

OCP Housing Policy Update

Public Engagement Transcript | June 2025

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION	2
2. SURVEY RESPONSES	3
I. Survey Section 1 – Our Existing Housing Stock.....	3
II. Survey Section 2 – Housing Options.....	4
III. Survey Section 3 – Other Housing Policies.....	45
IV. Survey Section 4 – Open Ended Input	64
3. OTHER INPUT.....	82

1. INTRODUCTION

The District of West Vancouver is reviewing its housing policies in the Official Community Plan (OCP). This process is being undertaken in response to an amendment to the Local Government Act in 2023 by the Province, requiring local governments to review their Zoning Bylaw and OCP and, if necessary, update them to accommodate their 20-year total housing needs by December 31, 2025. Staff completed a technical review of the District's Zoning Bylaw and OCP housing capacity and identified a need to update the OCP's housing policies to comply with Provincial legislation.

This report provides a full transcript of all input and comments received during the engagement period. This document accompanies the OCP Housing Policy Update Engagement Summary, which analyzes and summarizes the input within this document.



2. SURVEY RESPONSES

The survey was designed to enable public feedback on the community’s priorities and ideas for new housing in West Vancouver, to help us define changes to housing policies in the OCP. The survey was available online for over a month in the period from March 31 to May 5, 2025 (inclusive) to allow the community to provide feedback. The following sections provide the responses received for each survey question:

I. Survey Section 1 – Our Existing Housing Stock

Question 1: Tell us how important the following housing types are for the creation of new housing:

	Very important	Fairly important	Important	Slightly important	Not at all important
a) Smaller detached homes	31% (197)	13% (84)	21% (130)	20% (124)	16% (99)
b) Coach houses	26% (165)	16% (99)	20% (127)	24% (151)	15% (92)
c) Multiplexes (3 or 4-plexes)	28% (180)	18% (117)	21% (131)	16% (104)	16% (102)
d) Row and townhomes	31% (198)	19% (123)	21% (131)	15% (96)	14% (86)
e) Apartments up to 4 storeys	29% (181)	21% (131)	22% (139)	16% (99)	13% (84)
f) Apartments over 4 storeys	18% (116)	15% (93)	16% (99)	17% (109)	34% (217)
g) Market rental housing	21% (135)	17% (110)	30% (190)	16% (101)	15% (98)
h) Below-market rental housing	24% (154)	10% (66)	16% (102)	18% (112)	32% (200)
i) Seniors housing	42% (268)	19% (121)	22% (140)	12% (75)	5% (30)

II. Survey Section 2 – Housing Options

A. Smaller Lot Subdivisions

Question 2: Would you like to see more smaller lot subdivision in the future?

Yes	No
72% (455)	28% (179)

Question 3: Do you support reducing minimum lot width requirements to remove existing barriers to subdivide lots that currently meet minimum site area requirements?

Support	Neutral	Do not support
78% (356)	15% (69)	7% (30)

Question 4: Do you support reducing minimum lot area requirements to further enable more subdivisions?

Support	Neutral	Do not support
76% (348)	15% (68)	9% (39)

Question 5: Do you have other comments or ideas for enabling more subdivision?

Need more information. Where are they? Close to public transport? Schools? Recreation options?
I am pro density
No.
Townhouses and low rise condominiums to give people more opportunities to downsize
As long as the lots accommodate single family housing, it would fulfill the Neighbourhood Characteristics report.
Keep subdivisions in the same area. For example making high density housing on Cypress mountain does not make any sense. No infrastructure or public housing implies the need of car ownership.
Subdivisions or higher density housing along marine dr. and bus stops makes more sense. make street walkable - more roundabouts and traffic calming in neighbourhoods.
It's a District Issue for the Last 25 years....without Density you have killed our community...there are no more families or kids...just the rich. I blame the District and the population 100%...no family wants to even live in WV anymore...this district has turned into a retirement community of old people that don't want any change and they will all be dead in 10 years and then there is no community left. Frankly as a lifetime time resident of WV I almost think its too late for you to change. The only projects for density that get approved are the ones where the District owns the land...I am just so thankful that the NDP is one councilors

and our Head Planner and hope that there is punishing consequences for the community to create density. I have been a Realtor in WV for 30 years...and frankly what a disaster we are...look at the diversity in NV and across the mainland and then look at WV...what makes us so different? Council doesn't approve anything...the planning department is a joke...they tell would be property owners they are open for density and then these people spend hundreds of thousands of dollars only to be told NO...example 2550 Queens, Cedardale townhouse project....duplex on 2400 Mathers....GET THE JOB DONE...enough of these silly reports and incompetence!!
Allow for 3 level single family homes
We need to create affordable housing so our children can stay in the neighborhood... we also would like to subdivide our lot to create a duplex so we could sell half and pay off our mortgage and remain in the neighbourhood.
Better join the 2 properties through a common wall in the garages to reduce potential neighbor disputes and conflicts
allow subdivisions
Lots that currently zoned or will receive approval to be zoned for duplexes should automatically be also approved for multiplex homes, as in up to four home can be built.
Better transit links even in existing corridors.
Build a new bridge.
I have seen housing units in North Vancouver which look a bit like a duplex but have 2 1-level units at ground level, and have 2 2-level units above, accessed from a flight of stairs at the front. This provides 4 separate units on what appears to be a 50' - 60' lot. Edmonton and Calgary also have some innovative housing that appeals to varying levels of buyers.
Enabling more subdivision should also include FSR restrictions to preserve as much of existing culture as possible given the constraints. Smaller lots and smaller homes would facilitate those of us wishing to downsize but not having options - most homes now have 4+ bedrooms.
Yes, the red tape needs to be reduced. Many ethical and sound builders will not take on projects in WV because of the lack of timely responsiveness of WV staff and departments. Existing building project are delayed making it a difficult for new development. Staff need to work harder to meet timelines.
I don't believe density can be achieved in many creative attractive ways given the flexibility of zoning. For instance I lived and worked in Switzerland for several years where I learned its common to take a small lot and have 4 or more small homes built on the property. Its in the design. It can respect the contours of the landscape or surrounding heights. Often the they had creative solutions for underground parking and also situating the small homes to face each other with small shared courtyards for playgrounds for kids etc. It does not have to always line up to a grid on the lot. Also having terraced buildings set into the hillside. If its designed and landscaped properly it is livable and not a concrete jungle. If we enable creative solutions in design and let go of some of the rigid zoning we could have more density in very livable communities that promote human interactions.
I support these reductions in minimum requirements so long as it is a slight reduction in minimums only to support smaller single family homes but not big subdivisions
Thought there would be a large number of new homes in the upper lands to meet Provincial Government requirements.
there are more opportunities to subdivide corner lots than interior lots
Parking allocation must be on the subdivided lot and not the street.
encourage property assemblies be done in a way in which developers compete more directly

I understand that it's impossible to meet the planners allowable square footage on most divideable lots because of their tight set back rules.
Focus on multi family due to land costs too high to make even smaller lots with new homes affordable.
Do not destroy the character of our neighbourhoods. Some areas are suitable for smaller lots but others are not. Our hillside topography must also be taken into consideration. If not there would be way too much disturbance with blasting and excavating etc to increase the quantity of lots but destroying the environment in the process.
No
Reduce creek setbacks
The bottom line on all of this increase in density in our community is transit. In addition many of our roads are narrow and barely support one vehicle. Also what about schools and amenities?
Design Control necessary
Need to encourage investment
I think that duplexes, townhouses, row houses are the best way to increase density, create space for families with children, and maintain a community feel
Suited best for flat areas.
coach houses
I am assuming this will not be widespread.
Speed up the permit process. Much of it currently seems like a cash grab
As a layperson those questions are worded very difficult to follow FYI What about also encouraging lot assembly?
Not rentals
subdivision should be done with building guidelines to create appealing communities
Row housing should have requirements preventing further exterior changes regarding size
Subdivision by reducing lot size should be based on neighborhoods vs all over west van, and the people who own homes in that neighborhood should decide. Do not want to see several adjacent homes listed by an agent pending rezoning like we saw/see in Vancouver shaughnessy area
We need more options and services to be able to attract a younger and more diverse population.
Neighbourhood character is over-used as a reason to disallow subdivisions. The term is too nebulous and should be better defined.
Build more housing. Make it more dense. Make it cheaper. Reduce red tape bureaucracy and unnecessary rules that slow the creation of new housing. Deregulate
Any subdivision must provide for plentiful off street parking. With multi generations living in homes they will bring multiple vehicles
Continue to increase infill development such as the townhouses on 21st across from the United Church and the 3 structures at 12th and Jefferson
WV has so many huge lots that could be repurposed to a higher density
Streets require paved sidewalks to encourage walking and lots marked for subdividing must be close to bus lines. Some lots should be sold as "NO PARKING FOR A CAR" to minimize on-street parking with resultant narrowing of residential street functional widths.
The minimum lot width requirements as currently established severely restrict subdivision options without pursuing a costly and risky rezoning or DP variance.
As long as there is parking and proper road access

If we are going to have divisions of existing lots with single family homes we need a certain amount of space that allows for parking, otherwise we will see street parking
Just as long as they are not rubber-stamp type of housing. Variety in design is most important.
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Keep minimum lot width at 50 ft. and minimum area but forgive frontage requirements. 2. Develop vacant Provincial and Federal lands for housing. 3. Encourage Squamish nation to develop land portion opposite Fisheries research station on Marine Dr.
Subdivision into legal separate lots should be flexible
I would like to see a gentle densification by enabling larger lots to be subdivided and encouraging 'lane way' housing or coach houses to be built for rental ..
While I support the above, landlords CANNOT use these potential changes to evict tenants in their rental detached homes to profit off turning their single to a multi unit property. These changes need regulations to forbid rental properties being used for these changes. Only owner occupied should be allowed to do this.
If an alley exists, reduce the setback requirements to permit subdivision of both front, back and side lots
Need to try to restrict developers building high end smaller homes. E.g. in Dundarave, at the Pierwell, the apartments are priced higher than many detached homes in west van. I don't see how that's helping the housing crisis.
Fractional ownership.
I think it's also important that we REDUCE the land-to-building ratio so that perhaps small lots will not be overrun with a dwelling. It does not help that developers and homeowners feel they need to maximize this ratio in order to reap the full value of their property. It leads to a feel of housing 'taking over' the property. Smaller lots will make this even worse.
I support this in principle but given this is not the most efficient way to create new housing units I don't think drastic changes are worth the outcome. If it makes sense then yes. But there could be additional context that informs each subdivision
Work more creatively when creeks are involved. I understand now that we can't build on both sides of a creek when a creek runs through a property because the sewer and water must arrive and leave both buildings from the one location (usually the street front). If there is a viable option for secondary sewer and water access for the potential second building on the other side of the creek, it would make sense to me to explore that.
Have to fix traffic before adding more people to the community
Need to severely limit single family homes
Large lots with ranchers look underutilized. Too many WV communities promote a car based lifestyle (this seems passe in today's times). I'm excited for the Rodger's Creek Village concept, a model for development. I support the construction of townhomes in Eagle Harbour and would like to see townhomes in my neighbourhood (land assemblies required) so seniors can move to smaller places and families can get into the market. Put a limit on square footage; does one family really need a 12,000 SF home which sits vacate most of the year. The project next to the ice arena/Kiwanis is disappointing; this premium location should have been much taller with more green space around it.
To ensure neighborhoods do not become too dense it is important to only allow large lots to be subdivided
They will be more attractive when some green spaces are incorporated into the design
We should allow flexibility in siting buildings on single family lots. Zero or minimum clearance should be allowed in side and rear yard setbacks if planned and built in groups to allow for useful open spaces. Existing narrow side yards are often useless whereas minimum to zero

clearance siting can support open spaces tht are more useful and aesthetically more attractive.
The way they build duplexes now, they are similar to a narrow home on it's own. I don't support more than 2 family homes on anything smaller than 50 feet. It has worked very well in Calgary.
I think it important to create communities. fyi, I really don't like the way the last few questions are asked - they are to general and my answers may not reflect feelings for certain areas and not necessarily agree with blanketing higher density.
It should be done in areas that are walkable to commercial zones.
in creating subdivisions it is critical that minimum green space requirements be articulated so that the 'feel' of the neighborhood is maintained
Circular cul de sac development with smaller lots create community and neighbour protection.
Get rid of the community amenity surcharge and provide the utilities necessary to support this. Making developers who subdivide the property pay all the costs is just plain dumb.
Are we going to talk about the best use of the sloping sites on the north shore? Rather than change the site to suit the homes, why can't we revert to designing the homes to suit the site and minimize the damage and flood risk to the site?
I think the capacity of Park Royal North and Cypress Village together can supply most of what we need and take pressure away from overloading traditional subdivision areas (single family dominated neighbourhoods)
relaxing minimum lot width in newly zoned areas makes sense, however in certain established neighbourhoods, minimum lot widths may not ever spur on new housing opportunities. the cost of construction is too high to use smaller lots in built out neighbourhoods to contribute to housing need
I think that, if done tastefully and slowly, adding density is a positive thing, particularly if there is an attempt to make more affordable housing options. However, if there are suddenly dozens of subdivisions popping up everywhere, I think this is a more challenging transition. Perhaps an area by area or certain threshold of change per area would be a more reasonable pace to consider. If we are just lining the pockets of developers and not addressing the actual systemic problems than none of this has much value.
Locate them close to shops and transportation - walkable
That helps a little, but given the amount of demand and affordability, apartment buildings up to six storeys will be more helpful.
who is going to pay for the infrastructure? A tiny lot is going to have a huge utility connection and community amenity charge - will the district remove these fees? No one will subdivide for the good of the community if there is no business case to be made.
Transit infrastructure is extremely important. The highway is going to gridlock soon. Massive housing development on sea to sky corridor is outpacing infrastructure. Great to have dense housing but when everyone needs a car to get groceries and go to vancouver west van will become in livable
make the process of applying for a subdivision easier
Would much rather see more smaller detached houses and coach houses rather than 2/3/4 plexes.
"Pan Handle" lots must be allowed, possibly needing setback relaxation from exiting structures
Support smaller lots and homes that will provide more affordable housing for younger new families in West Vancouver.

Why not look at existing monster homes and allowing them to become multi family residences. With renovati9n. Oats ben8mg significantly lower than yearning down and rebuilding? Work with what we've already got
Where lots are deep with lane access, allow subdivision between street and lane.
I think it only makes sense in areas where street parking/garage access will be reasonable. I don't know how you will add more cars to the streets (parked or driving). It's unsafe to walk many/most streets during weekdays, especially with no side walks in place.
I think this type of housing (small single family) should likely make up a fairly small percentage of future housing options given the value of land which dictates that even with a smaller footprint most smaller houses would still command a very high price.
More development will bring higher land prices, so even if we increase supply, we may still not achieve affordability. I (family of 5) will be moving out of West Vancouver, because I cannot afford to live here long term.
I encourage subdivision to increase affordability for extended families
I fully support creating more housing opportunities by making lots smaller. However, NOT if the developer's intention is to just create high end housing (think Pierwell in Dundarave.) it doesn't have to be so called "affordable" housing but it should be middle range and smaller town homes should not be a higher value than existing detached homes as has often been the case in West Vancouver.
Should be architecturally appropriate
Allow front/back division on deep lots, may require an easement for the access to the rear dwelling
We need more accommodation and smaller family housing
Exploring expo67 Habitat type form up to 3 storeys on a larger single family lot that allows for higher density with incredible privacy and individual outdoor space
I'm in support - as long as subdivisions do NOT result in the demolition of existing homes. We need to reuse, not demolish!
Townhouses or like, are usually 2-3 floors. This does not address most seniors.
Absolutely it must be just considered in lower areas under highway. But, at the same time to control its consequence traffic, needs to expand some roots like 15th and 22nd Streets, and build two new North-shore Downtown connections via tunnels. By this way we can keep current significant character of upper-lands and its houses while will have available diversity in housing but no more traffic & environmental problems.
The charm of West Vancouver is the very reason we chose to pay nearly triple the cost to live here compared to other towns. Its smaller size and quiet atmosphere create safe neighborhoods and family-friendly streets. Introducing high-rise apartment buildings disrupts this character and feels more appropriate for larger metropolitan areas.
Instead, townhomes or smaller detached homes should be offered as more accessible options for those who wish to move here but cannot afford multi-million-dollar houses. Building high-density towers with lower rents may lead to higher turnover, less stable households, and potentially increased congestion and crime—changes that could undermine the very qualities that make West Vancouver so special.
We still need space to breath do not pile unit on top of unit covering backyards and losing sunlight because the the shadow factor
Allow six-plexes by right on all lots.
Just don't make them strata. Worst housing type. Rather live in a tent.

<p>Allowing lots with 50 ft frontage to subdivide into 2 lots in Ambleside and Dundarave to have more younger families to get into the detached housing, it's important to have more varieties of housing for younger families.</p>
<p>Tax unused land at higher rate, particularly expansive estates of the British Properties that occupy massive footprint and prevent development of smaller, comfortable housing that could be provide housing for our local workforce. Pool those without pre-existing homeownership together to chop up large underused properties into multiplex units that could comfortably house 3-4 family units. Affordable homeownership will raise the tax base and reduce commuter traffic. Please start considering your local dedicated workforce as members that create a healthy community, otherwise it is just a population replacement program with disconnected individuals vs. a community of people living and working together for community sustainability and prosperity. Reach out and Poll the workforce, not just existing homeowners otherwise you will not receive the truth about what needs to happen.</p>
<p>I would like to see these subdivisions allowed in all parts of West Vancouver.</p>
<p>yes in support for all comes with the key rider that it be done thoughtfully regarding infrastructure that has to go with it(services: schools, etc \$</p>
<p>I do not know what the current width and lot areas are so feel unable to answer</p>
<p>We need more subdivision, but on smaller lots, there should be smaller properties with appropriate set backs. We do not need houses that extend right to the property lines.</p>
<p>I have a large lot that if it was divided, the 2nd lot would be slightly under what the current requirements are so I do support allowing that land to be used for housing</p>
<p>The process should also consider the lot topography, where the ground is sloped or restricted in another way, subdivision may not be appropriate. All resulting lots should be desirable for building and living on.</p>
<p>The district needs to make sure traffic planning as well. All new high rise have increased traffic congestion that is a wastage of resources and adds to global warming</p>
<p>Dividing a lot does not make it much cheaper certainly Not half the price as people think. Maybe 20% max. And building 2 new houses up the property value considerably, so there will be little if any savings</p>
<p>Our lots are pretty big; larger than most people really need—subdividing them makes sense.</p>
<p>Smaller homes are essential for reduced environmental foot print. Vanity homes are irresponsible.</p>
<p>Ensure that the overall subdivision process is streamlined. A step by step subdivision process guide would be helpful (for the average homeowner). Also, "Lot averaging" should be introduced into the zoning bylaw (so people could subdivide their lots and create one smaller lot that does not meet minimum lot standard [and the other lot would be larger] yet on balance/average they meet the lot area minimum standard.</p>
<p>A few smaller single family homes are okay. Large single family homes are more than necessary. It is nice for some people to be able to have a house and yard.</p>
<p>It would be helpful to see maps of the represented areas and what this means. It will be important to provide fast and frequent alternate modes of transportation so people don't have to rely on personal cars as is currently the case.</p>
<p>Allowing housing clusters and fee simple "cottage" units</p>
<p>Minimum lot widths not less than 25 ft</p>
<p>increase density in Eagle Harbour area houses that are close to Marine Drive and Greenleaf road, and increase density in horseshoe bay and on Skilift and Chairlift road</p>
<p>We need more housing options like the multi units on Esquilmalt and 20th</p>
<p>Make permitting easy</p>

<p>Sub division of larger lots could be considered but an important component would be to maintain as much greenspace, trees as possible. One of the features of West Vancouver is the garden like setting of the community. Densification needs to go hand in hand with the environment.</p>
<p>Other municipalities have better transit accessibility which is the focus of where density is being permitted. As WV has limited public transport and residents rely on Hwy 1 and Lions Gate Bridge for access to other areas, density/multiplexes would make sense 400m or 500m from main Hwy 1 access points such as Hwy1/Taylor Way, Hwy1/15th, Hwy 1/21st etc.</p>
<p>I support allowing more subdivisions and reducing lot size.</p>
<p>BUT - I am extremely concerned about infrastructure. Do we have the necessary bus, public transport to support more people? Not many WV residents take buses.</p>
<p>The only way to lower the cost of housing is to have smaller lots, as they are over 50% of the cost of new housing</p>
<p>No</p>
<p>Detached single storey smaller seniors housing. Seniors enjoy a small garden, privacy from neighbours, close to bus routes, or with walking distance to grocery/pharmacy stores.</p>
<p>smaller lots mean more houses and less expensive houses</p>
<p>A range of dwellings need to be created for middle income earners so that people of all ages can afford to live here. We desperately need to provide housing so that people can both live and work here. This would strengthen, enhance and build West Vancouver into a healthy and vibrant community!</p>
<p>Higher density is better than subdividing for increasing housing.</p>
<p>No.</p>
<p>The DWV needs to go beyond just zoning changes. It should proactively promote and encourage the type of development that it consider to be in the best long-term interests of DWV residents.</p>
<p>Growth should be measured (e.g. maximum 1% increase in DWV population per year) and planned to encourage the most appropriate type and mix of development.</p>
<p>Abandon over the top , ultra large homes to be built.</p>
<p>This support is qualified depending on the appropriate regulations and monitoring be in place to ensure a gradual and appropriate pace of development and allow for the expansion of infrastructure required.</p>
<p>Should not cause permanent harm to neighbouring homes ie block views, ugly solid concrete walls facing existing homes etc</p>
<p>Prefab housing</p>
<p>The houses need to be smaller not excessive size with 8 bathrooms</p>
<p>A good plan to change larger lots to smaller. More parked cars will require changes to the community.</p>
<p>All policies related to housing must be linked to transportation and healthcare related infrastructure policy and spend.</p>
<p>Build with quality construction and cost effective fixtures & appliances.</p>
<p>I would support reducing minimum lot width and area requirements only if maximum allowable FAR is appropriately reduced to include generous setbacks (smaller home sizes, larger setbacks). Also, must have restrictions on excavating sites to prevent lot-line to lot-line excavations and deep excavations. More must be done to protect existing trees and hedges that border lots.</p>

I agree with smaller lots and more subdivision, if it allows for the middle class (and subsidies for lower income) to purchase these homes. I am not in favour of these homes being turned into commodities for the rich to get richer and foreign investment. Densified housing should come with restrictions and protected for seniors, individuals, families and essential workers (fire, police, nurses, doctors and teachers, home care providers etc.).
Improve the infrastructure to support the higher density otherwise the incentive for owners to employ subdivision of any sort will be removed (buyers will pay more for more space and less density - i.e. the subdivided property than the sum of the divided property - unless of course the selling price of the subdivided property increases and becomes even more "unaffordable" to the middle class.
must me in keeping with the vibe of each neighborhood
Rezoning for multi-residential development for sale of a block of single family homes such as those on the north side of the 1500 block of Fulton Ave. (across from current district owned lands zoned for redevelopment). [REDACTED]
More density. More young families can come to live in West Vancouver as well as working here.
Reducing minimum lot width and lot area requirements would increase the supply of single family dwellings and cater for the needs of modest family incomes.
Support small families not requiring large lots May reduce traffic from less commuting

B. Coach Houses

Question 6: Would you like to see more coach houses in the future?

Yes	No
79% (504)	21% (130)

Question 7: Do you support the following ideas to promote more coach house developments?

