWV-#5731326-v1-Cemetery_Weeds_pdf.PDF

Dear s. 22(1)

Thank you for your correspondence dated May 21, 2024 and for sharing your concerns regarding the Capilano View Cemetery. We are very sorry to hear that you found the conditions unsatisfactory during your recent visit.

Staff maintain and mow the lawns at the cemetery regularly; however, the combination of rain, followed by sunshine, caused the grass and dandelions to grow very quickly. While our team must prioritize internments as they arise, please be assured that maintenance is a top priority. Along with regular maintenance, spring is also the time when overseeding and fertilization takes place, and you will see this work underway at the cemetery over the coming weeks. Last December, when you requested an adjustment s. 22(1) staff also added soil and grass seed to the plot. We will add more soil and seed within the next week.

District staff are responsible for maintaining approximately 20 acres of cemetery and work diligently to keep up, especially during the rapid growth of spring.

Thank you for bringing your concerns to our attention, and we hope your next visit to the cemetery will be a more positive experience.

If you have any questions or concerns in the future, please feel free to reach out to Cemetery staff directly at cemetery@westvancouver.ca or 604-925-7007.

Regards,
Corinne

Corinne Ambor
Parks Stewardship Manager | District of West Vancouver
t: 604.925.7138 | westvancouver.ca

We acknowledge that we are on the traditional, ancestral and unceded territory of the Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw (Squamish Nation), səł'lwətaʔt (Tsleil-Waututh Nation), and xʷməθkʷəy̓əm (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.

This email and any files transmitted with it are considered confidential and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are intended. If you are not the intended recipient or the person responsible for delivering the email to the intended recipient, be advised that you have received this email in error and that any use, dissemination, forwarding, printing or copying of this email is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete all copies of this email and attachment(s). Thank you.

From: [Redacted] s. 22(1)
Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2024 12:10 PM
To: cemetery@westvanouver.ca; correspondence
Subject: Cemetery weeds

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,

Last year I complained about the amount of weeds at [Redacted] s. 22(1) plot and was told a weed control plan was in the works.

Until then weed removal was my responsibility. I weeded out one bag.

This year the weeds are worse. I have weeded the plot again, this time taking out two bags. Looking over the grounds, there was a sea of dandelions.

What is the weed control plan going forward? [Redacted] s. 22(1) years old and may be unable to take this task on in the future.

Maintenance of the grounds was my reasonable expectation when I purchased the plot. The condition of the grounds currently is disrespectful to our loved ones who have passed away.

Regards,

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



From: Michelle McGuire
Sent: Monday, May 27, 2024 4:53 PM
To: s. 22(1)
Cc: correspondence
Subject: Caulfeild LUC response
Attachments: Caulfeild LUC.pdf

Dear s. 22(1)

In response to the attached correspondence, I'm providing the following information about the proposed zoning that Council is considering at tonight's public hearing for Caulfeild Land Use Contract area:

- The existing Caulfeild land use contract includes a height limit of 8 m and that is also included in the proposed zoning;
- The sites within s. 22(1) are generally built with 2 storeys plus what is considered a basement due to the steep topography of these sites (the definition of a basement is simply a storey where the floor is 1 ft. below the average grade of the site);
- For anomalous sites that may not meet this definition they would be legally non-conforming and could seek a variance (if necessary) for reconstruction; and
- For all sites across the Caulfeild LUC area the proposed zoning would legalize the dimensional height that exists for buildings built with an issued building permit.

Please let me know if you have any further questions or comments.

Best regards,

Michelle

Michelle McGuire, MCIP
Senior Manager of Current Planning and Urban Design | District of West Vancouver
t: 604-925-7059 | westvancouver.ca



From: s. 22(1)
Sent: Friday, May 24, 2024 11:35 AM
To: correspondence
Subject: Proposed Zoning Bylaw Amendment Bylaw 5321, 2024 - Caulfeild LUCs - File: 1610-20

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.

My name is s.22(1) and I live at s.22(1). I am writing with a request regarding the zoning being proposed to replace the expiring Land Use Contracts, more specifically the expiring LUC governing s.22(1) Caulfeild.

My property and the other s. 22(1) would be adversely affected by the Zoning Bylaw changes currently being proposed.

I applaud Council's Feb 21, 2023 directive to prepare replacement zoning to generally ensure consistency with current LUC provisions. To a large degree the other draft provisions for the s. 22(1) are fairly consistent with what exists now. However, the proposed limit on the number of storeys (2 plus basement) is a significant reduction from the 3 storeys currently allowed and therefore is a very significant inconsistency with current LUC provisions.

My request: That the proposed number of storeys "maximum 2 plus basement" in the draft Zoning Bylaw be changed to "maximum 3 plus basement" for s. 22(1)

Thank you.

s. 22(1)
WV s. 22(1)
s. 22(1)



Virus-free www.avg.com

From: Jill Lawlor
Sent: Tuesday, May 28, 2024 4:13 PM
To: s. 22(1)
Cc: correspondence
Subject: Gleneagles Golf Course

Hi s. 22(1)

Your email has been referred to me for response. Thank you for sharing your passion as well as your concerns for the Gleneagles Golf Course! We are seeing this trend across the whole golf industry, as most courses are experiencing higher demand than usual. We will continue to evaluate our analytics and explore options to reduce wait times.

Thank you for your patience and understanding.

Sincerely,

Jill

Jill Lawlor (she, her, hers)
Senior Manager of Parks | District of West Vancouver
t: 604-921-3467 | c: 604-418-3657 | westvancouver.ca



.....

We acknowledge that we are on the traditional, ancestral and unceded territory of the Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw (Squamish Nation), səliwətał (Tsleil-Waututh Nation), and xʷməθkʷəyəm (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: s. 22(1)
Sent: Sunday, May 26, 2024 12:35 PM
To: correspondence
Subject: Gleneagles Golf Course

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.

To: District Council and staff

I have been a West Vancouver resident for the s. 22(1) years and have golfed at Gleneagles golf course throughout those years. I have sometimes had to stay up late in order to book tee times as soon as they become available on line. While I may not get been my first choice, never before have I been unable to find an available tee time. Until now. Recently, I tried to make a booking the minute the website opened to me. I had a long wait and then a message that the course was fully booked. No times available at all for the day I had planned to golf. I heard later that all tee times were gone in under 5 minutes!

I understand that there is more interest than ever in playing golf. And all courses are extremely busy. However, Gleneagles is different. To my knowledge, it is the only nine hole course in the Lower Mainland. A half-size course can only accommodate half the number of golfers as the other courses. Ergo, double the wait time than on all other courses. Or longer, if some of the golfers decide to do a full 18-hole game (i.e. go around twice). It seems to me that this situation is unfair to West Vancouver residents and needs to be remedied.

One possible solution to this dilemma might be to allow West Vancouver residents to reserve a day before other golfers. I understand that this would require some changes to the current booking system to enable it to recognize those eligible for pre-booking. It would likely require a one-time registration -- including proof of residence -- of West Van golfers. However, as the system already recognizes different golfing groups, I have no doubt these changes could be made fairly easily.

Thank you for your consideration. I look forward to being able to golf at my neighborhood golf course again!

s. 22(1)

s. 22(1)

West Vancouver, B.C.

s. 22(1)

s. 22(1)