	Support	Neutral	Do not support
Allow coach houses to be owned (as well as rented)	72% (363)	15% (73)	13% (68)
Provide more floor area exemptions for coach houses (to be determined through future technical study)	8% (358)	21% (107)	71% (39)
Exempt 2-storey coach houses that meet zoning and design guidelines from requiring a development permit	18% (313)	20% (99)	62% (92)

Question 8: Do you have other comments or ideas for enabling more coach houses?

Need more information. Why were they made rental only in the first place? Regulations for making them available for ownership?
I am in favour of coach housing if they are going to provide rental units
As long as the coach house meets the Neighborhood Characteristics report
It would be beneficial if the lot size were taken into consideration. For example, we own a 26,000 sq foot lot and a coach house there would have the same limitations / restrictions as one that would go on a 10,000 sq foot lot. That does not seem logical.
Let's keep in mind that if the whole lot becomes a coach house and a house. Well that's not cool.
Coach house's should have limited floor space. They should be owned by the home owner and either used by the home owner or rented out.
Coach houses are a great way for multi-generational families to be together. Selling them would also support the drive for more affordable housing.
reduce parking requirements for coach houses. Reduce street parking. Support congestion pricing for transit to build better infrastructure.
Nobody is going to build coach houses unless they can be stratified...this zoning change to allow them has been a complete disaster...how many have been built...likely less than 10. Follow the example of Kits and allow strata coach houses in Ambleside and Dundarave...its a no brainer...but will never be approved.
If we can have owned multi owner houses the coach houses are just a 2 item version
duplex zoning not enough to trigger needed density. Thus the glacial rate of development. Make lots 4 Alex minimum
Better transit links.
Much depends on access - is there an existing laneway? Could a partial laneway be included into a 2 - 5 lot redevelopment? Would "manufactures homes" be considered for these options?
Reduce time for processing of DPs and BPs. Protracted timelines drive costs up and discourage owners from proceeding with coach houses.
I was told by WV staff that Eagle Harbour was not allowed to develop any type of additional buildings for rental or otherwise. We were told that our 77 ft by 170 ft lot was too small for a duplex. We find that bizarre.
Goes to my previous comments. Flexibility will enable better solutions that fit the needs and make it more livable.
All smaller homes are a welcome to this district
Must change regulations to allow for 3 full size kitchens on each property with a coach house. Way too many problems in the future if coach house to become separate entity. Neighbourhood disputes apart property cleanliness and say rat problems.
Any new coach House must not impinge the view corridor more than the primary dwelling.
Coach houses seem to me to be the ideal choice for a solo independent senior, who may like a pet, downsizes from a larger 3-Bedroom Home in West Vancouver, and doesn't want to live in an apartment building with noisy neighbours.
Coach houses need to be two stories to be efficient at land utilization. Very few people are going to go through a year-long development permitting process unless the coach house is for a family situation. We are working against ourselves by requiring slowly processed rubber-stamp development permits for projects that me zoning and design guidelines -- poor use of everyones time and money and counterproductive to increasing affordable housing stock

West van is known for having very long development process times, with many hurdles and restrictions. We contacted them about a proposal and were given a big run around and so many restrictions that were impossible to build on newly divided lots. Ask your staff what went wrong on their numerous dead files.
The District should go beyond simply amending zoning requirements and making the approval process more efficient. It should also consider more active encouragement of these types of homes by bringing together interested homeowners and potential builders, and by facilitating consideration of more standardized (and hence less expensive) designs. Holding periodic forums at the Community Centre could be one possible initiative. In other words, consider an active marketing program for the development of coach houses in DWV.
No
Again, transit, schools & amenities. I supported the Cypress development as it was a walkable community where they were integrating the stores and businesses you need within a short distance so keeping traffic down
Coach homes are a great way to support seniors and student it's rentals
These are the wrong questions. These are questions policy experts should ask. You should ask the public "YES" or "NO" do you want to see more coach houses in your neighborhood? Why or why not? I don't know the zoning and design guidelines...
Not for rental
As rows housing, restrictions should prevent additional exterior expansions
We have so many "unwritten rules" in our district and things get approved on a whim, it seems. We need to have more options for our residents so that we can build multi generational housing options on existing lots.
Deregulate. Reduce the restrictions simplify those that remain and focus on affordability and speed and ease of construction. All other considerations are secondary with the exception of health and safety of course.
I worry about the parking on the street from these coach houses
While I agree there is an existing need for additional housing in WV: *I don't want to become a community of structures which don't meet necessary safety standards *I don't want structures peppered over our villages which don't enhance the neighborhood *I don't want our graceful community to become over-populated
Reduce regulations and restrictions.
Speed up the developmental review and the time taken to get a Building Permit. WHY 3 MONTHS???
Setting some basic design requirements, such as wide doors, halls and bathrooms for handicapped access, as well as accessible covered patios or porches to allow sitting outside, even on rainy days, would increase the housing stock for older adults and would also reduce design costs and the time taken to acquire a Building Permit.
Yes, I support allowing strata coach houses with separate ownership on a single lot.
Must have parking
Preapprove a number and variety of coach house designs. A person then need only select model "B" and a permit will then be immediately issued.
I think the building of coach houses is much preferred to the building of huge single family houses that cover the building lot from property line to property line and bare no resemblance to the the size and scale of the existing homes in the neighbourhood....
Allow 2 smaller suites in coach house. Don't count suites in coach house as part of the main house (ie allow 1basement suite + 1 coach house suite etc)

Smaller lots are better idea than coach houses. Need to be mindful on strain on infrastructure from rapid growth in coach houses.
They should not impact views for neighboring properties
In fill housing would be a good fit in my neighbourhood. Only concern is parking as transit service is poor. Residents who rely on street parking overnight, should be required to buy an annual permit. Street parking should not be free, this will help limit vehicles.
Roads, roads, roads. The municipality/provincial/federal governments must address the inadequacy of bridges and major arterial roads on the North Shore.
There should be a lot limit for newly built coach house. Not any of lot can be built coach house.
Need to expand possibilities eg house has a licences suite should be able to have a coach house as well.
Well this definitely needs to be supported -I visited city hall, I have an over 8,000 foot lot with a 3000 square foot house, was told I do not qualify for laneway house, but my yard has so much room and a laneway
Given the larger than average lot sizes that exist in much of West Vancouver, we should fast track the approval process for coach housing. This supports existing owners who wish to continue living on their properties long after they are able to take care of large lots. Younger families and individuals may well be able to afford to rent or buy smaller coach houses, thus giving a desirable age mixture to neighborhoods. Senior homeowners should also be able to move into coach houses built on their existing large lots, thus freeing their existing larger homes for rent or ownership by younger families.
Completely in support of adding coach houses having returned from New Zealand and staying in various typologies including coach houses. Observation from other cities seems to be that the key is to maintain a "green necklace" and maintain the coverage requirements to maintain porosity, wildlife habitation, privacy and sense of place. Smaller main homes with small homes works very well in a garden context.
Too generalized questions. From what I hear, too difficult and too expensive to make building coach houses in general worthwhile, although I think they are a good option for some properties and owners. Did not want to answer the last 3 questions, but could not move on without answering so answered "neutral"
You cannot ask me about densification without addressing traffic, road congestion and bridge issues. This is not an isolated issue. Cars and densification are connected. Waste of a survey without addressing an existing larger issue. Bridge traffic.
ensure that there is sufficient greenspace maintained on the lot....ratio of building to undeveloped space must be articulated
Allow adding rental mini houses on larger properties, lane house expansion.
Get rid of the high cost optional step code provisions, get rid of the sprinkler bylaw and cover the utility improvement costs through utility general revenues. Figure out what neighborhoods actually have lot sizes to support coach houses and ensure the high costs of building forced on developers are mitigated.
encourage sympathetic design with existing houses
Ownership can facilitate extended family supportive housing arrangements and estate planning, and local workforce ownership. 2nd storeys could be made subject to maintenance of neighbours view corridors, to reduce NIMBY opposition.
no
coach houses won't be implemented on smaller lots and if a separate water/sewer connection is required, the average homeowner will not proceed with a coach house. the regulation and DWV cost to develop a coach house needs to be simple, easy and predictable.

This is a realistic way to allow younger generations to afford staying in West Van without changing the single-family home currently built. I think coach houses help satisfy those who don't want to see SF neighbourhoods change too much and also allow for more housing. I think we should also allow the sale of coach houses separate from the home like in Vancouver.
why does it take 10 to 13 months to get a development permit - the Municipality needs to clean up the process
That helps a little, but given the amount of demand and affordability, apartment buildings up to six storeys will be more helpful.
remove requirements to sprinkle coach houses less than 1,000 sq ft.
Again need transit improvements.
I am very surprise that In North and west Vancouver, they keep on building everywhere, but no one is complaining to the city and province, about the traffic congestion that people has to deal everyday on the Hwy and the bridges that have, by far, done their time. Or is everybody waiting for a major disaster before someone does something about. Can some one please talk about this issue too.
As MOST houses are built to their maximum FSR there is NO possibility to add a coach house without adjusting it. Plus setback requirements must be looked into. It is also inevitable that West Van must eventually consider "Infill Housing" (like coach houses) when we run out of land, so the FSR MUST be flexible.
Remove as many barriers as possible. I would love an infill house but many wouldn't consider it.we,need to show advantages of this type of building
Have a few coach house plans by architect pre-approved that are contemporary and well-designed.
Again, my concern is traffic as our streets are not equipped for more cars. Traffic and speeding (even in smaller side streets) are already a huge problem. Unless there will be better transit options ...more density will just amplify the problem.
Coach houses appear to be an appropriate means of offering more "affordable" (entry-level or senior) housing.
Coach houses are one more way that extended families can stay together in West Van
Make the review process much easier. Currently people have to spend thousands of dollars on design and THEN thousands more to pay professionals to fight through the review process, before they can even start building. It's prohibitive.
I don't fully understand the process for c) to comment properly.
Give density bonuses for coach houses preferentially to owners of heritage homes if it allows for the retention of the heritage home
More coach houses as part of existing homes is a relatively simple and appealing way to increase affordable housing. However, non supportive neighbours frequently stand in the way.
Increase its maximum floor area up to 150 square meter as well.
It seems like a good idea to help more professionals to move into town while being the mortgage helpers to the owners.
EVERY development needs to follow guide lines and a development permit. Otherwise garbage will get built and we will be living in a cheap dump
Too tepid and tentative. Allow much greater density and flexibility.
Coach houses are incredibly expensive for owners to build, so maximising incentives is key.
Ensure there is parking without a paid permit.
Blocking neighbour views is a no go.

<p>These types of development will also allow for more aging in place and thus senior housing. This is a very important avenue to pursue, and to remove barriers (permitting and cost).</p>
<p>Traffic planning is to be added</p>
<p>Well owners of expensive properties are mostly not interested. You cannot make people build them if they don't want one, no matter how attractive the zoning and permit process may be</p>
<p>Cutting the red tape on all this sounds like a no-brainer to me.</p>
<p>Please remove the DP requirement...the zoning bylaw standards are sufficient and I don't need a far flung neighbour complaining about a structure that does not affect them (furthermore, most coach houses in WV will be built with quality and design in mind to compliment the principle dwelling & neighbourhood....the DP process is just too onerous and puts another road block into providing infill development. Also: provide more FAR and site coverage exemptions for coach houses...there are too many lots at 'build out' and they cant provide a coach house (even for their kids, parents or as a retirement dwelling).</p>
<p>I'm not sure but it is possible that a development permit is a good idea? Also, I live in an apartment and would love to live in a coach house.</p>
<p>If only some areas are selected for accelerating coach house development, those areas should be close to existing transit hubs.</p>
<p>Need to allow larger sizes of coach houses to accommodate family options - consider 1000 to 1200 square feet on all lots irrespective of size of main house, as long as setbacks maintained. Larger lots in district (10000 sq ft plus) could be considered for even larger units or two coach houses.</p>
<p>Approval times should be shortened</p>
<p>Coach houses can fit nicely into existing neighbourhoods without changing the character of the area.</p>
<p>I think we need to be looking at whether we are wanting to add more coach houses (smaller buildings) or that we are actually looking at putting in a small house. What is the difference? Should we consider leaving coach houses as is and looking more at the subdivision of bigger lots? It seems the conversation goes back to subdividing larger lots to allow additional housing.</p>
<p>Other municipalities have better transit accessibility which is the focus of where density is being permitted. As WV has limited public transport and residents rely on Hwy 1 and Lions Gate Bridge for access to other areas, density/multiplexes would make sense 400m or 500m from main Hwy 1 access points such as Hwy1/Taylor Way, Hwy1/15th, Hwy 1/21st etc.</p>
<p>Need more one story units suitable for seniors or those with limited mobility. Two story coach houses do not meet these needs.</p>
<p>2 storey coach houses that have one storey above ground and the other either entirely below grade or landscaped so that you cannot tell there is a lower level should be exempt from development permits. West Vancouver has many sloped lots and it is easy to hide a basement in a coach house reducing the visual impact on the neighbourhood</p>
<p>Streamline permitting process</p>
<p>Active education about options, opportunities and incentives should be undertaken and widely disseminated.</p>
<p>No.</p>
<p>The limited number of new coach houses that have been built is an indication of the lack of active promotion by the DWV. Asuming that the DWV wants to see a significant increase in the number of coach houses built, it has to go beyond just zoning changes and actively promote the concept and make it much easier to implement. This means directly addressing time and cost constraints imposed by DWV policies and processes. Hollyburn Mews (2000 block Esquimalt) has been widely acclaimed as an excellent model of</p>

development on single family lots. In the 12 years since these duplexes and coach houses were built, why has this concept not been replicated many more times in WV? Can the DWV do more to facilitate this?
There should be restrictions to ensure rental agreements are long-term not short-term.
Air B&B should not be allowed
Ensure adequate parking as public transit is inadequate.
Coach houses should not be allowed if they will have a detrimental impact to neighbouring properties (privacy, views, trees/hedges).
Coach houses, like rental suites are a form of increases population accommodation density but leaves ownership alone - their is no sub-division of the property ownership. If this was changed to allow ownership it is the same as the first category i.e. a subdivision. A subdivision based on parallel lines to the street vs a subdivision on right angle lines to the street. Making different rules for subdivisions does not make sense from an efficiency point of view - either to manage or to develop. Make sub-division based on lot size, lot coverage, building height just like land use management has been doing since WW2. Don't complicate land use management.
depending on the slope of the property where coach houses do not effect others view corridors
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Relax the set-back requirements for rear, front and side and between the main building and coach house (from the existing 16 ft to say 10 ft. 2. Remove the rental restrictions on coach house. 3. Increase the bonus allowance (from existing 800 sq ft to 1200 sq ft) 4. Remove the development permits requirements for the construction of two-storeys coach house, including "the neighbourhoods agreements", to expedite the coach house approval process.
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Remove rental restrictions 2. Increase bonus allowance 3. Relax setback requirements 4. Expedite coach house approval process
Relax set back requirements from 15 ft to 5-10 ft Remove rental restrictions Increase bonus allowance from 800 to 1200 sq ft Remove coach house restrictions for 2 storeys homes
Coach houses should be used to provide lodging for aging, able body parents which can reduce the demand for senior living individually

C. Multiplexes

Question 9: Would you like to see more multiplex homes in the future?

Yes	No
72% (454)	28% (180)

Question 10: Should single-family zoning be amended to also allow three units to be in the form of a triplex?

Yes	No
89% (404)	11% (50)

Question 11: Should single-family zoning be amended to increase the number of units per lot to up to four (a fourplex)?

Yes	No
73% (331)	27% (123)

Question 12: The District currently has a rezoning process for multiplexes. Please indicate the kinds of locations where the District should eliminate the rezoning process for multiplexes. (Please select all that apply)

Next to parks	56% (254)
Next to schools	65% (295)
Next to places of worship	48% (216)
Next to existing multifamily sites	76% (347)
Next to recreational facilities	65% (297)
Next to marine commercial areas (i.e., Thunderbird Marina, Yacht Clubs)	56% (256)
Next to local commercial nodes (i.e., Dundarave, the Black Cat, Isetta Café Bistro, the Dale)	70% (316)

Question 13: Other than the list above, where else do you feel multiplexes could be permitted?

Don't understand the question. Allow multiplexes everywhere.
Multiplexes are ideal for all sorts of people and families. I am pro density.
Anywhere
glenneagles community center
create high density housing along marine dr.
Anywhere in West Van without public consultation. Isn't this what the province has legislated... anything next to a bus
Near public transit
everywhere
Everywhere...

in all places
all of Ambleside and Dundarave
Any type of housing options should be permitted where the topography and lot sizes do not adversely affect existing neighbourhoods.
Question 12 is not clear. Is the question "eliminating the rezoning process" so as to permit multiplexes without rezoning, or "eliminating the rezoning process" to preclude consideration of multiplexes?????
Eagle Harbour should be permitted to build multiplexes. There are a number of flat large lots where this should be permitted and fast tracked.
All sites should require rezoning approvals.
a long arterial straight including Marine drive Taylor way
Close to transport along Marine Drive.
Ambleside
Anywhere. Multiplexing provide a variety of price points for young families without building ugly high rises. They also usually have green space around too, if properly planned. The current time delays for removing can sometimes take 3 years which is way too risky financially with spiraling interest rates. For example, a superb multiplex was designed for the corner of Bellevue and 22 and got shot down several times for petty issues. That's why developers are so scared of doing anything in West Vancouver.
Primarily In fill locations
Triplexes should be allowed on all RS lots.
Next to purely commercial areas. Would hopefully reduce vehicle traffic so people can walk to the grocery store pharmacy, coffee etc.
Taylor Way, Horseshoe Bay
Non
While in principle I support multiplexes this has to be done deliberately and with care- there are many places in WVan that are not suitable for larger developments due to narrow roads, safety, and already high traffic. Have you been around West Bay or Rockridge at school drop off or pick up times?!? Should only be allowed where there is already higher density and a transit plan.
Everywhere
I think multiplexes should exist in all neighbourhoods.
Wherever space and parking permits
Everywhere! I don't know (as a layperson) how to answer this question. Again - wrong question - many people probably have no idea what rezoning is or the implications. I am "pro density." You are the experts on how to exactly do that with codes, ODP's, policies etc.
High streets not residential neighbourhood
Specific sites after staff review and local comment. Know this is a slow and expensive process
Anywhere by bus stops
Around all community centres and at transit hubs
On main streets near transportation, within walking distance to schools and grocery stores.
AMPLE PARKING MUST BE INCLUDED IN ANY INCREASED DENSITY BUILD.
Everywhere in West Vancouver. Deregulate. Build more housing.
No on existing single family lots.
see above

Anywhere that owners / occupants could live without having to drive to buy milk. These homes are less likely to appeal to those who could afford to live in West Van, run a car and not worry about driving to buy food and other necessities. Thus, eliminating parking could help reduce the design, development and building time for this type of housing stock, as well as 'street clutter'.
Allow multiplexes throughout existing residential areas including Ambleside and Dundarave, with form of development (height and floor area) controlled to fit in with existing single occupancy houses.
Next to transportation hubs
Where there are huge lots that are sitting vacant like the former Nursing Home on 29th Street.
I think multiplies should be allowed without re-zoning on all currently single family zoned neighbourhoods - we need the housing diversity throughout our various communities in West Van.
Permit multiplexes along the transit corridors, i.e. Marine Drive. and above the Upper Levels highway
There should be no restrictions. A variety of housing in all areas adds to community vitality.
I believe multiplexes should be permitted throughout the district without restriction.
Permit them everywhere
All Dundarave and Ambleside lots should change to multi lots.
Along the marine corridor.
Along public transportation routes
Near commercial areas such as along Marine Drive in Ambleside and Dundarave
No restrictions.
Fulton and below. Close to transit and shops.
In the corridors previously identified. I.e. ambleside up to Fulton or around area west of Dundarave up to Fulton
The areas closer to Marine Drive, recreation centre, Library - where there are already some. Expand those areas.
Anywhere
Anywhere feasible
Closer to Taylor Way
Near busses and shopping
Any location where lot area makes multiplex viable and readily accessible services. Available infrastructure is a high priority.
Near entrances to single family neighborhoods and near to transit infrastructure
Near high rise towers
Walking distance to commercial zones (within 5 blocks)
Near malls
On all the major roads
Around the rec centre; within proximity of bus routes
wherever
Adjacent to high service public transit nodes. Mini-stratas should be encouraged but subject to a limit like Vancouver has on SNRFS (Special Needs Residential Facilities) - small group home style; limited to one per x metres radius, to avoid overloading neighbourhoods. In WV, this could protect existing single family neighbourhoods from overloaded street parking. Many large lots (eg: ██████████) could support several cars parked on their own driveways - and already do, by my observation.

anywhere commercial
there are other locations within a certain distance to transit stops that could be acceptable
Next to bus corridors
Next to Park Royal
Next to transit. Having dense housing in the middle of no where means excessive cars on the road and no options for lower income people. Great to have coach houses but gridlock will be the result
Everywhere by right.
There are many areas where multiplexes can be built. Because if large lots. Unless it fits in with the neighbourhood I might not,like a multiplex in an area of the above places are ideal for multiplexes. My only concern is transportation. We have 2 arteries highway and marine. More infrastructure will be necessary and major Improvements along marine drive keeping in mind that people live a,not this corridor and do not suddenly want to be living 9n the new upper levels with speeding cars
Within walking distance to existing transit routes.
They should also be encouraged to be near Marine Drive to facilitate transportation. There should be no restrictions on re-zoning for multiplexes - this is essential for neighbors that reasonably do not want high-rises, they are better able to accommodate multiplexes.
Next to major bus routes
Generally along the marine Drive corridor
Ambleside
Do not think that any areas should be eliminated from the rezoning process.
everywhere
At new development sites like next to Cypress area.
Multiplexes could be built anywhere
NO exemptions everything needs to go through rezoning process.
All lots. We need to get serious about the housing crisis.
Everywhere. Victoria has made considerable headway on this and has retained its flavour and charm. There is absolutely no reason West Vancouver cannot do the same. In fact it would provide the tax base for the improvements, that the commercial district sorely needs.
Horsehoe Bay commercial area
All over Ambleside and Dundarave. There are two lots in Ambleside where multiplexes have been created, and one in the process of development on 16th/Haywood. None of these developments have had a negative impact on neighbourhood character. If anything, they have enhanced character.
everywhere
On or close to bus routes
on Fulton near 15th street
On any residential lot over a minimum size, say 10,000 sq ft. I have lived in the original [REDACTED] [REDACTED] for over 45 years and I think there are many larger lots which could be redeveloped into multiplexes which would not overwhelm neighbourhood character but would facilitate increased density.
All areas where homes in excess of 4,000 square feet are permitted.
Horshoebay area
No additional suites or coach houses for multiplexes.
I don't really feel like there's anywhere they should be forbidden from being built.
Gleneagles

Along Marine Drive.
None
Anywhere near good transit connections. Additional transit connections and zoning for community-sustaining commercial spaces like local grocers will help improve quality of life.
Perhaps on corner lots
On main arterial corridors
horseshoe bay should increase density
In proximity to transit and commercial areas.
Designate specific geographic areas such as Altamont and British Properties to allow multiplexes
I think they should be on major streets that have bus stops and safe walking routes (ie streets with sidewalks). More density is needed but it is important that they have a non-car way to get around for daily needs.
It would seem another option is to offer multiplex development on a large lot, which could be in various areas of the community. If it could be done while preserving green space, there is less of an impact into existing neighbourhoods. There are opportunities, ie church sites, gas station sites, to redevelop into a multiplexes - that fit into a neighbourhood.
Next to a mall.
Question 12 - clarification, my answer is based on allowing the multiplex and removing the requirement of rezoning for a multiplex ie prezoned.
Kay Meek, Empty Building near Capilano River that was a Seniors Home.
On all lots in West Vancouver
On transit routes
While I support this approach, a simplified, effective and efficient protocol needs to be established for this approach to be effective.
The DWV should permit up to three units on virtually all single family lots in the District (subject to lot size), but provide greater flexibility in the form that these can take. Subject to reasonable constraints, the time and cost of approvals of conforming developments should be reduced to a minimum.
In the British properties
Wherever they can be built without being too conspicuous in the middle of a detached home residential area
Next to public transport
Everywhere sufficient land is available
Yes
They should be permitted within regular residential neighbourhoods, as long as they have 2 parking spots per unit included inside the multiplex.
Anywhere and everywhere.
Parks and recreational facilities are already over extended - need to have a strategy in place before additional densification.
British Properties.
Anywhere that is suitable. I feel that there should be a cap on multiplexes, I feel too many in one location would cause parking issues noise etc. Everything done in moderation can work.
Everywhere? Or nowhere? In It is better to designate smaller lot size/multiplex use in island areas within areas of higher lot size and lower density and to create corridors of "slums".
not near busy areas such as Marine Drive. spread them out so that when people have guest over they don't park on marine drive. It's already a shortage of parking issue there.
within walking distance of transportation and/or shopping

Question 14: Do you have other comments or ideas for enabling more multiplexes?

Need information about transportation issues. Need to know why they haven't been allowed before now?? What's held them back?
Please make the zoning easier in order to encourage development of these type of buildings.
yes vacant land adjacent to marine drive at gleneagles golf course
A random multiplex in what is normally a single family area does not make sense.
Transit has to be updated to support densification
Don't see it ever being approved in WV as the resistance is to strong and public consultation makes it impossible to approve unless WV owns the property...Maybe we should just sell our lots to WV then density will get passed?
Better transit links.
As a senior, having lived in West Vancouver for 50+ years, I have spoken at length with others in my position. What we would love to have is an individual smaller house (or other designated individual living unit) with access to a communal garden area we can all enjoy without having to maintain it ourselves. As someone who worked in the New Home Development, I have much information about how these goals have been met across the entire Lower Mainland.
WV staff need to develop processes that maintain the environment and the integrity of a neighborhood while speeding up the approval and mitigation process. WV staff have a reputation in the Lower Mainland of working mostly from home and not working hard enough to keep the district in fine running order.
I own a single family home. Planning for the future I would like to be able to divide my house into two dwellings and build one or two small homes on the back of the property. This would enable me to age in place, accommodate adult children with kids if I needed or desired to or rent or sell those dwellings so I have other neighbors close by on the property that can check on me.
Higher density areas make sense for multiplex development but not lower density areas
It
corner lots offer greater potential for multiplexes than interior lots there should be more opportunities on corner lots throughout Ambleside and Dunderave
Open up the over constrained rules for development. Show developers you're willing to work with them. It will be hard because of the initial Refusal of West Van to adhere to the BC mandate for multiplexes on single house lots. It was a very aggressive stance and developers are now reluctant to come to this area at all.
No
Parking will be a problem. For multiplexes, the city should require that parking be built into the complex.
Make sure that incentives, FSR, is preferable to build multiplexes. Or else we'll just keep getting more giant homes. Make sure they are low-carbon all electric with cooling. Make sure they are family sized.
Near bus stops.
Multiplex's fine I. Ambleside too, but no more high rises in Ambleside. We don't want to be a concrete jungle like Yaletown with too many people. Keep open spaces, it keeps people sane
Newly developed building sites
Create better pedestrian walkways (trails, sidewalks) and increase transit frequency.
a minimum lot size for multiplexes to ensure there is still green space on each lot
AMPLE PARKING MUST BE INCLUDED IN ANY INCREASED DENSITY BUILD

Deregulate, those regulations that remain need to be simple and clear and encourage building more home faster
Will our existing infrastructure support densification? My biggest concern is water and sewer. If we're going to incur cost to upgrade capacity, then build the homes people want
Ensure the lots are big enough to allow for "elbow room". Infrastructure has to be considered in advance, how will the addition of people and cars, for example, impact the area.
Ensure that each has a covered outdoor seating space, as well as a small garden for growing flowers, fruit and vegetables. Housing should not only provide necessary shelter but should help encourage and facilitate a healthy way of life!
Eliminate the use of the term "single-family zoning" and change it to "Residential Inclusive district schedule" as used in Vancouver. Single-family zoning is a legacy of the past thinking.
Just do it!
Other areas should require spot rezoning as currently is permitted.
Multiplexes, add character and variety to neighborhoods. They also add the possibility of social connection and interaction and a sense of neighborhood.
Permit each multiplex to have a suite. This is common in other Canadian cities and provides a rental income for owners, helping offset the added costs of this project
Allow developers to build complex buildings.
As per my comments above. A multiplex can't end up costing the same as a detached home.
Please keep them separate from each other, ie. only a certain (small-ish) number per neighbourhood
Yes. Part of beauty of west van is the gardens and shrubs. Any infill or duplex etc should require good landscaping with space for outdoor living to avoid parks being even more congested. Good balance should be required
In my opinion, this should not happen up in areas like Altamont, British Properties, Caulfield, etc. (No, I don't live in these areas). These multi family homes should be in areas of the community that it makes sense to put lower cost housing, done in a way that fits the fabric of the community, where there is infrastructure in place to support these additional people (i.e. parking, access to schools, access to transit, etc.).
I would be concerned about multiplexes taking over forest space
no but my biggest concerns are traffic, parking, and the lack of sidewalks/ pedestrian safety with added density
Maximum flexibility should be permitted in design and siting. Some of the best examples of multiplex quality can be found next door in the District of North Vancouver where noted architect Fred Hollingsworth designed a number of 4plexes along the western end of Edgemont Boulevard in the 1950's. Today, these are much-coveted multi family accommodation that offer most of the benefits of single family dwellings -- privacy and greenspace -- without most of the negatives that badly designed multiplexes often include.
Should have parking for each unit
with the aging population, consideration for multi-generational housing could enhance the quality of life and the support system for the aged in our district
Retail on the main floor, apartments above.
They should be limited to 2 storeys in height
be clever about it
There should be a category for small scale strata's that join a vehicle collective that supplies shuttle service to and from high frequency public transit, to facilitate multi-plex dwellings in traditional single fam areas, without overburdening their streets with parking. 100 units would support a shuttle just like 100 u. seniors' residences do (financed thru a shared strata budget).

triplexes are able to be done under part 9, whereas a larger 4 flex might not be. review code implications to see if four-plexes really make sense.
That helps a little, but given the amount of demand and affordability, apartment buildings up to six storeys will be more helpful.
Caution/rules in place if increasing allowable units in a multiplex to ensure quality of units developed. Otherwise, concerned developers and/or will use this as a cash grab to create multiple small, inadequate housing spaces.
Needs to be close to transit
I would like to see multiplexes but built for families. Not just with 1-2 bedrooms but ones that can accommodate a family with 3-4 kids. Square footage of a modest house but not the large footprint of a single family home
Allow for neighbouring sites to combine which could allow for more flexibility and improved multiplex layout.
My experience would dictate that parking and traffic are the biggest issues facing increased density in exiting neighbourhoods. That doesn't enable more, I acknowledge, but in fact might endorse the need for re-zoning.
Regarding my earlier comment regarding development-related increases in land prices - if development is allowed virtually everywhere then that would limit the overall increase in land prices, as development would not be restricted to very small areas.
Make the application process faster
As per my comment before, I supposed multiplexes but not if the townhomes/apartments become more expensive than existing housing stock. I can think of 3 recent examples: building at 23rd & Marine, the new pierwell development in Dundarave and Horseshoe Bay. I initially supported all 3 of these developments but now regret that. They are so high end and expensive that local residents couldn't even sell their existing home to buy one. I looked into downsizing to Dundarave but the apartments cost more than what I would get for my house. This does not create housing opportunities. it only pushes younger people, families, single people, seniors and downsizers further away.
Support Michael Geller type of developments.
streamline the rezoning process to a maximum of 6 months total including building permits
Follow the provincial guidelines
I grew up in Montreal with many rental opportunities and mostly row type housing None were more than 1 floor except for the wartime homes. Life was very good.
All around Marine Drive area.
stratification is necessary to make these work
NO exemptions everything needs to go through rezoning process.
Why stop at four? Six would be better. Rowhouses would be even better. True densification would be even better than that. Aim higher!
Once again, forming a registry for those that are not current homeowners that would like to come together to purchase and divide large underused properties into comfortable multiplexes to house 3-4 family units per property. Approach government for interest free or interest reduced loans to help families afford this type of endeavour. If gov't can help with building affordable housing in the Jericho lands, they can help with housing the inadequately housed WV workforce and WV renters who would prefer the stability that homeownership provides.
If the site is big enough and the plan is built to look similar to a single family home then they should be allowed anywhere
on Fulton near 15th street

<p>One factor which I think could/should be taken into consideration is the natural setting of such lots. There are several lots in my neighbourhood which could be developed into multiplex development while preserving privacy and blending the scale of the development into the neighbourhood character.</p>
<p>Restrict developers from constructing more huge, luxurious and expensive homes. We need more affordable homes for people who work in West Vancouver.</p>
<p>There should be a streamlined rezoning process (whereby early drawings/ideas are presented to Council) and then Council can decide early on if development will be generally supported on a specific site....and then the detailed drawings, staff review and public feedback can be completed. As it stands now, the developments 'are fully cooked' by the time they are at Council at considerable cost to the developer (and staff time).</p>
<p>No</p>
<p>Multiplex design inherently involves smaller living spaces, both indoor and outdoor. Pedestrian infrastructure in these scenarios can greatly improve quality of life. Our streets are currently designed for cars with pedestrians as an afterthought. Dedicating more of this public space for pedestrians and local community can enhance livability, especially in areas that are walkable to commercial amenities. Removing on-street parking sooner rather than later is important if we want to shift behaviour away from car-dependency and avoid a catastrophic traffic problem.</p>
<p>Allow and enable large homes to be internally renovated into several units - without size constraints on those units. For example a current 7000 square foot house could be made into 3 or 4 units without changing the original home footprint thus minimizing the impact on the neighborhood aesthetics. Review ways to do so economically without having to gut the home to achieve this.</p>
<p>Simplify and Speed up approval processes</p>
<p>allow increase density in horseshoe bay to allow to build smaller affordable units so people can stay in horseshoe bay by buying units under \$1m</p>
<p>Parking issues would be a problem</p>
<p>Ensure that parking for multiplexes does not overwhelm the landscaping. Parking needs to be at the rear and not affect neighbours through good buffering. There should be design regulations to make multiples fit in and not be an eyesore.</p>
<p>I am hesitant about having a bunch of density added right next to schools and places of worship, particularly those where most students/congregations don't live within a few blocks. Traffic can already be significant around those facilities and they often don't have large enough parking lots to accommodate. And given the current (very limited) transit service levels and sparse bike/walking infrastructure, people living in these new homes will inevitably be car-reliant and contribute further to traffic.</p> <p>West van 100% needs more density and I fully support that, including on my own single family home street. Having lived in Kitsilano prior, it's definitely possible to do this while also maintaining neighborhood character and without traffic gridlock. But a critical difference between Kits and West van are the ubiquity of sidewalks and frequent and efficient buses to commercial areas and to downtown.</p> <p>Bike infrastructure is also better in kits, but I think west van is limited in how much bike infrastructure would help (hilly so going to be harder to get people using bikes for daily errands). If West van could significantly step up its transit and speed up its sidewalk installation project, I view that as a total game changer in terms of how open people would be to more density on their street. It's all about the cars/driving traffic and people being afraid of being trapped in their street or their kid being hit by a car.</p>

While we are looking at adding density, we need to be concerned with changing the neighbourhood characteristics and loosing green space. Thoughtful design guidelines should be prepared along with changes to densification.
Other municipalities have better transit accessibility which is the focus of where density is being permitted. As WV has limited public transport and residents rely on Hwy 1 and Lions Gate Bridge for access to other areas, density/multiplexes would make sense 400m or 500m from main Hwy 1 access points such as Hwy1/Taylor Way, Hwy1/15th, Hwy 1/21st etc.
Yes, for seniors homes. Currently the wait list for public care facilities for seniors needing memory care is one year plus. They can't wait that long. The only alternative is private. Memory Care at Amica is \$17,000 per month!
Engaging with builders to create prototype models that could be built efficiently in a short period of time.
Again, zoning by itself is insufficient. The DWV should be proactive in encouraging the type of development that it considers to be beneficial to the District.
Be careful regarding high volumes of pedestrian and vehicular traffic encouraged by mixing high use areas and multiplex housing
I only support triplexes if they can be stratified. The current rules, which require the property owner to become a landlord for the additional units, does not work because why would anyone who can afford the property want to manage renters?
Must have a transportation, recreation and education policy that aligns with densification.
Do you have examples of multiplex options? What do other municipalities, provinces or other countries have that would be a good examples. My issue with multiplexes is too much density in some areas, noise and parking. As I mentioned above, in moderation it could work.
In any specific neighborhood allow a mix of zoning areas. Blur the lines between slum areas to allow acceptance. The examples to follow is Plateau Village in the Pemberton Heights neighborhood.
some areas are more suited for multiplexes than others depending on ease of access, parking etc.
Reduce the time of approval by the city Government.
1. Conduct area-plan studies to pre-zone for multiplexes in alignment with provincial legislation to provide housing diversity in the municipality. 2. Allow for the stratification of multiplexes to increase the housing supply.
Allow for the stratification of multiplexes to increase the housing supply.
There are so many streams and creeks in West Van. Some are just water drainage channels. Should relax a bit on fishing bylaws (case by case?)

D. Row and Townhomes

Question 15: Would you like to see more row and townhomes in the future?

Yes	No
77% (490)	23% (144)

Question 16: Please indicate your support for the following strategies to enable row and townhomes next to “neighbourhood hubs” along the Marine Drive Transit Corridor.

	Support	Neutral	Do not support
Update zoning to allow for row and townhomes in these areas	84% (411)	10% (51)	6% (28)
Continue with site-specific rezoning requirements, but prepare design guidelines to facilitate their review	65% (318)	24% (117)	11% (55)
Permit ground-level live-work and/or lock-off rental suites	66% (325)	21% (102)	13% (63)
Allow townhomes up to 4 storeys, not only 3 storeys	43% (211)	17% (83)	40% (196)
Undertake a study, with community engagement, to identify which locations make most sense for new row and townhomes	77% (378)	16% (78)	7% (34)

Question 17: Outside of Marine Drive, are there other locations or other strategies the District could consider to enable row and townhomes (if at all)?

2-3 blocks up from Marine Drive
Cypress Village
everywhere
Horseshoe Bay
anywhere in west van.
They should be allowed in any other location.
Dundarave Villiage, Horseshoe Bay, Ambleside
Above Dundarave
Transit has to be planned and included in densification
All of Taylor Way...15th, 21st...Fulton from 15th- 21st...the obvious places around recreation, schools, amenities.
Everywhere including British Properties, Dundarave, Caulfield, Whytecliff, etc. avoid bringing more density where there is already high density e.g. Horseshoe Bay, etc.
Close to existing amenities such as schools and rec centre and transit
Anywhere in the district
Ambleside and Dundarave
Near schools, community centres, parks.

Bellevue
Dundarave
When the south side of Fulton Avenue was designated to allow narrower lots, the municipality did nothing to encourage that concept to proceed. I have not specifically looked into suggestions for other locations, but I am concerned that the more eastern blocks of Fulton (which I think I read are being considered) are likely too steep for many seniors.
Shorten timelines for the process, and reduce uncertainty as to the outcome of the rezoning process.
Everywhere it makes sense
along the peripheral periphery of parks townhouses in stacktown houses should be allowed. also near schools and other transit corridors
Next to existing multi- family concentration areas in Ambleside & areas around schools.
I believe this form of housing would be suitable at entrances and exits to the highway as well. If we increase the density in these locations it would have minimal impact on the surrounding streets as access to the highway would be convenient.
Caulfeild Shopping mall. This area could actually host towers!
Along the Sea to Sky corridor.
British Properties
Above highway
Yes, there are several double lot or older commercial lots which would support these types of homes beyond just marine drive.
Yes. There are a number of areas in WV where row and townhomes could be permitted, particularly where there are other community facilities such as schools, shops, community centres, places of worship, parks, etc. This is an important way of addressing the affordable housing situation without having to provide subsidies or other non-market incentives.
Any areas are fine
Major arteries (especially those with bus service) should be considered (e.g. 21st Street). Other streets like Argyle and Bellevue too.
Other commercial hubs: Caulfeild, New Cypress Park area,
Upper level cypress
In Ambleside and along to Dundarave, where there are already quite a few mid rise apartments, 2 adjacent older houses could be demolished and replaced by 6 or 8 unit town houses.
On streets adjacent to marine drive (eg Clyde, duchess & Esquimalt) in the Ambleside & Dundarave corridors
Ambleside block by block approvals
Ambleside and Bellevue ave
Taylor Way and 15th Street
Let the market determine
taylor way; 15 th, 11th, 21, 25, mathers, fulton
Near WV Rec Centre and Ice Arena
Everywhere
lower Ambleside, lower Dundarave
Townhouse developments and the resulting density should only be considered in place where the infrastructure to support the density exist. This is not true for much of Marine drive west of about 30th. NEED sidewalks, streetlights, parking. Need a safe way for kids to WALK to school. Need better bus service and a safe way to access bus stops along marine drive

Everywhere! I am opposed to adding density on main corridors. It is VERY unfair that single family owners get to enjoy 'quiet residential streets' but families that can only afford townhouses and apartments have to put up with the noise, pollution of arterial road traffic. My kids can't play outside in front of Marine drive! Allow townhouses to replace single family if you want equitable communities.
Don't waste money on studies. W V already has too much bureaucracy, rules and regulations.
Yes, other areas should be explored. Along Haywood between 24th and 2nd Along Fulton
Not unless it is accompanied by regular transit
Taylor Way, around the 3 high schools, Mathers, Inglewood, Fulton -
Around our community centres and schools.
Your question assumes people who live in townhouses commute by public transit and do not drive. This is incorrect - therefore your question is flawed and will skew the results of this survey to your desired result which is to announce that the survey supports building townhouses along marine drive in west van. I do NOT support townhome development along marine drive (ambleside/dundarave). Please find another area eg caulfield or west of caulfield eg squamish. Otherwise people who wish to live in townhouses can go to North Vancouver, they have plenty of options.
main thoroughfares such as Fulton and Inglewood.
Any where that they will fit with the area proposed.
No
Too many studies. Just get to work on facilitating the creation of more housing that is affordable for more people. Deregulate and let the free market provide the housing we need it.
Just along Marine Drive which has good transit.
e4verywhere
Row homes an be integrated into existing neighborhoods
As previously described in answers to other questions.
Allow townhouses throughout traditional residential areas and in particular adjacent to parks and schools
Dundarave and Ambleside
Above hwy
Townhouses could be built anywhere in West Vancouver
Again, allow diversity in all communities in West Vancouver.
Above the Upper Levels highway.
Fulton Gordon in Dundarave Ambleside
The proposed restriction to Marine Drive would simply end up stifling any construction of townhouses. The Quintette development on 14th demonstrates row houses can fit in anywhere.
town houses in the British Properties in the areas around existing private and public schools..
Permit them wherever there are sufficient utilities and businesses nearby. Encourage building near transit routes.
Horseshoe Bay
Up Dundarave. They have big lots.
Marine corridor is best

Fundamentally need a mix of properties in all neighbourhoods. Should not restrict location of townhomes.
None
Anywhere Fulton and below
All RD1 and RM4 zoned lots
Up to Fulton ave along whole of marine drive
what are we going to do about the lions gate bridge and congestion traffic that we already have?
Taylor Way or close to park royal
Close to Upper Levels Highway. Also, cluster townhomes near schools for families.
Do NOT build multi-home, row nor townhomes on the Taylor Way corridor - traffic is already TERRIBLE between the Lions Gate Bridge & Highway. The traffic infrastructure cannot take more houses (& therefore traffic) on this route!
Fulton ave & 15th Street
Duchess, Fulton, Inglewood
Horseshoe Bay
Off Marine Drive, but nearby, such as the area around the rec centre and tennis courts, perhaps on the side streets around Dundarave.
Near Caulfeild Shopping Centre. Near other major congregation areas.
Above the highway
I would like to see more townhomes throughout WV as seniors need places to move so they can stay in their communities. A variety of housing makes for a healthy community. Eagle Harbour townhomes will be a positive addition. Keep parking off Marine Drive and add a bike lane instead.
I'd stick with Marine Drive through Ambleside and Dundarave, and of course the development up Cypress. West Van is very special and desirable because it is low density. Our taxes reflect this. Coach houses help residents stay in their homes as they age but row and town homes just add density.
Taylor Way, British Properties
Encourage big lots around schools to develop townhomes which is relief traffic.
Integrate within the community
Throughout much of lower Ambleside and Dundarave.
Near existing duplexes or townhomes.
Do not think that the entire Marine Drive should be considered. If adding these types of densities, similar growth will need to be in place for schools, community and infrastructure. Specific locations should only be considered with CAC or DBIs. Our current infrastructure, schools, parks and community centers are not keeping up with other Municipalities.
Near commercial area of Someplace Special
row homes are appealing to downsizers who enjoy the garden space. having multiple levels with stairs may limit who can avail themselves of these properties. design considerations could adapt for this population cohort
Horseshoe Bay, Caulfield, Cypress
Widening 15th to improve corridor extra lane and bike lane, changing the zoning similar to done by NVan on westview into NV.
Stick to commercial areas where density can be supported more readily. Need to consider impact to traffic, parking etc.
Park Royal

Around the rec centre and senior centre
look at Oak Street for reference
Yes - on otherwise uneconomical large lots of underutilized land. A topo survey should look for those sites and a public ed strategy should encourage owners to sell or bring them forward for housing proposals.
there may be other flat sites accessible by transit that could make sense. lots near other commercial nodes, like Caulfield village could be appropriate
Along 15th st and Taylor way, in a 2 -5 block radius above Marine Drive in Ambleside and Dundarave.
On bus corridors
Taylor Way; Horseshoe Bay; Caulfield Shopping Center
More transit. Marine Drive is a cottage road. Buses come by once in a while.
Cedardale, Horseshoe Bay, Cypress Park
Everywhere by right.
Why only Marine Drive corridor. This type of housing can fit in any of West Van enclaves. Caulfield, Eagle Harbour, properties etc.
Along and within a block or two of existing transit routes (ie Fulton to Queens).
Why not look at areas around Marine Drive a little further west? West of the center of Dundarave? all the way to 32nd. The lots are big and it is still central enough to have easy access to amenities, even without driving. Easy access to buses and shops. Densifying too much in the already denser neighbourhoods will just add to congestion.
Closer to schools, parks, amenities, shopping so that people can walk everywhere.
No
Taylor Way Caulfield Eagle Harbour area
Any commercial or civic hub would be fine for these.
No right now. Let's focus on Marine Drive.
Only support this if heritage homes are not demolished in the process
The School Board seem to hold a lot of property at each school currently only part of which is used for team sports or play grounds. Row housing could certainly be built without losing defined areas currently in use. Example; Irwin Park
Taylor Way Within partially developed commercial area at West Vancouver Yacht Club and Thunderbird Marina
The core area would be ideal
Why all of Marine Drive,,, infill up on Chippendale and get transit up there.
Allow zero lot line development everywhere by right. My only complaint is that it's not dense enough without also relaxing FSR and height limits.
Anywhere
There is no reason to disallow this type of housing in any neighborhood; best to distribute in various neighborhoods versus pool altogether in one, or two subdivisions.
Horseshoe Bay
Row houses can be beautiful, if designed well. I think Ambleside and Dundarave lend themselves to looser rezoning laws on row houses. Especially in light of the Ambleside LDP. near shopping / service areas like Caulfield/ Westmount/ Chippendale at Cypress Bowl road
Any single family lot/lots big enough to accommodate with design guidelines

Caulfield
Caulfeild, Horse shoe bay
on fulton near 15th street
To me (as a senior), one of the major problems with townhouses is their height , both in terms of interior living accessibility and their dominating impact on surrounding or upslope neighbourhoods. Burt again, I think there can be natural settings such as abutting or backing on forested parks or upper elevation lands or golf courses (think Capilano or Gleneagles) where their impact can be mitigated .
Start building now and remove permitting as West Vancouver is far behind growing our community to fit the lifestyle of young adults.
Remove all incentives for developers to construct luxurious homes instead of the types of housing that people can afford. Help restore economic diversity in our Community.
Transition between apartment area and single family in Ambleside and Dundarave. Horseshoe Bay?
Ambleside and Dundarave has become the main areas for multiplex housing. We need to move further west and create opportunities for housing in Caulfeild, Cypress Park and Gleneagles.
Taylor Way
Determine through above mentioned community engagement
All along Marine Drive from park royal west - not just areas in the Ambleside local area plan
Cedardale
Isolated neighbourhood pockets which could be densified without compromising the larger neighbourhood
I would like to see multifamily on Greenleaf road which is close to the park and elementary school
All areas of West Vancouver should be in consideration.
Mo
Strategic locations throughout the district
Horseshoe Bay and the new development on the British Properties
They should be permitted anywhere the required lot area is available. IE: where 2 or more adjacent, large single family homes are available to be combined. It would be worthwhile and socially healthier to have a mix of housing within the single family zoned areas rather than keeping row and townhomes along transit corridors or near commercial hubs.
The development at 14th and Duchess (former church site) has a row of town houses. It fits into the neighbourhood, nice landscaping. Also the development at the north east corner of Marine Drive and 19th is an attractive looking multiplex/row housing. I support this type of development going forward.
Other municipalities have better transit accessibility which is the focus of where density is being permitted. As WV has limited public transport and residents rely on Hwy 1 and Lions Gate Bridge for access to other areas, density/multiplexes would make sense 400m or 500m from main Hwy 1 access points such as Hwy1/Taylor Way, Hwy1/15th, Hwy 1/21st etc.
Move away from Marine Drive which is already over congested and build along bus feeder routes - Mathers, Fulton etc.
Bellevue or Argle
The District should definitely not limit townhouses to busy car corridors such as Marine Drive. They should be allowed on the streets that are adjacent to the arterial routes and near existing facilities and established neighbourhood commercial areas. Pedestrians prefer

walking on quieter streets and there are many single family zoned streets that are very close to existing commercial areas.
Consider a few case studies to show the community the actual benefits of smaller lots. Give reductions in capital costs for units and reduced expenses/ Also social benefits of living closer to shops, services and transit.
Other "villages" in the municipality, such as Ambleside, Dundarave, Caulfeild, and the soon to be built Cypress village could be included,
Near Hwy 1.
Yes. If this type of development is desirable, why limit it to the Marine Drive Corridor?
Up to Cypress bowl
Caulfield Village.
Large vacant land areas
They must be near public transportation and not in residential areas that do not support added cars.
Enable townhomes to be built in regular residential neighbourhoods ... with an aging population, townhomes make sense for retired persons wanting to downsize. They can be just as attractive in a neighbourhood as are single family homes. Retired folks do not want to live in noisy traffic areas like Marine Drive or near schools, community centres, churches ... a neighbourhood can definitely be preferred.
I think we should have more row and townhomes in all areas, not just along Marine Drive.
British Properties and Caulfield.
Along Keith Road east of Marine Drive by the park alongside Capilano River. City property that is not being used at all and could support hundreds of smaller type homes. Location is close to transit.
Require clarification? The entire length of Marine Drive is a bus route.
Townhouses can work anywhere in the District, why limit it to Marine Drive?
Within current neighborhoods: example Plateau Village in Pemberton Heights Neighbourhood.
main roads, bus routes, larger lots further west
Lots big enough to build townhouse up in the mountain.
Caulfeild Horsehoe Bay

Question 18: Do you have other comments or ideas for enabling more row and townhomes?

I support this type of housing anywhere in West Van.
They are preferable to allowing tearing down old homes to build a monster home.
We need to do everything we possibly can to provide housing that young families can afford. When my neighbor was moving out of her house in West Vancouver she asked her daughter if she'd like to buy it for her family, at a very favorable price. The daughter said, "Absolutely not. There aren't enough kids in West Vancouver." They moved to North Vancouver instead.
Don't see this ever going through in our community...if it means public consultation for each project...can only count on this is NDP legislation overrides council and Head Planner.
Please stop studying everything forever.
Row homes should be considered as per the current Ambleside Neighbourhood Plan.
Ensuring that 3 bedroom offerings are available.

Better transit links.
The two biggest issues in West Vancouver are the unaffordability of accommodation for people working in the Municipality, and the lack of options for seniors who cannot afford the Amica-type options, but who do want to maintain a level of autonomous living. The first should be addressed by something similar to the Whistler approach to local workers, and there are already many examples in and around the lower mainland of more age-appropriate housing for seniors.
Must ensure transit infrastructure accompanies all increased density.
We need as many new housing options as possible. However, we must marry new starts with increased infrastructure. For example, a new multi home development is coming between Westport and Daffodil. This is a good thing but the community is concerned about the impact of traffic. What is the District doing to ensure traffic safety and to avoid traffic bottlenecks?
If the design and landscaping fits into the community, I don't see why the areas should be limited.
Do not create a ghetto of sub par housing at below market rates.
make it easier to subdivide lots for fee simple row houses
Again on-site parking must be available.
No
Revise your rules to be similar to other suburbs, Burnaby, for example where they have successfully built their housing stock by adhering to the new BC housing mandates. Don't just do another 3 year long, expensive study to have naysayers slow down development in West Van. Your numbers tell the story. I've done this survey for the last 4 years I've lived here and nothing has changed other than Kiwanas housing or Uber expensive condos in Dundarave which seems to be stalled.
Good information to the public on how private ownership of a rowhouse works ----- it has party walls, perhaps common area greenspaces. Does it have to be stratified, or would fee-simple ownership work for these kinds of units?
No
Again - transit!
It needs to be done to fit within the character of the neighbourhood. Unfortunately, many of the proposals are often very small units, crammed in to fit a lot to maximize developer profits, with no parking included. (Shifting the parking problem to neighbourhood streets and current residents.
Along mail pedestrian routes to WVCR etc.
Identify areas first and add the necessary infrastructure before the townhouse are built
Rowhomes today are very poorly laid out due to stacked nature. Stairs eat up so much floor space. Can we not have stacked townhouses? Flat units for families where we don't need 8 baby gates. Also I'm concerned about your survey. You're either going to get "PRO" density or "NO" density NIMBYs. I hope the Nimby voice doesn't dictate how you progress here. We're in a housing crisis. Get bureaucracy out of the way, and stop listening to anti-change residents. As a young family parent, I can't live here when homes are \$1.5 Million!
Stop studying and let people build to bring young families back to west van.
West Vancouver is nationally reputed to be an elite neighborhood. Any development should reflect that status. I don't hear discussion about building affordable housing in Beverly Hills.
The Squamish Nation land across from the fisheries lac at Marine and Burkehill. Development was on the table and then it was not. It's a perfect area close to bus stops and a school.
AMPLE PARKING
Speed up permits

Less studies and more action. Deregulate and simplify those remaining regulations to allow for the fast efficient creation of new housing
Around the commercial districts
Those four story condo buildings all over North America are such a tragedy for the landscape. Really ugly and depressing usually.
DO NOT be swayed by developers ' pleas for four stories (or more), which will lead to loss of daily sun exposure for units / houses / shops / parks, etc., in close proximity. Sun exposure should really be a requirement - a health necessity - for all housing. Building beehives to house those with lower incomes in the dark is a perverse practice!
Traffic concerns for lions gate bridge
Row houses need to be architecturally interesting - European in style not "box like"
low more in residential areas. Far better than condo towers in such areas
no
Allow some small scale commercial (corner grocery, pharmacy, etc) in these projects to help service the developments, increasing walkability
Dundarave and East of. Nothing West of that area. With community consultation.
We need way more of these! Excellent option for our aging population.
Avoid mess of Fraser valley where there are ugly conformity units
British properties maybe due to their lot sizes.
There should be NO increased density or population without corresponding transit increase/infrastructure and Lions Gate bridge expansion/replacement for a minimum of two lanes on each side, safe bicycle lanes, and dedicated transit lanes.
Land assemblies should be allowed, where they make sense. Tantalus Gardens has stalled out; does the project need to be expanded to be cost effective? Develop Tantalus Park for housing and purchase Tyee Point for parkland.
Those big lots along creek area, can be developed as town homes and provide enough park area.
Encourage design excellence by allowing flexibility. Allow for green space bonuses and do not aim for maximum density. Look for and emulate good existing examples (Mathers Mews in West Vancouver) that blend in well with existing communities and still feature attractive green space while increasing density compared with neighboring single family communities.
Lighter on the land. Require innovation in building to use less. True passive requirements with operable windows etc. not "Passive house" which requires more petrochemical products (spray foam, insulations) and use of air conditioning in the guise of heat pumps. Embodied energy requirement. Better to find a way to subdivide/renovate existing "large house" inventory in West Van.
Should be walking distance to commercial zones
Grant air rights to Dundarave Village to force the village to stay the same but they can sell the air rights for towers. Towers, we are going to need to develop a new shopping center with towers and row houses around.
be clever
Row home will only be successful on flat sites. otherwise a builder will build detached as there is a premium in value.
That helps a little, but given the amount of demand and affordability, apartment buildings up to six storeys will be more helpful.
More transit. Dunderave, amblesode and horseshoe bay have minimal transit or transit that is at capacity.
Just build them. Make it worthwhile to developers to build this rather than single family monster homes

Have a contemporary well-designed plan by architect that can be used as reference and adopted to specific site conditions.
Make areas of the district open to row houses, and make the process simpler.
Same comment as before.
Another study? It seems like the planning department does endless studies and nothing changes.
Why all of Marine Drive,,, infill up on Chippendale and get transit up there.
Stop being so tentative. Allow them in more locations. Reduce community feedback. You can't have a process beholden to status quo loving landed gentry AND address the housing crisis. Ditch the former, address the latter.
Make then non-strata. Strata is worst form of housing. Provide adequate parking.
Fully support this type of innovative housing that would help house so many that are current underhoused or inadequately housed. Current housing models for West Vancouver is antiquated and unsustainable.
there is a missing middle crisis in our community. we should have higher density along fulton avenue south side between 14th street and 15th street since there are high rises already in front of it.
I think that zoning conceived only in terms of built form can be very limiting. As commented earlier in this survey, variation in natural settings can provide more flexibility in terms of accommodating different forms of densification. Think the eastern end, the western end and the upper lands as examples.
I love townhouses—they look really nice from the street, and they're a highly efficient mid-density option for families. I don't support continuing site-specific rezoning requirements as I think our zoning laws should be changed to just be more permissive of them in general.
Do not have rows and rows of them. Have them interspersed with regular size homes. Now like Oak ST. or Granville St. in Vancouver.
No
Townhome designs can be terrible, cramped spaces. I think it will be important to establish guidelines for good living spaces in this model of housing. Often, 3-4 storey apartment buildings will have significantly better layouts.
The row housing that exists is often comparable in price to single family units and thus do not provide for diversity in households. This option seems too costly to build
Let the market determine densities and built form
the density should be increased from the current far to at least 3 or 4 far on a 50 by 120 foot lot we should be able to get 6 or 8 small units that are easier for people to buy especially in horseshoe bay as there is a high demand to travel to Victoria from west vancouver
Don't allow townhouses that are all garages within neighborhoods. Too car centric at the expense of landscaping
Please see comments re multiplexes, and concerns about adding more density right next to very high-traffic areas where there are few ways to move people around (few sidewalks and infrequent buses). I'd love for west van to be more like Kits, but we absolutely need the sidewalk and bus infrastructure to support it!
Make it easier to create small land assemblies and shorten the time line for permitting.
The important part is not only the location, buy the design and how it would fit into an existing neighbourhood. We can add density but it needs to fit our community not the other way round.
Make sure sufficient parking is provided so streets don't start looking like a parking lot and other long term residents are not adversely affected.
Ideally row and townhomes should be near transit.

Affordability, simple design options and speed of building.
No.
If the DWV wants to encourage a particular type of development (the first decision), it should try to remove all unnecessary constraints and cost factors. Again, if the DWV is in favour of a particular type of development, it should be prepared to actively promote the concept.
These developments depend on alternative public transit within the district.
I know many retired people who would move out of their large family homes if there were more living options in West Van which include a private garden.
Do not allow townhouses along the portions of Marine Drive where car access to the townhouses would create traffic hazards, or where the townhouses would be adjacent to single family homes.
Allow single family lots in neighbourhoods to be divided into townhomes. Its a financial advantage for the builder to have more to sell on the lot and its a financial advantage for buyers vs. buying a large single family home with a larger price tag.
Must be part of an aligned transportation and recreation policy , infrastructure spend concurrent with densification.
See above
Park Royal North might be appropriate for townhouses. I do not support "stacked" townhouses (too tall).
Educating the current residents of West Vancouver about the advantages of providing housing for the age range 30-50, middle class and lower income is an asset for the community. West Van has an aging community and attracting a population that can sustain local business, tax base, fill service positions (police, fire...) etc. is essential and well overdue.
The concept proposed for Marine Drive in West Vancouver has already been tried and used (and failed) in the Marine Drive in North Vancouver. All that it has achieved is a canyon strip (like a residential strip mall in the US) with a destruction of small business facilities within the DNV, a sharp increase in local pollution and (because the infrastructure was not improved along with the re-zoning) a severe strain on congestion; potable water, storm water sewer collectively leading to, demonstratively far environment that is far less safe and healthy for all residents (all living things).
need to be very careful with density as current transportation system and roads are not keeping up with demand
Pre-zoning of large single family lots for diverse housing. topologies, including row houses and town houses, would make it easier and faster for developers to provide those types of housing.
Better transit

E. Low-Rise Apartments

Question 19: Would you like to see more low-rise apartment housing in West Vancouver?

Yes	No
76% (479)	24% (153)

Question 20: Would you support increasing height limits for standalone residential apartment development proposals outside of our Local Area Plans to four storeys?

Support	Neutral	Do not support
56% (266)	16% (78)	28% (135)

Question 21: Would you support increasing height limits for mixed-use apartment proposals (i.e., apartments above shops) on existing commercial and marine commercial zoned sites to four storeys?

Support	Neutral	Do not support
63% (301)	16% (76)	21% (100)

Question 22: Would you support future planning initiatives, with community engagement, to study opportunities to add housing and support the smaller commercial nodes along Marine Drive (i.e., Thunderbird Marina, Yacht clubs, Dundarave, The Black Cat, Isetta Café, Bistro, the Dale)?

Support	Neutral	Do not support
75% (363)	16% (75)	9% (45)

Question 23: Do you have any other suggestions for enabling low-rise residential or mixed-use apartments in the District?

Wouldn't support Marine Drive because the roads and topography are already so cramped.
West Van is the most NIMBY place in the world. Expand housing so people can afford to live here.
Dp allow community participation. not just an after thought
I would like to see housing above existing commercial units. I am not in favour of brand new apartments with commercial below. Having lived in such an apartment & been on stratas, it's a pain having commercial units below your home.
only in Ambleside. no need to grow west van. if I want a development mess and a drastic decrease in my standard of living I can move to Surrey, Burnaby or Coquitlam
more traffic calming along main routes, neighbourhoods- make hubs and commercial areas more walkable
If you have public consultation again...will never happen.
We don't need to study this for 5 years.
Make the development process easier and faster for all the building projects in the district
Ambleside up to Mathers
Have the district engage in leaseholds for some developments of this type, where they own the land. Similar to the city of Vancouver. Open door for rental priorities of these types owned by the city of West Vancouver.
Better transit links.

We should build more high-rise buildings in the Taylor Way area.
Again I would suggest a concept similar to that developed for the Whistler area.
Support more high-rises at Taylor Way area
Upper lands
reduce parking requirements
In addition to townhouses I think low rise apartments would be very suitable for around entrances and exits to the highway. Specifically the Southridge exit beside the chevron. There are several aging homes in that area and would be very suitable for a new cluster of apartments and perhaps retail.
No
Yes, just open he door for it. Not another study. Planning Departments delay any progress because of continual studies. No wonder so few apartments have been built.
West van will lose all its charm and views if taller building are allowed. It has already happened with the Grosvenor monstrosity and the new Dundarave building on Marine, I DO NOT support raising the height restrictions.
Ensure that some percentage of these must be rental.
Move the existing elevation limit for housing to build low rise apartments from the cypress lookout towards Ballantree park. I realize this would also entail a new pumping station for
Going further west with high density on Marine drive makes no sense. It is a narrow, winding road and can not take additional traffic - buses can hardly make some of the corners!
The areas listed above (Thunderbird Marina, wvyc/ehyc Yacht clubs, Isetta Café, the Dale) should not be areas for low rise or mixed use apartments.
Again, let the market determine
Try to locate closer to commercial centres to minimize travel
Increasing housing will increase cars being parked. All new building must include parking on the lot and/or garages.
Most of marine drive west of 31st is unsuited to this density. Need sidewalks, street lights and better transit. Roads are too narrow
Again why are you asking the public? The same public that strongly opposed a rapid bus, you think will support mixed use density!?! We need housing. Get on with it! This survey is just a lead to NIMBY no sentiments.
High rise apartments at Thunderbird provided Marina parking, boat sales and needed repair areas are maintained Site is somewhat unique as not many views of surrounding homes would be affected
I do not support a lengthy study. Just make decisions.
Hugh end Low rise housing is needed for affluent west can seniors who can no longer live in their homes. Suggest you build it in the British properties for those citizens. Please stop adding density in amble side and dundarave.
Infrastructure first
AMPLE PARKING
Build even more density. Towers at Caulfield Village and I set up. All of Marine Drive should be minimum eight stories with 30 stories plus at major intersections. Density
I've attended community events to tell the District and developers what I'd like to see in the new structures. It's a joke. No community ideas make it to the planning/design stage. The developer dictates to the District and the citizen.

Not really, i like the looks of the OLD 3 buildings in Park Royal North and understand that the units are quite spacious (surprise !!). The buildings are spaced nicely to not have the feeling of "crowded in" and i would like to see more of this type of rental apartments (covered parking too !!).
Permit them in Ambleside/dundarave near schools and ~5-10 min walk to marine drive transit and services. Kitsilano does this well and it helps blend neighborhoods
Plans to provide mid-rise apartments near the high-rise buildings in Amberside LAP
Should be from dundarave to park royal but not west of 25th st
Please keep them along Marine Drive commercial hubs & not in higher up established neighbourhoods
Low rise apartments have greatest density impact and cause less visual impairment. Look at how European cities achieve good density using this model.
Prevent overcrowding
Support establishment of more equity housing co-operatives like Ambleview Place, located at 14th and Duchess.
Considering the long east-west strip terrain, the future plan would study several commercial hubs based on the existing facility.
We need better condos, modern built BUT affordable - \$5Million is not this!
I am concerned that 4 storey frame construction can, without strict fire safety codes, become a safety issue. Sprinkler systems and other safety measures should be mandatory for all new frame apartment construction.
As far as four storey buildings in hubs, I think the view from existing buildings have to be considered as well at the whole view from sea to mountains. There was lots of talk about the view North a while back. I think it's important.
Better to focus our nodes on recreation as we have a unique and beautiful topography. Build more trails for all levels - less stores (commerce). Easy to sell coffee from cool little trailers than build more (see Tofino / New Zealand everywhere). Great to bring people in who then stay for dinner, ice cream, drinks etc.
Care should be taken to not block views
there is a need for this particularly for downsizers or those who live alone
be clever
Look for areas where traditional view corridors would not be impacted by 3,4, or more storeys, and which are also close to high frequency public transit service.
There is a lot of under developed land in the nodes mentioned above. with a better transit frequency, these locations that are currently parking lots could function as new village centres and it would benefit the neighbours
This is helpful, but given the amount of demand and affordability, apartment buildings up to six storeys, not only four storeys, will be more helpful.
save the money
As a resident of [REDACTED] I will once again reiterate. I am in support of these projects but it's imperative that the marine drive corridor be Improved. It has become the new upper levels highways with excessive speeding and not intended for the volume of cars going at these excessive speeds. People will not want to live here if safety and Speeding are not Improved
Embrace the Provincial single egress stair code change to allow for better units and housing options within a low-rise apartment - Europe (Germany / Switzerland) have many examples of this type of housing done extremely well. Embrace and prioritize mass-timber construction (over stick built) for higher-quality homes.

The Ambleside Local Area Plan should expand the current apartment building area to the adjacent area, increases the number of storeys to a maximum of 6 or 8, especially the single house area next to the high rise buildings on 15th street.
Build more where there are already hubs of schools, shopping/retail, recreation.
Only near marine drive and community centre
no
Please do NOT ruin precious heritage areas - The Dale, Black Cat and Isetta!
I strongly believe that should not be mixed all kind of residential at any area except in support of the main use of the land/area. I.E. basement suits and coach house can make single family homes more useful and maintained. So I consider all tall apartments buildings at lower side of Marine Drive and all low-rise apartments buildings just upper side of Marine Drive in one or two blocks distance. This policy makes less traffic as its developments will be less car dependent and can depend on current infrastructure as well. Also, will maintain our cultural stability in West Vancouver.
Why all of Marine Drive,,, infill up on Chippendale and get transit up there.
Blanket rezone all single family home areas for multifamily use. Let the market decide, not rich old people.
Just don't make them strata.
Horsehoe Bay
The area around community centers should also be considered for low-rises. Edgemont Village has done an outstanding job of maintaining the Village feel while increasing density upwards. The area around the Ambleside/Dundarave Community Center is perfect for this.
should have low rise building allowed on fulton south side between 14th and 15th street since highrise already in front of it.
I think that the municipality should prioritize on low-rise residential apartments rather than mixed-use developments and consider sites in exisiting residential areas rather than existng commercial nodes.
Take advantage of obvious sites first. That stretch along Marine beside the gold course is an obvious site for low rise housing. There seems to be very few similar opportunities outside dundarave and amble side
It's time we enter the 21st century with the rest of Metro Vancouver and start building more mixed-use developments that put people closer to the essential goods and services they need. Dundarave in particular feels like it's in economic trouble with the recent closure of the Shoppers Drug Mart over there, and our commercial areas need to be supported as they're essential to the fabric of our community.
There should be a study and determine potential neighbourhood nodes that would allow multi plex low rise infill development (eg. thunderbird marina area, eagle harbour, cypress park, Gleneagles (near the golf course). Also, think about changing rules up in the British Properties.
No
Guaranteed fast and frequent transit access. Dedicated rapid transit infrastructure.
Also consider live work options
Taylor Way Corridor
Streamline and simplify approval process
I do not support any hirise above 4 storeys to be built in Ambleside especially around Clyde and 14 to 19th and Marine Drive I oppose any high density as this is a Village not downtown Vancouver. Please do not allow any higher density in Ambleside than what is currently allowed in the OCP.

<p>Four storeys is reasonable for most areas provided the buildings are high quality and attractive. Prohibit parking within a building along a public street. Ensure that there is a pedestrian focus in design. Apartment buildings should look like they “belong” in West Vancouver - we’re NOT North Vancouver or elsewhere...</p>
<p>Live the idea of more housing around “third places” like popular commercial areas (coffee shops, etc). Millennials like me place a weirdly high value on being able to walk to somewhere where you can buy an overpriced drink. People would love to live in these places, and having a few more people living around these places would make these areas more vibrant too, in my opinion.</p> <p>But again, sidewalks and buses please to support these businesses and new neighbours moving in!</p> <p>I think it makes more sense to be adding density around these types of places, vs right next to schools/places of worship, since coffee shops/restaurants tend to get a more steady stream of traffic, vs having an intense onslaught of car traffic 2x per day.</p>
<p>I don't think all new construction of housing should be limited to along Marine Drive and smaller commercial hubs.</p>
<p>Other municipalities have better transit accessibility which is the focus of where density is being permitted. As WV has limited public transport and residents rely on Hwy 1 and Lions Gate Bridge for access to other areas, density/multiplexes would make sense 400m or 500m from main Hwy 1 access points such as Hwy1/Taylor Way, Hwy1/15th, Hwy 1/21st etc.</p>
<p>Yes, for seniors homes. Currently the wait list for public care facilities for seniors needing memory care is one year plus. They can't wait that long. The only alternative is private. Memory Care at Amica is \$17,000 per month!</p>
<p>We have done so many surveys and there have been so many studies over the 25 years that I have lived here. It is not rocket science, we know the logical areas where these should go and I am tired of a few residents making decisions for the entire community because they don't want something. Smaller units need higher ceilings to maintain and enhance livability, minimum 9 foot ceilings in the smaller units will make them far more appealing.</p>
<p>No.</p>
<p>The first priority should be to make it easier to build low-rise apartments up to three storeys, rather than allow increased height.</p> <p>increased height (e.g. four storeys) should only be permitted on a site-specific basis, except where specifically accommodated within an LAP.</p>
<p>Should not damage long standing views of established homes</p>
<p>Keep the height low on lower levels...</p>
<p>Any changes must be aligned with policy and infrastructure spend related to transportation and recreation needs associated with densification plan.!</p>
<p>See comments re KleeWyk park on Keith Road east of Taylor Way. Land sitting dormant for years.</p>
<p>The problem of the term mixed use is in the way it is implemented. Again the example of the Marine Drive/ Lions Gate Village of the DNV. Making the residential part smaller but still acceptable for human use is understood by the planners/developers. The non-residential part (the mix) size is historically demonstrably is not. The units designated are too small to support anything but a small section of commercial business (mainly boutique sized shops - clothing or very small eating places). This means that the public definition of "mixed use" is not being met by the planners or developers - they are effectively lying when they say that a building is mixed use. While I support the use of true Mixed use building I do not support the use of</p>

what the DNV Planners and Developers call Mixed-use - theirs is a bogus definition. WVD should use the publicly acceptable definition.
1. Encourage the design of liveable unit sizes to accommodate different types of families needs. 2. Require developers to include a percentage of affordable (below market) units in new developments.
I think on the cost wise it is more beneficial to go up to fix, so the cost of units can be spread out more. With lower cost on construction, hope encourage lower rent for renters.

III. Survey Section 3 – Other Housing Policies

A. Heritage and Character

Question 24: Do you support providing zoning incentives, like more height, density and/or lot coverage, to protect and revitalize heritage properties?

Support	Neutral	Do not support
55% (348)	26% (163)	19% (123)

Question 25: Do you have any other suggestions for protecting heritage homes?

Ask the owners of such homes [there are only some 200] what they would like to see offered, in order to protect their buildings. Allowing short term rentals and relaxed permitting may be one such offer that will enable some owners to agree to designation.
Perhaps a tax reduction to holders.
Should fit into the Neighborhood Characteristics report
Continue HRA option
Keep space around them ...
I'd like to see them protected and done right, increasing the density is an option I suppose. I just don't think West Van needs to follow the rule of more density. That's what makes it special to live here.
I [REDACTED] .. Rush Vinson and Clegg Houses. The costs and crap these owners had to go through to get their projects approved is a joke...I wouldn't recommend anyone goes through all the insulting meetings at City Hall with council members being repulsive to these home owners...example [REDACTED] final meeting and 2 of the councilors were so offensive to the property owner. Cassidy and Wyatt come to mind.
I have no interest in using tax payer resources to protect so-called heritage homes
Survey the district to find the heritage homes and designate them as such regardless of the owner's wishes
There are not many heritage buildings in West Vancouver that are truly worthy of protection. Existing heritage policies apart restricting development, often fail to achieve good results that are truly beneficial to the community.
Cheaper and more efficient to build new unless extraordinary heritage value.

I think it depends entirely on where it is located, whether or not it may have to be moved, and whether or not a Municipal benefit can be developed along with the protection of the heritage home. An example I visited recently was the Roedde House in Downtown Vancouver.
The current registry is flawed. We are owners of a house that is on the register but there was no rigorous study undertaken - we are one of the catch all that were added from the old list of houses. We respect the concept of heritage preservation but are firstly interested in rights of private property owners. These houses cost a lot to maintain and upgrade to current standards. More serious protections would be reduced property taxes and utility bills to support the expenses of maintaining heritage homes.
Protection is a good idea so long as they are in a viable condition and repair costs would be reasonable and wont bankrupt the owner to retain them.
Tax them at home value only
I live in a heritage list home. So far we have managed to preserve it. I do think allowing for more density on the property via additional buildings that could be have short term rentals or otherwise would be helpful in preserving heritage homes.
West Vancouver's heritage policy only restricts development, doesn't benefit the community.
relax parking requirements, relax setback requirements, and significantly relax building department requirements which can be as significant barrier
Property must have significant historical and architectural value.
I believe an additional incentive of not having to pay property taxes would encourage people to save and develop Heritage assets.
Do gardens ever get heritage protection?
Provide monetary incentives to owners of heritage homes for the upkeep of the property.
I support density and/or lot coverage incentives. I do NOT support height incentives
Heritage designation should not be a way around other appropriate conditions for redevelopment.
No
people who have bought heritage homes should be able to do what they want with them. It is not a District issue.
Incentives yes, public funds no
Most are not worth the effort unless of great architectural merit
this is to answer the previous question. Stop over densifying West van, it's over-saturated as it is!
West Vancouver is a special place and I have moved here SPECIFICALLY to avoid the chaos and high-density issues of Vancouver. It does NOT make sense to densify this area when Vancouver needs to do their work and we do NOT have the infrastructure to support all these 'high density' ideas. It will make a mess out of our beautiful community and everyone will suffer.
Needs a more comprehensive definition and criteria for "heritage". Events surrounding "heritage" house NE corner of 16th and Haywood
None of them is actually " heritage" - there are no heritaeg buildigns in West Van. All had been constructed in last 100 years and really has no historical value to speak of.
Do not see the value in keeping up these properties.
Provide options to owners of heritage homes to maintain a certain percentage of heritage features and provide 3/4 funds to help maintain
Unpopular opinion - heritage retention is very expensive, resource consuming, and a relic from a time when we could care about preservation of the past. We need housing. Don't put effort into developing incentives to maintain heritage.

<p>Yes, if it's possible our heritage should be kept. It is sad that the Guinness families original home in the British properties was destroyed last year. How could that happen!? There should be strict protocols and if the house fails then then fair enough if it's unsafe to keep under certain circumstances.</p>
<p>Do not increase density of apartment buildings between Dundarave and Ambleside. Protect waterviews and traffic flow near Bellevue Avenue and Marine. Dundarave village should keep shops, not be redeveloped into more apartments. There are enough rental units available at park royal.</p>
<p>Should have a traceable history and be somewhat unique to West Vancouver</p>
<p>We have enough heritage buildings. Enough already.</p>
<p>People who want to live in heritage homes can finance it themselves. It is not my priority as a taxpayer to fund heritage homes while I am sacrificing my own home expenses.</p>
<p>There must be a time limit set between approval and development. the construction fencing at the Sutherland house on Inglewood has been up for 3 years and nothing is happening. Also, with that zoning approval, it should be mandatory that the back lane between Inglewood and Haywood should be paved and proper ditch drainage upgraded.</p>
<p>Keep protecting them</p>
<p>Heritage homes should be truly unique. This designation has been over-used and has wasted too much staff and council time, resulting in slower and more costly redevelopment.</p>
<p>Maintained in current form.</p>
<p>Give them minimum three FSR if they retain the heritage property. Increased density while retaining heritage.</p>
<p>No. Homeowners should not be restricted on what they build on their property as long as it fits within zoning and site coverage bylaws.</p>
<p>Protect heritage home contribution to the neighbourhood by limiting nearby development that can destroy the ambience (ie. new ugly development next to attractive property).</p>
<p>Ok to eliminate such, it's not important in the large perspective.</p>
<p>These houses are part of our history - which contributes to our culture. To lose these houses is to lose part of who we are - our past. And to forget our past, and all that was part of it, is to lose our way. If we do not know from where we came, how can we know where we are going?</p>
<p>Density transfer to other sites</p>
<p>I think what Keller did on Jefferson and with the Vinson House properties are great examples of preserving heritage properties. We should encourage this.</p>
<p>They should be protecting only if they are in good condition but not at the expense of having to accept more density and higher neighborhood buildings.</p>
<p>Very difficult subject, we have a (small by current standards) house which was built by Mr. Caulfeild and except for the (superb) fireplace/chimney completely rebuilt in 1997 (all new plumbing, wiring, insulation, etc.) and extended by 5 ft towards the street; the house covers a small part of the property which suits us. A new owner is likely to replace this house with a much larger footprint simply because the lot is expensive and thus the house "should be too". We disagree. We would like to see small (old) houses - no matter if "heritage" or not - replaced with similar size "looking" houses, build them "into the ground" if a larger house is desired but avoid this monster houses filling the property to the legal limit and beyond.</p>
<p>Streamline the process.</p>
<p>There are homes in my neighbourhood that are approximately 90 years old. I don't know whether these are "heritage homes", but I do see value in preserving them. They are a huge part of the character and variety and personality of our streets. However, they are old and</p>

take a lot to maintain. Therefore, there absolutely needs to be incentives of density, infill and / or subdivision to keep them.
Saving the original structure and converting it into suites then adding smaller unit or units in keeping with the heritage style....
Exempt the heritage homes from lot area calculations if they are restored and maintained.
I think the historical value of heritage homes does not warrant the preservation
I don't feel a property owner of a heritage property should be required to keep the existing building. If the District is interested in this they should pay fair market value for the home if they want to preserve its heritage.
Reduce number of heritage homes
Reduce barriers and costs to owners of these homes to update/renovate. Make it more affordable for these people to be able to keep their homes and update. Less red tape for these home owners (no I don't own a heritage home).
This is ridiculous. We ain't Europe. Nothing here is that old so don't kid ourselves
People tear down heritage homes so they can maximize the land-to-building ratio. Reducing this ratio will remove a huge incentive for tear-downs.
Provide incentives to preserve rather than demolish and replace heritage properties and other properties of significant character. For example, 5558 Gallagher Place.
Clearly if a process--any process--is expensive and onerous, people won't comply. Clearly it would be wise to make the heritage designation and protection process simpler and cheaper if you want to protect and save heritage homes.
West Coast Modern should be a priority architectural style for both preservation and informing of building code. Effective code changes must be put in place to prevent the construction of "monster houses" whose style and scale are not reflective of the character and architectural legacy of West Vancouver.
New homes in a neighborhood should reflect the housing around the neighborhood and not growing in size
Homeowners who choose to go through the process to protect their heritage home should be supported. However, private property rights should ultimately be protected and no homeowner should be forced to designate their previously/currently owned property as heritage.
All homes would be heritage if the municipality hadn't allowed monster homes to be built on the lots and catering to developers. I'd say that train has left the station and you're just looking at the few that haven't jumped on the caboose. We have some terrible eye sores aka homes in West Van. Some sort of aesthetic officer would have been useful over the past 30 years in making/keeping our neighbourhoods beautiful today. The municipality shouldn't get in the affairs of private property, determining who can do what with their homes, but they should have aesthetic standards that all homeowners need to meet to get approvals. Mostly with green space, which hides a multitude of poor choices.
I am not in favour of protecting heritage homes unless the home is truly exceptional. Just because a house was designed by a famous or deceased architect should not be a reason to characterize it as an heritage home. Housing stock should be driven by market demands- not emotion.
Protecting heritage homes is very expensive and not so necessary. I support the district to hold limited heritage houses and use them as public art facility. The other old houses should be decided by the owner whether to pay money to protect or rebuild a new house.
The box shaped modern houses with flat roofs have ruined the charm of many WV neighbourhood streets especially I. The lower sections of Ambleside and Dunderave .
Owners of heritage properties should be given maximum flexibility to modify, enlarge and improve their properties to ensure that they remain viable and habitable residences. Much

better to flex a bit while retaining architecturally significant buildings than to see them demolished in favor of densification or replacement by new, bland and characterless buildings.
I'm not sure by the previous question, whether you mean renovating heritage homes or what?
Protecting the homes should also include protecting the character of the lot and garden. A house is still just an object. Removing large stands of mature trees should also be considered in these proposals. More hardscape and footprints in the long run is going to be problematic for storm water, biodiversity etc.
We should value and respect Heritage. It should be clear that you cannot demolish, structurally change a heritage home. It will allow people who love it to own it at a lesser price due to smaller demand. Developers should not be allowed to buy it and then change their status to then sell it at a higher price. Heritage should be preserved. We have so little of it and even less respect for it.
No
Absolutely support the preservation of all heritage housing and buildings.
Heritage homes can be protected by allowing them to have a modern lane house built on the land. Tax favour moving heritage homes out to free up real estate. That hideous Arthur Ericson house should have been allowed to tax favoured move to the B.C. interior or the Island to make room for a tax-paying home.
Provide tax incentives and get rid of the public input process and make the building permit process more straight forward. The recent clegg house project took three years to get to building permit. Outrageous.
be clever
we should be careful about what is heritage. some of the West Vancouver modernist structures should be saved. early cottages that have no architectural value, that were simply built in the style of their time might not be worth saving.
Consider property tax holidays and other incentives. remove the need for public consultation. Relax building permits for these restorations and make the owner's life easier.
Stop allowing the building of monster luxury homes where modest homes once stood.
Would like to see more small lots and small single family homes to encourage affordability for younger families and would also like to see many more AFFORDABLE concrete apartment RENTAL high-rise buildings for Seniors instead of preserving any further older buildings. So many Seniors who have lived their lives in WV are now being forced to move far away from life long families, friends and way of life, to less expensive living scenarios instead of financially accessible (and possibly subsidized) buildings of studio apartments in and around the villages of Ambleside and Dundarave, which would thereby encourage more active and financially healthy shops and businesses.... including the businesses of providing for much needed Senior Living for those who have helped build the WV community all their lives. Should one or two older buildings be more important than your Senior Citizens?
I am a sucker for old homes and would do anuth8 g to preserve them. Many others do not share that vision so it would come down to community feeling and input
Have stronger policy and clear expectations for protecting our heritage homes as a priority for our community.
I don't agree with protecting certain heritage homes like the one next to John Lawson Park! It is an eyesore, dilapidated and costly to renovate! It should be torn down!!!
ensure they conform with current envelope criteria so as not to become hazardous housing

Having owned and renovated a designated heritage home (in Kelowna) I understand the need for some flexibility in order to maintain the integrity of the heritage aspects of a property, but make it possible/viable for an owner to make necessary improvements.
no
Make consultation easy and available for potential heritage homeowners
Previous comment re Michael Geller type developments.
Heritage homes need to be assessed based on their authenticity and how that will continue into the future as well as the physical state of the structure. ie. Navy Jack house was designated heritage but as it is being upgraded I do not think there will be any truly original "heritage" features remaining.
It is important that the process for heritage developments is improved to make it faster, less cumbersome and less expensive. The process should be clear from the beginning. It is unclear what you mean by zoning incentives as HRA's already provide for that. If you mean, advance spot re-zoning of all heritage sites, then this would be good. Other incentives that would be useful would be fast-tracking permits and the overall process. As you pointed out, HRAs or other heritage developments take double or triple the time of a standard development, often with unnecessary modifications, lengthy delays and unnecessary costs to the homeowner, as a result of a single concerned neighbour. Also, you might consider eliminating the need for a public hearing and council vote if the staff assess the development to be compliant.
The current process for heritage revitalization is arduous and expensive - at least double or triple the length of time for new builds. They also suffer from a overly intensive neighbourhood reviews. There should be additional incentives to retain precious heritage buildings (residential and commercial) eg heritage projects should be fast-tracked within the development process. Heritage developments should be approved at the Director of Planning level - and not have to go to Council and/or a public hearing.
You can provide non new developments incentives to completely keep the heritage character, but provide more fruitful incentives like allowable uses for commercial, educational, recreational and so on.
I could support simplifying the process only if zoning incentives are modest and well-controlled — enough to encourage preservation, but not enough to change the look and feel of the neighborhood drastically.
incentivise home owners to maintain heritage homes
Why bother? We should limit "heritage" to buildings of true historical significance (e.g. if something happened in or to them that actually mattered or is unique to this community), not just reinscribing old white colonial history as the dominant and most protected style.
allow freedom to homeowner including tear down. These old homes are not worth the trouble
Sometimes it's not obvious why a heritage home has that designation.
Actually protect them. We have lost far too many significant properties.
As a taxpayer, I do not support the diversion of development dollars and planning staff time and resources into the complexities of heritage preservation. I think there are many more important needs in our community requiring our resources than the wants of a small group that want to preserve our heritage homes.
Each heritage home is unique and should be dealt with individually. Location and lot size should all be part of the decision making process. No one size fits all approach.
The HRA process should be streamlined.
No
Heritage signage and info at the properties could help tie residents to the history and importance of heritage homes.

Pasadena and Phoenix have designated heritage areas, with zoning and incentives within these historical areas to protect and revitalize. Doing it by area, rather than individual properties allows a coherent and attractive neighborhood while not advantaging or disadvantaging individual homes and owners.
Saving structures which are past their physical or structural limits is impractical and financially burdensome.
allow coach houses
I support the District protecting all heritage assets. We are losing too much of what defines West Vancouver at the expense of mansions. The District should incentivize heritage preservation through grants, but also by preventing demolition of any heritage buildings. There is not enough effort to protect West Vancouver's heritage.
Protecting heritage homes are not important to me. Being able to have people live in, and contribute to, the community are so much more important. I don't not agree with preserving heritage homes if it's at the expense of more density.
There are a significant number of homes in the Hollyburn neighbourhood that are approaching 100 years old. Why not make a heritage designation for this original West Vancouver neighbourhood? Design guidelines would help enhance the heritage of new builds. Homes on larger properties could be stratified, ie into a duplex or similar without losing the integrity of the existing neighbourhood.
Heritage homes should be protected by maintaining them on the sites they were originally built, and preserving their original architectural integrity.
Don't have to provide density or height to maintain heritage housing. The survey is set up to reach a predetermined conclusion.
The process needs to be very simple, and should not require development processes that need input from Council and residents. Give staff the ability to make decisions based on the rules and regulations that are in place. They will make good decisions
Don't necessarily have to give density to protect heritage housing.
Education on the value of retaining heritage homes e.g. history, circular economy (no demolition) ghg savings)
Expediting and clarifying procedures to do so.
No.
The DWV should not provide zoning incentives that are not available to non-heritage buildings. The DWV should address the protection of heritage properties (where appropriate) directly rather than bundling it with otherwise non-permitted height, density and/or lot coverage variances. Heritage protection and height, density and/or lot coverage should be treated as separate issues. For example, consideration could be given to financial incentives (where appropriate), such as partial property tax relief. This would directly relate the "value" of the heritage protection to the "cost" that the DWV is prepared to incur. This should not preclude site-specific variances involving heritage properties, where appropriate.
Stop mega houses
I would support a review of how heritage sites are identified and the criteria for issuing a designation in order that these homes are not lost to demolition.
Heritage properties are more than just the houses. Once you add density to the property, you ruin the heritage value. In WV, most of the so-called heritage homes are poorly maintained and not worth keeping.
heritage homes remain in their existing settings with no compromises or conditions to allow them to remain heritage

Keep height levels low, we don't need the Lower Lonsdale vibe or look.
I do not agree that these are heritage worthy homes. Navy Jack efforts are a waste of taxpayer money. These designations should be referendum driven.
Help senior long time residents with tax relief.
I do not like the idea of allowing more height/density, I would prefer to see other incentives, maybe a break in property taxes for maintaining heritage homes.
Protecting heritage homes is extremely costly, I would like to see more heritage homes saved, but who pays for it? In some instances heritage homes could be used for community services. As the community ages, would it be a consideration that certain homes in certain areas be converted to small clinics, check in centre or day program locations for the elderly. With fewer care homes available would it not be less expensive to convert older homes into service pods?
Human population increase compared to the develop able land area (Infrastructure and Housing) is very important issue facing the future of the District management. I would argue that the population to be accommodated has already reached a point that the allocation of land (use) to ANYTHING other than 1. Greenspace (to keep the environment free of pollution CO2 and PM2.5); 2. safe and healthy (minimum congestion) infrastructure for humans; safe and healthy housing for humans is unsupportable. The heritage is in the land use management decisions we have made in the past and the ones we make now. Don't dwell in the past just use it to learn from for current and future decisions.
Lower or defer the property tax for the owner of the heritage house.
Our community does not actually have heritage homes, by definition of heritage.
Provide additional tax incentive, such as lower property tax and tax deferral for heritage homes.

B. Rental and Affordable Housing

Question 26: Would you like to see more purpose-built rental housing built in the future?

Yes	No
71% (455)	29% (183)

Question 27: Do you support the following strategies to enable rental housing development?

	Support	Neutral	Do not support
Require rental units in new multi-family residential development	63% (287)	24% (107)	13% (61)
Provide zoning incentives (e.g., increase height and density) in return for more affordable rental housing provision	62% (282)	18% (83)	20% (90)

Encourage Provincial agencies to expand housing on their sites	70% (320)	24% (108)	6% (27)
--	--------------	--------------	------------

Question 28: Do you have any other suggestions for increasing rental housing?

More affordable rentals. Not everyone wants to own or can afford to own.
Housing Cooperatives
I support these initiatives but not at the expense of current structures losing their views.
I'd rather see higher buildings with more open space around them rather than 4 storey buildings that cover the whole site.
Encourage housing co-op development
There needs to be a shift in thinking that rental housing is a good option. Homeownership is not everything.
work with province on transit hubs for densified neighbourhoods
Good start here with the project on 22nd and Gordon...but this project only went through because the District owned the land...if it was a private property owner would NEVER have been approved.
Do not allow ownership of existing rental properties by financial entities that are using them for financial gain. Housing is a social need not a financial gain
Require all new multi unit/ multi storey residential development to have a percentage of rental units that will be bought/owned by the municipality to rent in the community at a slightly lower purchase cost from the developer. In exchange the developer is provided a more stream lined additional process and reduction in some fees.
We should incentivize the market rental high-rise buildings via FAR policies.
This is NOT a topic that can be covered with a "yes or no" answer. There are inherent issues with both sides of the coin. I would again ask what results have been with the Whistler employee property program. I have been out of touch with the housing industry since I retired 20 years ago.
Co-ops should be considered as viable options for creating housing and community and bringing down the cost of shelter
to question a. Requiring rental units depends on the size of the development. I don't think a home owner wanting to put 4 units on their lot should be subject to that rule. So it depends on the context hence I was neutral in my answer
Much more short term and long term housing is needed - short term whereby people can rent whilst looking to purchase
Provide zoning incentives (e.g., increase height and density) in return for more market rental high-rises.
offer density bonuses for rental projects and relax parking requirements
No
If a developer agrees to including a number of rental units in a building don't let him swap it out by paying extra fees or a minor green space dedication. Insist they stick to the plan.
Height and density should not be a function of tenure. Turning question b) around, what is the rationale for limiting strata developments to lower heights and/or density than rental? There are other ways for the DWV to incent rental housing, but it should always reflect an appropriate cost/benefit trade-off.
Work with the Province to ensure loss of existing rental housing.

No
We don't need to increase height or density, we just need to rebuild or maintain the Bellevue area apartment buildings that are great for rentals and seniors. Many of them are quite old now, and provide housing for many people. Another option is to allow suites in residents houses and lower (or remove) the annual fee to register a suite
Lots of houses and appartments sitting empty. Sold at out of reach pricing. One example is the Hyde development at Ho Bay. Come in on an evening ferry and tell me how many lights you see on...not many!
Check what City of Vancouver is doing. They are the experts.
I would like to see more purpose built rental housing but only in areas that make sense. West Vancouver is known to be an expensive area in increasing rental housing, and all areas will decrease the property value for the majority of homeowners. We also need to ensure that our infrastructure can support the increase. At the moment, the traffic is insane and something needs to be done about our infrastructure before we start talking about increasing rental housing..
We need owners of rental housing that have a long time horizon. The current model does not compensate developers for the risk they are taking to build rental. The DCC schema in BC is too expensive to attract developers. The district should be an owner in the rental property.
Keep BC housing out of this. Just increase the supply of housing. Rental, market, strata, everything
Federal tax changes to allow developers to accelerate depreciation in order to eliminate income tax on new build rentals for several years.
As above, please do not accept developers' plans for beehives, without patios, access to gardens, attractive living spaces, storage or laundry within each unit. For example, why should rental units require tenants to use a common laundry? Lessons from the recent pandemic and those from earlier times suggest that sunlight, unique and excellent ventilation systems and one's own washer and dryer are basic necessities to minimize infections and deaths. These comments also apply to previous answers!
Why all this additional housing when we have problems with traffic congestion? What does the province plan to do re rapid transit or a third crossing or even a ferry?
There is no problem with building "Rental Housing" - most people want CHEAP - subsidized - housing. In the past the Federal Government built these apartments but most disappeared ???
Encourage more income-controlled housing like Kiwanis. Suggest more Provincial gov't renter assistance programs.
Half of British Columbians rent, and are grossly under represented in west vancouver. Our family has rented here for 16 years and live under constant threat of being forced to move and having little chance of being able to remain in the community we love. Strict enforcement of short term rentals, and prioritizing new rental units is crucial for the long term health of West Vancouver.
Incentivize building cheaper units which will be more affordable
The issue is more affordable and smaller housing stock rather the specifically rental units.
Rental housing will not get built unless there is incentive for the developer to do so. It should be all market rent housing. Without incentives they will not build as the numbers simply don't work.
The district and provincial government need to be involved to keep affordable rentals outside of the market.
Anything that encourages young people to stay
Desperately need low rental apartments

Let the market determine the need for rental housing but I do support the need to include some rent subsidized rental units within a rental housing development. I do not support mixing rental and condo-type developments in the same building.
I support rental housing but hope the rental price based on the market. Any below market price is not real. The relationship between supplies and demands will decide the price.
Partnerships with non-profit agencies should be considered for this type of development. Service clubs (Kiwanis, Lions Club, Shriners, etc) should be encouraged to become involved in development, construction and on-going ownership and maintenance of rental housing.
Incentives for home owners to add rental suites to existing single family stock. Currently there is a fee and business license required which only hinders rental suites.
Waive amenity contribution requirements and development cost charges.
Focus on density near commercial areas
Simply to make it a priority so our children can live here when they grow up and seniors/the work force can continue to live here.
Allow apartment rentals in single family homes (at last!) with the proviso they be registered with sq.ft. etc
Make it more profitable for developers by shedding red tape and public input processes and the invisible hand will work.
consider using some underused parks for affordable housing along the perimeter... or even using all of it if underused park (such as Tantalus park in Horseshoe Bay) is being maintained by WVAN.
Encourage the hybrid tenure of up to 5 years of rental converting to ownership thru a rent-to-own program - to both facilitate locals owning, as well as mixed ownership and rental in strata developments (for diversity, and strong ownership based responsibility). Short term rentals should be encouraged where professionally curated, to ensure proper use of it to alleviate owner's costs and invigorate our stock of tourist accommodations.
the reality is that Market condo does serve as rental stock. not sure if it matters if the rental stock is all owned by one well capitalized REIT in the form of a rental building, or independent investors, buying a condo unit and renting it out. there are already laws regarding vacancy that shovel incentivize owners to rent unused property.
Everyone needs to drive their kids to school. We need better transit. Every school is gridlocked. Great to have denser neighbourhoods. But no one can get anywhere as is.
If zoning incentives are provided, the 'affordability' the District asks for must go beyond the tepid 10-10-10 model (or even 10-10-in perpetuity). Affordability must be recognized as deeply discounted or income-g geared units.
Yes, more concrete built high-rise rental-only studio apartment buildings for over 60 yrs. of age Seniors jointly financially subsidized and administered by local, provincial, & federal governments and private investors.
I would encourage option c from,above
Thoughtfully designed green space makes all increased housing density options much more palatable for existing residents and desirable for those hoping to live in rental accommodation in West Vancouver.
no
in my opinion, too much focus has been on seniors. I'd like to see a focus on affordable housing for people who work in the community. Seniors have either 1) an asset in an existing home, 2) provincial support through housing. I appreciate that it isn't adequate, but I don't think adding more senior housing adds much to our community, but providing homes for families and workers does.

<p>Rezone some vacant lands or potential redevelopment sites just for unlimited time use of rental high-rise residential building with permanent irrevocable covenant on land titles.</p>
<p>infill up on Chippendale and get transit up there.</p>
<p>Explore the creation of a public, municipal developer to create and manage true public housing. Market-based approaches have largely failed to make a substantive difference. Provide massive relaxations of zoning for co-ops, cohousing, and other similar speculation-proof housing.</p> <p>Provide zoning incentives for sustainable design like use of mass timber, especially tall wood buildings.</p>
<p>Deregulation</p>
<p>Rents are too high as they are and will force the workforce to permanently relocate. The time has come to lobby the government to acquire building materials at a bulk rate to assist in reducing costs to build through non-profit development. The graph above does not accurately represent existing rents in WV and income required to afford existing rent. It is much higher and there is little left over, after tax and rent for the renter to live off of. Quality of life for the average person in the workforce in the lower mainland is decreasing. This must change for community viability and sustainability. Time to pool intelligent heads to create solutions focussed on affordability which is the missing piece.</p>
<p>Supported and supportive housing should be a priority</p>
<p>Rental housing options, particularly below market rental, are in my opinion, a priority.</p>
<p>high rise rental building is needed in the area in the down core.</p>
<p>Provide incentives for smaller scale purpose-built rental housing such as multiplexes discussed earlier in the survey.</p>
<p>Careful control of developers, including indigenous (bad developments park royal and Burrard street), to avoid congestion and taking views</p>
<p>Land is expensive in WV, so rentals will be also.</p> <p>The feds need to provide tax incentives to developers. We should not have to offer height and density to realize this goal. That diminishes our quality of life. Also need to plan for infrastructure first</p>
<p>Explore the creation of a housing authority (like Whistler)</p>
<p>I don't know but allow home owners who have suites to rent them - without a major cost burden to do so. Or zone to allow them to do it - so it is a legal rental not an illegal rental</p>
<p>The most important type of housing that we need is non-profit housing. For example, non-profit housing cooperatives should be supported in their development. Our current systems in Vancouver build terrible housing in order to make a profit. Let's take Switzerland as an example and build exceptional housing without a developer or landlord profit incentive.</p>
<p>Park Royal Gateway Residences - purpose built rental that is probably over 50% empty. For how many years now?</p> <p>Why?</p> <p>Probably rental rate too high?</p> <p>Maybe a need for Rent Control.</p>
<p>Don't force market strata projects to build affordable rental. Market rental yes, subsidized or "affordable" no.</p>
<p>allow more buildings to be built around Taylor way similar to the Clyde and Taylor Way which Larco have designed smaller units I like this concept but only in this area, and in horseshoe bay area where it is very busy and there needs to be smaller units not the high end units in sanctuary that most people can not afford</p>

Rental housing can and must still be attractive and make positive contributions to our community.
Advocate for the province to have a more balanced approach to landlord/tenant issues. We have considered having a rental suite in our house, but have been scared off because tenants seem to have so much power (ie can go months and months without paying rent). I may be wrong and just influenced by media stories. Maybe there's an opportunity to educate homeowners on how to be a landlord etc so that people aren't intimidated by the prospect of offering a rental suite in their home.
Cypress Village would be a good location for rental housing.
Remove rent controls that will encourage construction of more rental units (increased supply), which in turn will bring down rents over time. Older units built at historical costs will rent lower than newer units built later at higher inflated costs as long as opportunity to increase supply continues, and permitting remains efficient..
The municipality needs to protect the existing rental stock that is aging and ensure that any redevelopment does not allow rezoning of rental to condos
This approach would provide the opportunity to build diverse, healthy and supportive "neighborhoods" in which people can live and work together.
No.
DWV should leave it to market forces to determine the balance between owned and rental housing. This should not preclude the DWV using either or both: (a) financial incentives (e.g. through lower CACs) where the benefit to DWV residents can be demonstrated to to exceed the financial cost in foregone revenues, and (b) site-specific zoning, based on the merits of the proposal. Overplanning can be costly and counterproductive.
I support increasing the amount of market rental housing through height and density incentives. You have neglected to separate rentals from 'affordable' in your questions.
Provide incentives for current apartment owners. Give them tax breaks or subsidies to ensure buildings are being maintained properly, subsidies to make improvements and upgrades, discourage renovictions. This would also protect long term renters who's rents are lower than current rates. It would cost the District less to preserve the current stock of apartments, then have to foot the bill for building new apartments because owners are selling their apartment buildings which ultimately will be torn down for condos. Bring back the Co-operative housing model.
Just admit that affordable housing (of any description) in DWV is not possible. The population is too big and the land too little. Subsidized housing such as Kiwanis is possible and workable. Work with organizations like Kiwanis to develop criteria for co-development opportunities particularly in the less desirable locations (without views).
to implement the program asap.
1. Eliminate any age and rental restrictions on existing and new apartments (low or high rise) unit. 2. Simplify the approval process for the development of rental housing 3. Utilize district lands for building affordable rental housing
Use district lands for building affordable rental units.
Remove rental restrictions, Pets, families allowed No age restrictions
I'd like to see a 100% rental building rather than a mixture of owners and renters.

C. Seniors Housing

Question 29: Would you like to see more seniors housing (i.e., independent seniors living, supportive and assisted housing and care facilities) built in the future?

Yes	No
87% (552)	13% (82)

Question 30: Please indicate your support for the following strategies to enable seniors housing development.

	Support	Neutral	Do not support
Provide zoning incentives (e.g., increase height and density) in return for seniors housing creation	64% (356)	21% (115)	15% (81)
Work with landowners of now closed seniors care facilities to redevelop lands for seniors and supportive rental housing units	90% (496)	8% (44)	2% (12)

Question 31: Do you have any other suggestions for increasing the supply of seniors housing?

Increases of height and density should not impact views of current buildings. Please get moving on approving the proposal from Baptist Housing to re-design Inglewood. Their concept is a good one and we need more long-term care facilities in West Vancouver.
It is not a good idea to replace existing low-rise apartments for 55+ owners/occupants that already exist. The problem is where all these seniors will go if their existing property is rezoned, sold to a developer, and new buildings built. This would be a hardship for seniors who are living on fixed incomes and cannot manage the cost of selling, moving, legal fees, and buying a new place to live.
Get Provincial and Federal funding for more Seniors Housing. Work with established organizations like Kiwanis to establish proper units. Don't let overpriced units limit seniors from a life at the end. Some organizations are charging way too much. This is an area where Provincial funding should be established, just like they advertise \$10 a day daycare (which is still vey limited) they should focus in affordable housing for seniors.
Bungalow row houses
I think it's fine to build it but I don't want to see increased height or density for it.
I don't believe West Vancouver is an appropriate district to facilitate any more supportive housing for a number of reasons, like limited transportation access, geographical impediments like steep hills, proximity to grocery stores and dental/medical offices, and so on.

Make sure they are affordable for seniors on pensions not luxury housing. We can't afford places that cost \$10,00 a month. Affordable prices for seniors on pensions that are maximum of \$794 cannot be over a few hundred dollars a month.
We should stimulate the marketization of senior apartment buildings via FAR policy
Again, too big an issue for an "off the cuff" comment
Do not subsidize this with tax dollars.
Could we explore the seniors housing seen in Nordic countries that build senior housing that includes housing for families and students. That way seniors are less isolated and there is intergenerational community. Work with developers that have a vision. Possible incentives and funding from the Provincial and Federal governments. This is a model of below market housing that I believe could be universally supported.
Where zoning can make a difference for seniors housing is how its designed. Having gone through this with an elderly parent I have seen too many "seniors living" facilities where the apartments cannot accommodate a wheelchair or carpet piles are too high, taps out of reach, light switches too high. There does not seem to be any thought put into how a seniors apartment needs to function. This is true even for the newest and most expensive places. It's crazy no ergonomic thought is put into this.
Provide zoning incentives (e.g., increase height and density) in return for market seniors housing development.
Keep the seniors in their own homes for as long as possible. Amica should not be the end housing for all. In home medical care should be the goal.
relax parking requirements
We need cheaper private seniors house. We need plainer eg less fancy, more wholesome places that invites the outdoors in for those people like myself that grew up here who are more crunchy granola types! No need for chandeliers and grand entries! How about lovely natural gardens and veggie beds.
No
It is deplorable that we have allowed the closure of so many public long term care AND subsidized senior living in West Van to make way for private, for profit developments. Seniors deserve to have access to housing. Many are living on fixed incomes and cannot afford escalating housing and rental prices. The municipality should be prioritizing access to senior housing, so seniors can continue living in the community they love. There should be incentives to builders and faster zoning applications for developers interested in building more senior housing.
Provide West Van owned to small builders to develop senior land on, not just priced so high only the big guys can afford it aka Grosvenor group. It's embarrassing how they always get the best pieces.
Developing more seniors housing is a very important issue, but it is not as simple as "Provide zoning incentives (e.g., increase height and density) in return for seniors housing creation". Height and density should not be a function of age of owners/tenants. It needs to be much more nuanced - based on income level, level of care, if any, required, and location.
Ensure new-built multi-family housing has features that accommodate seniors (elevators, accessible units, good landscape and greenspace design, balconies, small additional bedrooms for caregivers). These features would permit seniors to remain living "independently".
No

Convert multi bedroom mansions into smaller senior homes. More intimate. Read Atul Gawande's book for more ideas.
Require a minimum percent of purpose/built seniors housing for approving any development of multiplex dwellings and apartments within a mile of our community centres
We should build low cost rentals for seniors as we have an ageing population
Leading with a market growth plan will allow seniors to get value from their lot use and even live at home rather than downsizing
The old Capilano Care Home needs to be torn down.
Working with developers and the city to create more affordable, well-designed seniors' housing makes sense. Piling seniors into high-rises isn't the answer either. Instead, dignified four- or five-story residences in West Vancouver can provide a high quality of life. After all, West Vancouver is often seen as the "Hollywood" of British Columbia—it carries a certain prestige. For those considering retirement here, it's important to reflect on whether this lifestyle aligns with their expectations.
Senior housing must large enough to have professional staff available. Former Lions Gate home has several layers of care available so clients can stay as they deteriorate (at 91 I can say this)
What is going into Saks and The Bay park royal? Convert that to seniors assistance living
People want to age in their community. The facilities that we have in West Van are out of the price range of many. And, when they move away, they no longer qualify for the Capilano cemetery. Before that happens, they are unable to find a doctor or dentist in their new community. Again, this is an opportunity for the district to become a partner as an owner.
Government old age homes. Not fancy private places.
Build more of everything. Deregulate and simplify the rules that remain
if the landowners agree to redevelop the land of the former senior's facilities into house to support seniors, they need to stick to the plan, not decide to change it from that to multimillion dollar homes that seniors can't afford.
Increased height for seniors is not a good idea. If elevators break down they are unable to exit buildings safely.
Yes! Also provide more parking and especially handicapped parking. West Vancouver is one of the worst municipalities for catering to parking for seniors and also providing safer pathways with those who use wheelchairs, scooters, etc. Take a gander at the Senior Centre Parking lots!!!!
What seems to be the problem ? Why do you need extra "goodies" for land developers to build proper housing ? Anybody selling their house in West Van has enough money to move into a 'good' senior housing facility
Need provincial investment in senior govt subsidized housing , long term care facilities etc not just private developed housing and care facilities that are very costly only suitable for wealthy . Develop smaller multiplex /townhome or multi person "family style" dwellings .
Most seniors want to age in place but there is little housing stock, smaller, low maintenance, easy access. This is a priority over care facilities. Multiplexes allow families to live close but not together.
We will need this to house the aging population.
Seniors need to be taken care of. It's just not okay to prioritize other groups over the elderly.
Equity co-operative housing for seniors, like 606 14 th Street
There needs to be more options for seniors, but they don't all have to live in a warehouse. Are there options for supporting co-housing initiatives or co-ops targeted to seniors so that seniors who don't have serious mobility issues can live independently but in low-rise or single-story areas with access to the outdoors, perhaps including small gardens?

All new housing must first have infrastructure associated with increased population in place. Adding to the existing transportation problems by adding more people is ridiculous
Many seniors in my neighbourhood would like to sell their single family home (3000sf) and move to a smaller footprint, requiring less physical work to maintain, and have more social interaction. However, they want to stay in the community that they've lived in for 20-30years, and currently there are no options that meet these requirements. Not interested in Ambleside or Dundarave. Subdividing one lot for two smaller homes doesn't seem cost effective. Allowing land assemblies may make more sense.
Provide more assistance from BC Government to allow seniors to age in their homes. The government will pay \$13,000 per month to have a senior in a publicly funded seniors home but it won't much (without a big fight, as I've experienced) to get similar funding to stay in their own homes. I realize such a program would augment the shortage of homes but after all, the seniors worked hard to pay off the mortgages, paid property taxes for decades etc and they should be supported with options to stay in their existing homes instead of moving into a senior's home by default since they require more care as they age.
The district should not involve the closed care facilities lands. The reasons of closing shows that land have been already not suitable of seniors housing. The district should work with those developers are willing to develop seniors housing.
Encourage non-profit agencies like service clubs to become involved on their own and/or as partners with the DWV in developing such facilities for either rental or fee simple (condminium) ownership.
Integration not seperation.
We have current lands that could be used to redevelop senior independent living units. Like the one that was on 27th in Dundarave. Now it sits empty with no clear vision for its use. A sad case of missed opportunity. Senior care facilities should maintain their zoning and be encouraged to redevelop (with carefully considered incentives) to redevelop facilities to meet our aging demographics needs at affordable, subsidized costs. This is where we need to put subsidies, incentives. North Van has lots of housing options and rentals and is a 10 min commute, with good public transport. We don't need to offer everything to everyone. Pick our strengths, honor our aging long term tax payers and continue to be the special premium place we are.
incentivize developers to develop single family seniors homes that enable the senior (original property owner) to continue living on the property in a newly developed single unit, whilst enabling the sale of the other two or three units on the same lot.
L
Insist on senior units for larger developments that have access to medical facilities, as North Van has done for the 13th Street area. A medical facility built past 23rd street. Grab that land as needed.
Not quite sure what 23b above entails. I support creative options to consider increased housing options for seniors.
look to the Netherlands for ideas on how to create non-institutional seniors housing.
Encourage a new format seldom seen yet - strata titled, but supplemented with optional support services for aging in place, or for supportive services for younger multi-family occupants as well.
I'm wary of saying "support" to 'zoning incentives' questions as I feel it can provide a lack of limitation that, again, gets misused or lines the pockets of contractors and fails to get to the heart of the matter where change actually needs to happen.
Near transit groceries
We are in need of affordable seniors home/Places

Yes, more concrete built high-rise rental-only studio apartment buildings for over 60 yrs. of age Seniors, jointly financially subsidized and administered by local, provincial, & federal governments and private investors.
We need it where is it going to be built. Is this something that can built 8n the upper lands
recognize that people are living longer and to concentrate senior housing together and designate "senior" zones similar to "school" zones
As a senior I think I'm able to state unequivocally that increased height and density are justified in order to encourage seniors housing. Parenthetically, many seniors no longer drive so parking and traffic are not as significant an issue as with other increased density housing developments.
They need somewhere to live too. Get them out of their mansions so the rest of us have a place to live
no
with regard to 30(b) the lands of former sernior's housing should be required to keep or increase the number of senior specific units in any redevelopment. incentivise with rapid development approval
infill up on Chippendale and get transit up there.
More housing by definition opens up more senior housing. Build for everyone and this will follow.
Life lease type housing with supports should be explored
Create seniors communities with independent living multiplexes surrounding community spaces. Create communities of people supporting one another versus individualistic subdivisions of megamansions owned by foreign capital owners where no one even knows or talks to their neighbors, and with few of these recent owners participating in the community of West Vancouver. (I live in one of these subdivisions right now).
In some other parts of the world, there are seniors housing "villages" - gated communities of small, individually owned or rented homes and low-rises. My mother lives in one and I believe THRIVES at the age of 90, because of the community she lives in, in a home that is small enough to be manageable.
This is a critical/ crisis area... Myst have action on this in the very near future z!
Be more creative-take existing large homes and develop 3-4 rooms communal living.
senior housing is needed.
Consider co-op housing arrangements in some of the very large houses which have been built in the last 20 years in West Vancouver which are having resale challenges with the curtailment of the offshore buyer's market.
If there is a profit, they will come. Not up to WV to sweeten the pot.
Seniors housing is important so something should be done about it.
more independent seniors living required
most senior housing and care facilities too expensive - cost control?
Let the market decide. Gov't subsidized seniors housing in need.
put a cap on seniors housing as the existing buildings should be enough including the Inglewood expansion which has been stalled
The market should respond to need for seniors housing. I don't think the public sector should subsidize for-profit seniors housing, but I would support additional zoning benefits for non-profit or social housing specifically for seniors.
We need to acknowledge that not all seniors want to go into a condo/apt. Duplexes with an elevator and a suite would be a good option for those wanting to leave their homes and gardens. I know a few seniors who have been able to "age in place" . This could be a mantra for the DWV, to help seniors STAY in their homes for as long as possible.

More government subsidized long-term care.
Yes, work with developers. There is a definite need for fair market housing for seniors needing memory care. Why is it that memory care is \$7 per month in a private facility in Calgary and \$17K in West Vancouver. I feel that companies like Amica are gouging and shamelessly taking advantage of our seniors.
Currently the wait list for public care facilities for seniors needing memory care is one year plus. They can't wait that long. The only alternative is private. Memory Care at Amica is \$17,000 per month! I would like to set up a meeting to discuss. [REDACTED]
Maintain existing and optimize existing sites.
This was needed yesterday.
Need to distinguish between for-profit and not-for-profit senior housing and related incentives.
Co-op housing
Provide a diverse forum for facilitated focus groups to provide input.
No.
Financial incentives (e.g. lower CACS or partial property tax relief) may be more appropriate than zoning incentives. This should not preclude zoning variances on a site-specific basis.
Public (government-subsidized) seniors housing desperately needed. I answered 'yes' to question 18, but only with the caveat that it should be government-subsidized. Private seniors housing is unmanageable for most. My father was paying \$19,500 p.m. for care at Amica, and some residents \$25,000 p.m. Costs rose frequently. His apartment was sold, and the results of a life-time of hard work and prudent saving was paid to a company that makes a very, very healthy profit. As one visitor was heard to remark 'these places exist to gouge seniors life-savings'. Believe it or not, I was even asked to provide a replacement light bulb for his room. The only option for many families is for their elders to live in public seniors housing wherever it may be available, often many hours' travel away, which of course results in a break of the bond with their loved ones and a consequently more rapid decline of health. I know there is a very high demand for government-subsidized seniors housing - the wait list on the North Shore is currently three years or more - and I have often wondered whether privately run homes could be built or renovated on a basic, no-frills basis. There seems to be a middle-ground missing. Many families could afford to pay a reasonable cost per month - it is, after all, the care that matters, and not the aesthetics.
I support seniors housing but not general supportive housing
Do not confuse seniors housing with subsidized housing. Most WV seniors can and should pay market rates for housing.
Need more seniors housing at moderate and lower cost not the very expensive Amica etc
There must be a supply of independent living facilities, until seniors go into other care facilities.
I think it's extremely important that construction of new housing for seniors focuses on public/government subsidized housing and care facilities, rather than private housing and care facilities.
Survey to understand transition plans of current residents.!
I feel that at this point and with the aging community, the government has to step in and create housing. Find open space (can anyone lease you land, BPP?) bring in modular units and build seniors subdivisions (close to transit) or provide a shuttle service to connect with transit. This is a problem that will last for the next 15-20 years (baby boomer generation).

If you can take this out of the hands of the Provincial Government (e.g. Vancouver Coastal Health). But hire many of the local managers from them since they are the ones that really understand the issues and how to resolve them. The remote managers have either no competence to manage or have no interest in solving these problems in "the richest municipalities" in Canada. Your strategies above, while laudable, will be subverted by the middle and higher managers of the Provincial Government - as in the past, nothing has changed.
depending on level of care, seniors housing can be off the main transportation areas
Lobby for increase fundings from Provincial and Federal governments.
Low income housing and senior housing should be checked annually about the status of owner or resident of the units. I saw it happened all the time when the time pass. The occupancy of a unit change hands. Sometimes they do not meet the criteria of low income (income too high), but still stay at the unit. Not fair.

IV. Survey Section 4 – Open Ended Input

Question 32: Please let us know any additional comments you would like to share about housing options in West Vancouver:

I live by [REDACTED] and there are a number of empty homes in addition to development projects/empty land that have stalled out. I would like to see the municipality apply pressure to start building on these lots.
I believe West Van council recently approved the construction of a new community in the Cypress area- is this not sufficient for new housing supply?
Many people live in West Van for a quiet, peaceful place to raise a family or retire. We should acknowledge this and try to preserve the culture of West Van when considering additional housing supply.
Thank you for doing this survey. More affordable housing and rentals is required for West Van. Disappointing how NIMBY West Van is.
Protect homeowner views from new buildings and tree over growth
Stop protecting large, expensive single family homes in parts of the District. Spread out new housing. Build co-ops.
Do not increase height allowance along Bellevue and Marine where it impacts views of existing buildings. Do not use the land that the Lawson house sits on for any form of housing.
If we had some style guidelines and some landscaping requirements for new, smaller housing units like townhouses, multiplexes etc, it would help to create cohesive and attractive neighborhoods. Think Mount Pleasant area with many many multi unit Craftsman style houses that are full of young couples and families. We need more of those in WEst Van. Thank you for continuing to work on this.
I am, evidently, very positive to increased housing supply. I understand that it may well impact our own quality of life and neighbourhood - perhaps negatively - but I recognise that we have a duty towards others too. We are a community of the present AND future.
Please try to maintain as much car friendliness as possible, such as free street parking, adequate parking spots in new developments, and maintaining or expanding existing infrastructure for private vehicles.
West Vancouver is limited in land due to the mountains and the ocean. There is really only one highway and a windy Marine Drive.

<p>Any increase in housing has to be paralleled with improvements in infrastructure such as roads, hospitals, shopping, recreation etc. To try to increase housing without those considerations is dreaming. Furthermore with the approved Cypress Village, there will be so much housing available, so our infrastructure will already be insufficient. Political voices that call for more housing are blinded by the immigration numbers and have tunnel vision when they don't realize (or admit) our other problems like traffic, healthcare etc.</p> <p>More housing will not solve our issues. Immigration has been rapid and there is no way to catch up without looking at this issue as a larger system issue. West Van will always be expensive due to land geography ! Don't fool yourselves!</p>
<p>just move forward , engagement will in west van will always indicate no additional housing</p>
<p>West Vancouver does need affordable housing. it is a wealthy peaceful municipality. it has never been affordable and never will be.</p> <p>stop trying to justify a way to decrease my quality of life in Canadas best Municipality.</p>
<p>Small bungalow row houses for seniors</p>
<p>Do not subsidize housing for West Vancouver city employees. The salary limit for this new housing is way too high.</p>
<p>I am a major fan of increased density in West Vancouver. As someone in their mid 60's - I can see moving out of West Vancouver in the future as there is no suitable housing as exists in North Vancouver (ie Edgemont, Lolo etc.). There is also NO housing available for young people which seems inappropriate.</p>
<p>I am very excited to see housing policy be updated in West Vancouver. I moved to West Van from [REDACTED] 2 years ago and love it here. I am a renter. I would love to see West Van's community grow. It is great already but let's bring in some more vibrancy.</p>
<p>Please let's not join North Van City, Burnaby and Burquitlam in the race for more development. Let's keep West Van a beautiful place to live. It know it's expensive, but that's why. If you cheapen it, then it loses it's charm.</p>
<p>Housing starts of any kind MUST consider parking and traffic congestion. West Vancouver has unique geographical components that cannot facilitate anymore cars or buses. Never mind the cost of support services like water and sewage, West Vancouver is in grid lock everyday, and SOMEONE needs to finally address this issue. I am consistently gobsmacked that our provincial government has mandated we adopt more housing, yet we simply do not have any more room. It's not complicated. Traffic issues first, housing second.</p>
<p>better traffic calming, more walkable/bike areas, more transit less car centric development. The district has to work with the province and do a way better job than currently for all street issues. More densification must be accompanied by transit planning</p>
<p>Time for WV to give your heads a shake. 30% of the schools in WV are full of residents out of District because there is no transitional housing available. Either CLOSE the schools and embrace family buyers by creating density or just put density off the list and carry on with what WV has become...your the uber wealthy and seniors...but then you have a problem...the NDP legislation...Thank goodness for them...because you are going to have no choice for projects in the future. Sorry to be so blunt but so sick of nothing getting done in this community and watching it die has been very frustrating...Where are all the families...not in WV...just drive 10 minutes away they are all in NV where all kinds of transitional housing has been built in the last 10 years.</p>
<p>Ensure transit is extended beyond Park Royal especially the rapid bus line</p>
<p>Let's get going to encourage more density according to the government recommendations.</p>
<p>The subdivision process should be faster to encourage the creation of more smaller lots.</p>
<p>Forced multi use housing on any lot with single housing now by the province should be consistently resisted. I goes against the promise under which people bought their homes.</p>

Housing needs are urgent and we need a fast response with a rapid system for housing development. The development process needs to be speeded up so development can begin and we can approve housing projects quickly and efficiently. We need lots of different types of housing and ignore all the NIMB's sitting in their multi million dollar homes.
Until we address the transportation issue to and from the North Shore we will not succeed with solving density issues.
excellent survey
Location issues can be resolved with better transit links. More inclusiveness in future ideas. Look to European multi use buildings, shops and offices downstairs, residences upstairs. Better community and safety all round.
West Vancouver should change its existing overly strict real estate development policies.
The municipality should not in any way subsidise any development (as it has done at 22nd and Gordon). The city should avoid all new rental properties except in Park Royal and for senior housing. More dense development along Marine drive between Taylor way and 25th street should be encouraged.
Much of this conversation has already taken place in other areas and other countries. In particular, a lady in Victoria by the name of [REDACTED] (sadly now deceased) did major studies on seniors housing. Some Church organizations have become involved (Baptist Housing Assn, in various areas) and very occasionally a socially-aware developer will consider a wider range of options. Perhaps try talking to the local seniors to see what they have to say?
We are not now, nor should we be a densely populated area. I support increased development near transit hubs selectively in West Vancouver. This was/is/should be a predominantly single family community.
There is clear zoning for all the areas that were asked about. Don't mix residential neighbourhoods with high density apts and multiplex units. You will ruin the fabric of our community.
I have a single family home and am quite happy keeping this neighbourhood style as a primary use for housing in West Van. Sorry but higher density brings nothing but more issues, traffic, congestion, overuse and crowding that we cannot easily control and for which our services are not set up for. I am firmly opposed to what the NDP are forcing on municipalities against their will.
West van has an opportunity to remain a vibrant community that will be rewarded for resisting development excuses that lead to windfall profits. Neighborhoods are already being gutted by speculators who are hoarding SFH's expecting to profit from density changes. Are we any better off tearing down an offshore owned 2.8 mil older home that was rented by a local family to replace it with 4 3.6 mil\$ townhomes? The municipality should sue the province over their density mandate. Let other communities experiment with this program. So far it's been a disaster in Vancouver.
We don't have the infrastructure to handle the number of residents that already live in the area. The traffic trying to get off the North Shore is horrendous the majority of the day.
Reduce timelines for rezoning, permits and approvals. Current protracted timelines are a significant barrier to provision of housing options in a timely and cost effective manner.
Fundamentally I believe the provincial government should not interfere in the community plans of any municipality. That being said, there are opportunities to enhance the community plan as outlined by the survey. Thx for opportunity to respond.
I think WV as a district has to step up to the challenge of encouraging reasonable and healthy housing options by being far more flexible in its scope and more people centred. PLEASE SHAKE UP STAFFING SO THAT THEY WORK FOR THE TAX PAYERS NOT FOR

THEIR PERSONAL LIFESTYLES AND IDEOLOGIES. Thank you for disseminating this survey.
Please get on with it. kind regards
We need action now and more infrastructure to cope with the increase in population too like Skytrain, additional toll bridge or adapting lion's gate bridge with a cable car or tracks below above to allow for increased transportation - a tunnel could be built in the inlet at Lonsdale quay with the right engineering
West Vancouver should change its existing overly strict real estate development policies.
Encourage the upgrading of our villages - Ambleside and Dundarave - to the level of Edgemont Village which is much nicer.
it was wrong for West Vancouver to effectively prevent multiplex style developments. You were one of the few municipalities to do this by finding a loophole in the provincial regulations. I hope you will now remedy this and allow more multiplex opportunities, not everywhere, but where appropriate
The reality is West Vancouver is a very desirable and expensive place to live. I believe it is quite naïve to expect a material increase in multifamily and low income accommodation. It will not happen, and should not happen.
As the owner of an extremely large lot near [REDACTED], it would be nice if there was an option to add a second house rather than just a Coach House on my lot. My existing home is [REDACTED] There should be the option to keep the existing home and maximize the buildable floor space ratio without restrictions.
My 2-bedroom apartment at 21st and Bellevue costs me \$4,956.00 a month plus a storage locker \$50 and Utilities on top of this! This is out of range for so many seniors . Only possible for those who sold their family home after they lost their partner and now can draw on the capital, to enjoy a nice place to live in their final decade.
We need less single family detached homes but rental developments should also be livable not these tiny studios in huge high rises. I don't understand how in Europe they have have high density neighbourhoods with business on the ground floor and then 3-4 story apartments and we have to keep building these huge buildings that don't make anything more affordable.
Staff should have a look at where land assemblies could make sense to open up larger multi-unit construction and council should find ways to incentivize owners and developers to do the projects that have the most benefit to the overall community.
Rather than another survey why not seek out smaller builders to form a team to explain directly to planning departments how to achieve your goals. There are many in the area who looked at West Van years ago and even more recently and gave up. These surveys are just filled out by NIMBY people and do not share your goals.
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Provincial Government and Metro Vancouver need to update their population projections based on revised immigration targets. 2. Canada needs to stop concentrating increases in population density on major cities like Toronto and Vancouver. Current policies simply lead to increasing housing costs and deterioration in the quality of life in our cities. 3. Basing WV's "anticipated housing growth" on a regional growth rate of 51.5% over 20 years makes zero sense. 4. WV's future housing needs should be focused primarily on the best interests of the residents of WV and on maintaining or improving their quality of life, not on external factors. 5. We need to recognize the importance of new areas such as Cypress Village, Park Royal, Lions Gate Village, Squamish Lands, etc., and not impose unnecessary and unwanted change on mature areas such as Ambleside (particularly the Ambleside Apartment Area).

<p>Our infrastructure is pathetic and West Van cannot support any more density, just getting to Park Royal is a nightmare, never mind trying to get off the North Shore due to more traffic but no increase or even thoughtful planning of roads. Until more thought is out into getting people onto bridges without blocking all local traffic, we cannot add even more cars to West Vancouver. We want to preserve our neighborhoods as the beautiful places they are with the beautiful views people paid millions of \$ for. Do NOT INCREASE BUILDING HEIGHTS.</p>
<p>The District should work harder to meet the Provincial housing targets. Lot sizes for single-family houses above the Upper Levels Highway are far too large.</p>
<p>Thank you for the opportunity to share. WV is a challenge due to our topography and our aging population.</p> <p>Although change is necessary I do not want to see established neighbourhoods with large lots substantially changed. There are folks who can and want to live there. We can't have everything everywhere. It would destroy our character.</p>
<p>I support the need to allow more housing in our District, but, as a long time resident would like to preserve some of the 'uniqueness' of this beautiful municipality. Thereby I support the idea of Coach Houses, Duplexes, Triplexes over dedicated 'Rental' or 'Low Income' housing.</p>
<p>None</p>
<p>There could be opportunities for more new housing development near sunset beach and/or west of Whyte lake.</p>
<p>Still important to maintain character of our neighbourhood, as per the study & committee work a few years ago</p>
<p>West Van is lucky to have a GREAT Planning Department!!</p>
<p>Please do not ruin what a beautiful district we have, the character- which is calm, quaint and peaceful should be top priority. Adding stories to multi family buildings is not the answer and we should look to other cities that have maintained their character without ruining the community.</p>
<p>This survey is about housing. Housing is a factor of land. Land in West Vancouver is in finite supply. The District's insistence that the woke land acknowledgement be repeated over and over at every taxpayer-facing opportunity should really be considered as an option for the cost of housing challenges we're all trying to solve. If we follow the real meaning and purpose of acknowledging that all West Vancouver land "owners" occupy stolen land then we should all clear off and get out. Simply walk away. This would effectively solve all of our problems. The indian bands would get their land back - all of it. And us colonizers can then take our cost-of-living problems elsewhere. It's a win-win situation. If for some reason my suggestion is determined to not be feasible, then the District should immediately end the utterly impractical, meaningless and virtuously decadent land acknowledgement song and dance routine.</p>
<p>I recognize that population growth naturally brings a need for thoughtful expansion. However, I am deeply concerned about the direction in which our community is heading with respect to new development approvals.</p> <p>Taylor Way is already one of the most congested corridors in West Vancouver, yet Council continues to green-light additional high-rise developments in this already burdened area. Similarly, the Ambleside neighbourhood is facing unsustainable density. The Grosvenor building, for example, is not only out of scale with its surroundings, but its sheer mass has significantly diminished sunlight along the Marine Drive corridor, directly impacting local businesses and the character of the area.</p> <p>Bellevue Avenue is another example—parking is already scarce, and yet there is a push to further intensify development in this tight, heavily used corridor. This approach seems not only short-sighted but inconsistent with the values that have long defined West Vancouver.</p>

There is also a troubling contradiction in Council's messaging. On one hand, there is ongoing concern about so-called "monster homes" in the British Properties. Yet on the other, Council continues to aggressively concentrate density in already overbuilt neighborhoods. This inconsistency gives the impression that Council views open space not as a community asset, but as an inefficiency to be eliminated.

West Vancouver deserves planning that respects its character, natural beauty, and livability—not one that resembles the unchecked sprawl or overburdened density seen in places that struggle with limited planning resources such as developing nations. Please, don't turn our beloved city into one of these.

I urge you to reconsider the current trajectory and to avoid further congesting our beautiful community.

Thank you.

Thanks for the survey!

please let the residents here make this decision, not beurocrats. WE live here and know this area cannot support high density everywhere due to the fragile landscape and limited infrastructure (eg lions gate bridge and already overwhelmed roads, amongst other issues). Please do no force us to take on high density without us asking for it.

Adding density along Marine Drive west of 30th is a poor idea. This part of the "transit" corridor barely works as it is and will not handle a lot of additional traffic. There are nor sidewalks and few street lights. Tansit is poor and the road is often clogged with recreational users on bikes. It is fool hardly to add housing density without addressing these issues first

The reason for not supporting development is that we don't have any increased infrastructure for transportation in West Vancouver. Each area in the lower mainland has something unique, please don't turn West Vancouver into an overpopulated mess.

Why can't we just keep West Van as it is now with large lots, privacy and large houses? It is good place to live and no need to make expensive changes.

Just fix insfrastructure, maitain curent bylaw.

I'm sorry if I sound frustrated, but this survey is just a way to slow down progress. You are the experts. You have been mandated to add density. Why are you asking me if we should have zoning incentives? Require rezoning?

West Vancouver faces a housing crisis, and while densification is necessary, it must be approached thoughtfully. A feasible solution would be to allow oversized lots—such as one-acre properties—to be subdivided into two half-acre lots. This would create more housing while maintaining the character and quality of the community. However, simply dividing small lots further to accommodate tiny living spaces could strain our infrastructure, creating long-term issues.

We need to take a big-picture approach and ensure the city is prepared for increased density. Developers, who stand to gain the most from these projects, should also contribute financially to strengthening infrastructure—whether that's upgrading roads, utilities, or community amenities—so that growth is sustainable.

West Vancouver is unique; it's known for luxury living and a high standard of quality. While we should add more rental options that are somewhat more affordable, it's important to recognize that this city isn't suited for those struggling to get by. Thoughtful development and

responsible planning will ensure that growth benefits everyone without compromising West Vancouver's identity.
Along with low priced, high density housing comes increase social problems.
You have too many building inspectors, staff at City Hall. Loosen up.
Shorten the time to get a development permit.....reduce red tape.
District needs to actually listen to public. No more closed voting on "divisive issues." Be democratic and fair.
We support more density and height for developments along Marine Drive and Bellevue Avenue.
We have been in West Vancouver since we built our home, and raised our 5 children here, now only 1 lives in WV. My comments regarding Thunderbird Marine are based on the fact [REDACTED]
We need young families to move back into west van. They can only do that if you allow affordable housing. Young people work in the businesses. Otherwise you will have a dying commercial district and loose services for those who live here.
Increasing housing options in West Vancouver is long overdue. Our adult children can't buy or rent here. The rental stock in the new buildings available around park royal is very expensive.
West Vancouver is in close proximity to North Vancouver and downtown Vancouver- there are plenty of affordable options there. It is a myth that people who work for the municipality or at mcdonalds want to live in a shoebox rental or owned condo - they have shown us that they prefer to commute east and over the bridge as far as it takes to own a big home to raise their families.
The planning/complaining/pearl clutching has gone on for over 20 years. We need to get on with the creation of new and varied housing in our community.
Infrastructure first. Adding density without infrastructure just lowers quality of life
Allow home to build more square feet on their current peopertoes
Ample parking is absolutely essential.
People always will pay more for view property , mountains and water. Use the lesser valuable areas for lower rentals and denser houses and apartments.
1. If we want to talk about coach houses, triplexes and single family lot subdivisions, why are we not also talking about more duplexes? 2. If the goal is to add more housing units in general, the most efficient way is to use more high rises; why is this option excluded from consideration?
I want to see deregulation and market-based solutions to housing. Less rules less regulations and simplified straightforward regulations that remain. The focus should be on affordability and speed of construction
There is no real demand for additional housing in WV. The number of homes and apartments for sale is very high for the size of the municipality. Please review for sale inventory in other municipalities to determine if we should (or if anyone would) build any cheaper housing stock
Put pressure on federal and provincial governments for co-op housing
In any decisions, one of the most crucial issues must be potential increase in traffic congestion. It's getting intolerable on the Upper Level and even on Marine Drive west of Dundarave at times. If housing units on or near Marine Drive close to bus services, consideration should be given to limiting cars per housing unit/housing development.
WE need affordable accommodation for our young people to move into and stay in our beautiful West Vancouver!

Before increasing housing, look at the roads, hospitals, and general amenities on the North Shore. The streets have not changed or improved in years, traffic is horrific, and hospitals are crowded. I have lived here for 30 years, and there are too many people in the parks, on their way to the mountains for hiking or skiing, and en route to ferries. Adding housing to the already poor infrastructure will cause more chaos and frustration. I have been stuck for hours trying to get on and off the north shore many times. Please look at the big picture before focusing on the housing issue.

The hospitals are dismal—how are we going to serve all the extra people you want to live here?

The bridges have not expanded in years - how do we add more people to the roads.

These extra homes will allow people to park along the sides of the road. How does that work in a neighbourhood with narrow streets already?

We have been ignored for years on the North Shore. Why do we have to have the same quotas when we are being ignored in terms of improvements? Where are our politicians? Do they even live here because the situation worsens every year?

West Vancouver is special because of its natural beauty and low density environment. Don't destroy it by trying to squeeze in higher density housing. There are plenty of opportunities for lower cost higher density development throughout Vancouver and there is no need to make every part of the city the same. Please preserve what we have.

Be careful about getting bogged down in approving new projects. Everyone is a NIMBY.

Paint Parking Stalls all along Dundarave and Ambleside so seniors know where to park especially in the dark!!!

Pave our disgusting streets!!!

your proposals will take a lot of time, energy and convincing the locals... best of luck to you.
Phil Marshall

I would prefer to have row housing on my block rather than more monster homes. Please stop issuing permits for these monstrosities that ruin our neighborhood far more than row houses/townhomes. Smaller, more affordable homes bring young families, a demographic that is too scarce in West Vancouver.

With respect to Seniors' Housing, warehousing the elderly is one of the most perverse practices imaginable. Not all seniors will be able to afford moving to facilities such as Amica or Sunrise. But these are still warehouses, just with better public relations. Seniors belong in their own homes in their own neighbourhoods. What is needed is more help with ensuring these homes are as safe and elder-friendly as possible and that help is available and affordable. Yes, the latter is not often thought of as part of housing - but it is a major contributory factor to aging at home, thus reducing the requirement for more spaces in dedicated Seniors' Facilities. True, some individuals will require care that cannot be provided at home. But, with the right physical adjustments and assistance, more individuals could 'age in place'.

As a long time resident of West Vancouver, our policies around increasing density of housing have been shameful. With a growing population, and an aging one, we are already behind in the development of housing. We must do something - and quickly - to ensure that people who work in our community are able to live here too.

There are so many huge houses in West Vancouver that are empty. Stop allowing such monstrosities, and use the lots for multi-use houses such as town houses, duplexes etc.

We desperately need more housing options and affordable options for our kids who have grown up in West Van but can not afford to stay here. Also, for the workforce that our aging population certainly needs (and will need more of going forward)
Make sure we do not end up not being able to get out of West Vancouver because of traffic congestion caused by too many residents, ferry users, etc. and no provision from the provincial highways department, et al to keep the traffic moving.
New areas - like Cypress - should be developed with increased density but leave the older parts of West Van (Ambleside exempted) with the low density that exists now.
Encourage more British Pacific Properties to be developed in mixed housing.
In terms of seniors housing, I favour improving the ability of seniors to age in place.
We love this community and hope surveys like this are used for real, and substantial change. West Vancouver cannot continue to be near exclusively for the mega rich. It's a gift that so many are blessed here but incorporating these changes will multiply those blessings into a healthier and sustainable West Vancouver.
Neighborhood character does not matter when no one can afford to live here. Please consider the input of those who would like to live in West Vancouver as a stakeholder in this conversation, as they may have their own ideas.
With regard to rental properties, there needs to be regulation so owners cannot charge such astronomical prices for rent. Rather than building NEW rental properties, pls regulate & police current rental property owners so they cannot make renting in West Van unobtainable for our seniors, single parents & workforce.
In developing housing we need to also be concerned about impact on the environment like the clearing and building of the uplands . We need more smaller single detached dwellings and duplexes , not keep approving building these huge homes that are priced at \$10-20 million . Those single properties (such as one selling now for \$26million that is gigantic !!) could be lots that provide housing for several families not just one multimillionaire !
Reduce number of rain gle family home, yes prices will rise, to create more affordable housing stock for lower income and seniors. Do not build apartments over 6 stories, they destroy character of W Van.
Please consult with the neighborhood prior to granting approvals. Multi family projects should not be placed in the middle of a single family community. there are places for it ie Dundarave heading East towards Park Royal. Nothing West of Dundarave other than HS Bay.
Provide incentives for housing stock exceeding 50 years old (excluding heritage) to access favorable zoning density to approximate those now allowed in Vancouver and Burnaby (i.e. FAR greater than 1.0). These incentives should include automatic zoning amendment in lieu of lengthy development applications and favorable Community Access Contribution payments.
Fix the bridge then we can "talk".
I appreciate the complexity of housing decisions but I hope that you will do what is best for our community and not what is best for the provincial government or is on trend.
Lower taxes
High Rise apartments in Ambleside and Park Royal areas plus more density in Cedardale around Klee Wyck Park. That whole area could be redeveloped into dense mixed housing
We desperately need more affordable housing so any undertaking, properly analyzed , would be welcome
Housing proposals must be supported with the necessary infrastructure - schools, community services, public transit, etc.
West Vancouver is unique. It is safe and charming and is one of the few areas that sits within its natural world--it isn't all concrete and anonymity. Yes, we could do with some more

housing, particularly for seniors, but whatever we build shouldn't fundamentally change the nature and vibe of our district. Furthermore, I really do NOT want any "supportive housing" built in West Van. It sounds mean and NIMBY, but I don't care. I don't want to encourage crime where I live.
Adding more homes by increasing density just adds to vehicles on the road. The traffic situation, especially on the upper levels hwy, is becoming unbearable. If there were plans to say twin the second narrows bridge, then more development in West Van and North Van could be accomodated.
Infrastructure primarily transportation, should be addressed before adding to the north shore population.
Thank you very much for the community survey. The main challenge is how to maintain and enhance a sense of community in our lovely West Vancouver, while also meeting the housing needs of current and future residents. One way is to limit the height of the high-rise apartment while increasing the number of low-rise townhouses, also with increasing subdivisions of the current lots.
How can more people be brought to WV without worsening the traffic bridge?
Everyone likes parks but we have plenty of parks on the North Shore, we don't need any more. They take up too much land (for example, Grand Blvd Park).
Thank you for the opportunity to provide input.
Interest in permitting owners to move property lines back to establish freely accessible owner on-site street parking. Occupants have difficulty finding parking on street municipal property owing to the press of visiting or commercial demands.
Adding high density lots through rezoning would ruin what makes West Van's uniqueness. Almost every other part of Vancouver has bent over backwards with high density zoning. It makes sense in many areas but not in West Van as the land is pricier, as you have noted, because of the lot size and low density. There are less expensive (and therefore logical) places to build high density. If West Van changes too much, it will no longer desirable for the same reasons it is now and once its uniqueness is gone, we'll never get it back again.
As I noted earlier, we need to address inadequacy of the major road and bridge networks. All the expected construction will increase commuter traffic dramatically and very few of those trades people can afford to live here. It is not reasonable to expect them to come to work on public transit- or a bicycle. Transportation experts need to give their collective heads a big SHAKE.
High -rise apartment buildings would change character of West Vancouver and should NOT be supported or permitted
n/a
Make sure the services, (schools, parks, pools, recreation centres, policing, fire ect.) will meet or exceed the need of the West Vancouver population.
West Vancouver should look at Carmel by the sea in California where there is regulation and buildings have to be appropriate and no apartment towers can be built to ruin the community feel. West Vancouver should be a haven away from the city not turn into a city
Don't forget parks
NO HIGH RISES...keep our Community, low, slow, simple...Bring back more ground level merchants for us to enjoy and support...boutique speciality shops or nice merchants like South Granville...be more vibrant and supportive of locals....more variety of ethnic restaurants, not all the same ethnicity...
We should give priority to supporting imaginative design by relaxing and flexing both zoning and building codes. Much better use can be made of land than having sterile, often useless narrow side yards between single family houses on narrow lots. If many of today's side yard separations between buildings could be consolidated into attractive green space (a result of

<p>more flexibility in building siting), a much more attractive and livable West Vancouver could result.</p>
<p>I think we should preserve the charm of the city.</p>
<p>The recent development in Horseshoe Bay by Westbank is an example of the idealized commercial zone, empty units and a missed opportunity to provide community amenities (underground wires, rental units etc). One of our first priorities if we are looking to an electric future should be to bury the wires. Perhaps some of this future density strategy could include the masterplan for this. We are also very behind in our bike routes. Many other communities now offer routes off the main road for kids, and adults of vast abilities to ride for work or pleasure separate from the traffic. Sadly, we have painted a picture of a bike in the middle of the road and called it a bike path. Let's start with infrastructure and let that shape our nodes and hubs. We have one of the most beautiful locations in the world. The hills are an opportunity not a detriment as witnessed in Wellington, New Zealand. Would love to see a Lush more than a Luxe West Vancouver.</p>
<p>As West Vancouver becomes more and more unaffordable, it is losing its character and diversity as young people, new families and seniors cannot secure attainable housing. Further, if this continues, West Vancouver (and the North Shore broadly) will experience worsening traffic congestion as the service workers that are employed here cannot afford to live here.</p>
<p>I appreciate the opportunity to voice my opinion</p>
<p>we do have an aging population, many of whom still live in single family homes but do not have the capacity to develop multi units on their properties. incentivize owners and developers alike to pair up so that the senior can stay in a newly developed unit on their property or a property nearby undergoing the same development. this will create clusters of networks of communities supporting each other whilst adding to housing stock. whatever is developed, try to ensure that the greenspace on a lot can continue to be enjoyed by all. ie. do not build on the entire footprint of the lot size.</p>
<p>Taylor Way and Marine Drive is a huge problem that will get worse. Solve it early.</p>
<p>As a long time resident in West Van with strong ties to the community, I support some creative and flexible options to increase housing supply and bridge gap areas, but not at the expense of overdensification and changing the general character of the small seaside village of West Van. Changes need to be planned very carefully to maintain this character and what we all Love and enjoy about West Van.</p>
<p>There is no overarching philosophy regarding redevelopment- figure out what matters most and delete everything else. For example, Every time staff makes a proposal to make west vancouver the leader in energy codes, you drive up costs. You want everything, but the rest of us live in a world of trade offs.</p>
<p>Before building these houses units etc make sure there is infrastructure to support the population who will live in these new builds. Diversify the new builds so that neighborhoods will have mixed age groups , the elderly, middle aged & younger/workers/ or families....to provide opportunity to learn from each others experiences.</p>
<p>I believe seniors want to live at home as long as possible and if multiplex and coach house development is approved and made easier then options will appear for seniors who do not and can not afford costly seniors homes. I do not support any buildings over 4 stories in any residential neighbourhoods and would like to see new builds restricted to 8 stories where Grosvenor Ambleside set the precedent. We do not want to become a condo capital as Coquitlam and Metrotown and now Burnaby Willingdon has done. Please try to keep the beautiful village feel protected as we move through these because together we can do this.</p>

We need some flexibility on what current homeowners can do on their lots to provide rental, coachhouse, senior at home suites, etc.
We would like to downsize and continue to live in w v but have very few options please help
I would like to see much more co-op housing in Vancouver in general and west Vancouver in particular
we have an opportunity here to reclaim the level of unique design that the Mid-Century modern homes provided for the North Shore.
if we consolidate projected densification so as to protect most traditional single family neighbourhoods, but facilitate their families' future housing needs, we can produce the required new housing supply without losing the cherished unique nature of WV.
While I recognize the need for more, and more affordable housing options, our infrastructure, particularly transportation, cannot support it.
My comments are about 'the survey'. If the Municipality wanted any real input they need to design a survey that 1. has a lot more information and 2. a lot more choices. The survey needs to be designed with an open mind instead of 'how to get the answer the M wants. The Municipality needs to take the Prov Gov't to court over forced housing policy's. You should do a survey on this subject alone!
Given the high demand of affordable/rental/senior housing requirements, the most effective solution is to build more apartment buildings storeys, and allow more high-rise apartment buildings in the areas close to commercial zone, like Ambleside.
We can only reach our goals if the red tape associated with building is reduced. DWV is extremely excessive in their requirements and forces energy codes beyond the minimum and sprinkler codes in excess of the building code.
There are far too many demolitions taking place for purely financial gain. A huge portion of our landfill is filled with demolished homes. We must value existing homes. Too many large, palatial, and often empty, homes have been allowed to replace modest family homes. This is contrary to the interests of the community and ensures housing continues to become less and less affordable as long as the trend continues.
The city is all cul de sacs. Adding density outside of the park Royal to dunderave corridor will be a disaster. Marine drive is a 30k zone the highway is overloaded with ferry, Whistler, Squamish traffic already. Adding density sounds great but no one will be able to get anywhere. The new cypress village will likely overwhelm the highway when everyone is trying to get on the highway using the tiny on-ramp. Most of the on ramps are too short already. Drive out to Abbotsford in rush hour that is what the sea to sky will soon become.
Make it easier for existing older homes to provide legal rental suites (rf previous grandfathering)
Ok
I've seen single family homes in West Van bigger than units that house 12 families elsewhere. Some of the best neighbourhoods in West Van are where towers were allowed to be built in decades previous. Allow more towers!
Need to build concentrate population near Park Royal/Ambleside due to limited parks, facilities, traffic routes, resources throughout rest of West Vancouver. Upper Levels highway is already a transport hub that accommodates Whistler, Squamish, Ferries and the Lower Mainland; yet, pushing the local population around the out-skirting areas of West Van is going to cause serious issues for the overall balance for the residents.
All options must include off street parking. With the increase of electric vehicles they must be able to park on their own property to re-charge overnight.
Would love to see more small single family homes on small properties making more homes financially available to new young families, and ...
would love to see more concrete-built high-rise rental-only studio apartment buildings created

<p>for over 60 yrs. of age Seniors jointly financially subsidized and administered by local, provincial, & federal governments, and private investors.... instead of the current primarily 40-60yr. old owners who often leave new very large homes empty for years whilst living full time in their native countries and participating very little in West Vancouver life and living. The investing in young family homes and in Senior Citizens living would bring such a breath of healthy life into our beautiful community - a truly full participation and inclusiveness of all ages could only benefit everyone.</p>
<p>This is an a very important policy update to allow our community to continue to evolve through new ground-oriented housing options within all existing / established neighbourhoods that maintains the quality of life we have come to enjoy with the added benefit of new families for local businesses.</p> <p>While not part of this study, a follow-up looking at transportation throughout the district must be undertaken to prioritize walking and other active means by making them safe, attractive, and enjoyable. A series of east-west routes on quieter streets for bikes and walking (with bridges across creeks) should be complemented by green connections along our existing creek waterways to connect the water to the mountain.</p>
<p>The city has spent a lot of time and money on the Ambleside Local Area Plan. Ambleside is an area close to all amenities including parks, beach, commercial zone, traffic center, commercial center. It is the best area to accomodate more population and it will not impose pressure on our traffic in other areas of West Vancouver. The most cost effective and efficient way to increase affordable housing, the city should allow more areas in Ambleside to build apartments up to 6 or 8 storeys.</p>
<p>We need a new 8 lane bridge or new crossing before we increase the population of the North Shore. The traffic is getting worse and worse.</p>
<p>the survey was very binary, yes/no, I felt like I was opposing housing when in fact I support housing, needs to be more nuanced</p>
<p>Will the hundreds of new units in the upper levels cypress development be considered for the provincial request/requirement?</p> <p>And again, my main concern re more density in already denser areas will be congestion, more cars and less road safety. I would like to see densification spread out a little more west (past Dundarave center) along Marine Drive.</p>
<p>I don't think that DWV should get involved in social or below market rental housing types. This is the responsibility of senior levels of govt. Stick to traditional services please and tell Kahlon to stuff it....time to stick up for residents here who pay the freight. If he wants to try to shame or embarrass us who really cares, it's not like we get anything much from the Province anyway 'cause the NDP knows there are no votes here. Rents and property values are declining so we are shortly living in a new world.....</p>
<p>I'm delighted to be able to participate in this exercise. I was involved, [REDACTED] where we experienced similar challenge of a very desirable location, limited developable land, and a population very concerned about protecting the environment and the character of a small mountain community (anti-density) while at the same time demanding entry-level and rental housing options (contradiction with density concerns remained unresolved). Baptism by fire. Good luck!</p>
<p>I can share these pro-housing viewpoints, but it does not matter because residents in the district do not want anything to change (including a bus to across the North Shore to Dundarave). It is completely disheartening, and my family and I will eventually leave the area. There is very limited life in the district.</p>
<p>Great survey, very informative also</p>

no
More zoning for duplexes
Make the permit process easier and make consultations available for homeowners
I believe increasing density along the marine drive corridor while preserving the larger single family units on larger lots in a nice balance.
I'm not anti senior housing - I'm closer to that age than any other - but I think the politicians in West Vancouver are too influenced by the senior vote, rather than serving the true needs of the long term goals for this community.
I support the district's stance on density and oppose provincially forced legislation. It should be up to each community to decide its needs. Some local government support the desire for more density, while others do not.
West Vancouver and the North Shore is unique. Increased density would not be appropriate without infrastructure in place. The north shore already has limitation on infrastructure (roadways) due to its geography.
Improve Planning Processes in the District, Pay less, perform as we have the highest paid planners and GM!!!
Housing options are important but so are all the infrastructure needs that go with these options. Transit, parking, ability to accommodate the increased volume of traffic on the roads. Schools, parks, medical clinics, recreational centres and places for the increased population to buy food and supplies. Housing policies are good but a more holistic approach to the District's livability would be better.
Please stop building high rises or anything in the forest. It's terrible how they destroyed the landscape. Europe would never allow that even if it belongs to an owner.
Please try to focus on making use of existing housing by adding density to those sites through coach houses etc. Much of this existing housing is affordable housing. Also, the sustainability issue needs to be considered and factored in. Also please focus on the missing middle rather than highrises, which mar the landscape and also are not really very great places for people to live.
We need alternative housing options in high traffic areas. Multiple units allowed on residential lots with possible higher density.
Raise property tax to fund more housing - it is ridiculous for WV to have the lowest property tax rate in the lower mainland (and fewer public amenities than most)
In the past many "expensive studies" were undertaken with very little results. Ambleside has been studied over and over again at considerable expense to taxpayers. Other than the 1300 block of Marine Drive, not much has happened. There was an extensive study recently of Ambleside including the peripherals residential area and then it seems like the plan it was dropped and the planners concentrated on the commercial areas again.
I hope to see a shift toward a more sustainable and realistic housing market in West Vancouver. The rapid increase in single detached home prices—sometimes by \$3 million over just 5 to 7 years—is not healthy or reflective of local incomes. This kind of growth appears to be fueled, in part, by foreign capital funneled through legal and financial channels, often without the buyers ever living in or even visiting the country.
Housing should be prioritized for Canadian permanent residents and citizens who are looking to build their lives and families here—not for overseas investors seeking rental income or speculative resale value. West Vancouver's housing market needs to reflect the needs of those who actually live, work, and contribute to our communities.
Stop pushing all development on Marine Drive spread it out to the British Properties start putting in 4 story apartments up on the hills up on Chipendale. When you need a CRANE to

<p>build a house that looks like a 4 story apartment building it is time to reduce the lot size and start to build senior and subsidized housing up there;</p>
<p>West Vancouver it is the most beautiful municipality in the lower mainland. Please keep it this way and don't allow the communist provincial government to ruin our gem.</p>
<p>West Vancouver needs to pull its weight in the region lest its terrible, anti-future, anti-progress reputation continue to worsen. The only way for it to not get trapped in a vicious doom spiral and become a retirement village is to take the housing crisis seriously and invite in new generations of community members. The only way to do that is to take building housing much more seriously. The fact that 4-50 storey housing was not discussed at all in this questionnaire was shocking and depressing. Get with the times. Add transit, upzone corridors, recapture the profit to build community amenities. It's a recipe that works.</p>
<p>Try some deregulation and encourage developers and builders to respond to the free market, do not encourage strata building. Worst form of housing and makes people miserable</p>
<p>We drastically need to expand affordable housing in West Vancouver, and rapidly. Townhomes priced at 3.5m is ridiculous. People that are able to recently afford this price, are generally are not strong community members, volunteers or supporters. We need to develop, and sustain true community members and offer permanence to our workforce and those that have served this community for decades yet will eventually be priced out themselves. The damage is substantive and will be difficult to recover from if it persists. It's time for the council and planners to finally acknowledge it.</p>
<p>West Vancouver must provide more below market rentals for families and work with developers housing agencies, existing housing co-ops and BC Housing to achieve this.</p>
<p>I would have loved the opportunity to have saved my responses and come back to the survey later.</p>
<p>More options Critical focus on all types of seniors' housing Allowing folks to stay cradle to grave in West Van through providing proper housing types has to become our District's principal driver for housing policies. It is currently not there!!</p>
<p>I am very very grateful for the kind and well thought out hard work of the District staff. I am so grateful to have a beautiful green community to live in. Thank you for all you all do !!!!</p>
<p>Love the progress approach, limiting height and density, unlike our neighbours across the water.</p>
<p>We have to find a way to allow a cross section of families live in our district. The community, businesses, public schools etc will suffer if we do not.</p>
<p>There are other communities with the appropriate geography and services to support densification. Until there are better roads, more medical/educational etc etc infrastructure, we can't think about stuffing more people into the space.</p>
<p>West Vancouver did have more higher density housing for the missing middle along LAP area.</p>
<p>I think that the zoning and regulation regime over housing development in West Vancouver has strangled the needed growth in housing capacity and innovation. Why not pick a couple of locations and hold a competition for new ideas for higher density housing form on those sites. I know that the experiment for the wood structured high-rise on Bellevue didn't end well; but rather than obsess with compliance issues, lets try again to encourage innovation in our community on the housing file.</p>
<p>Please consider balancing increased density with quality of life for single person households by supporting affordable options other than apartments - tiny homes on wheels or on foundations. This would allow some single persons to enjoy some of the privileges couples and families are already more likely to enjoy - outdoor space, privacy, and access to land (which, along with allotment gardens) are a path towards food security.</p>

In West Van we have far to many senior housing locations than affordable housing. I was born in West Van and live with a disability and hardly can afford rent let alone food. I feel like my district has let me down. I'm 30 years old and live with my mom who struggles to see that we might have to leave because of the expense of housing and rent. Even the price of homes are ridiculous. It's depressing to think I will never have a my own family because If I can't afford do have a rooftop over my head how would my children ever.
In my neighbourhood (Dundarave) current redevelopment results in livable older homes being demolished and replaced by much larger, luxurious, single family homes. New housing options in this area and in West Vancouver, in general, should exclude adding more of such luxury accommodation and focus on providing affordable homes to enable seniors, young people who grew up in the community and people who currently work in or provide services to the community to afford to live in West Vancouver.
Canada is in a housing crisis and we have to contribute our fair share—we can't be exempted just because we think we're special.
Allow and facilitate density within the OCP (after public input), then make changes to the zoning bylaw (and other bylaws if need be) to streamline redevelopment without the need for rezonings or excessive community input. This would require an amenity charge based on square footage in order to still collect CACs...this is already done in Horseshoe Bay. Also: Streamline the process to allow for stratification of existing dwellings (so that a secondary suite or coach house could be sold as a separate legal entity).
None
Improved transit service and support for non-profit housing could significantly revitalize our community! Please consider these options in lockstep with new zoning policies.
Keep it vibrant, ground oriented with plentiful green space - a big challenge but with creative solutions such as housing clusters, large homes turned into multi family (as seen throughout Kitsilano district in Vancouver) we can add options while maintains the beauty of this unique community
get moving on it quit sitting on the fence stop fighting with the provincial government
Pleased to see the survey. Disappointed that West Van loves to do studies but rarely acts quickly to get anything done. The municipal approval and engagement times are pathetically slow. Who is managing the Place?
I oppose any further multifamily along Marine Drive as the current OCP for Marine Drive is good, and Altamont is not suppose to have multifamily as this is strictly single family and should not allow any higher density. It's like the Belmont Drive in Vancouver close to UBC would never allow multifamily and this area is similar to Altamont.
West Vancouver is wonderful and I want it to stay that way for my children and grandchildren, but also so they can afford to live here too. The character and identity of West Vancouver cannot be sacrificed.
West Van is an amazing place. We can continue to keep it special by increasing the variety of housing options. The key will be where and how the options are executed.
Please see my comment in the multiplex section about needing more sidewalks and buses to support more density. West van has so much potential to bring young families in, but the lack of sidewalks and transit is extremely limiting.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide input. There were many sections that are worthy of a discussion, ie coach houses, multiplexes, row houses, etc. The survey is a good start. West Vancouver is beautiful community, a garden like setting. People want to move here for what it is and don't want to see it changed. So whatever change is being proposed needs to

enhance our quality of life, maintain the garden like settings and green space. What about creating design guidelines for this purpose?
Other municipalities have better transit accessibility which is the focus of where density is being permitted. As WV has limited public transport and residents rely on Hwy 1 and Lions Gate Bridge for access to other areas, density/multiplexes would make sense 400m or 500m from main Hwy 1 access points such as Hwy1/Taylor Way, Hwy1/15th, Hwy 1/21st etc.
West Vancouver has always been an expensive place in which to live. I aspired to living in West Van for about 20 years before I could afford to do it. I am pleased that I had to wait and I would like West Van to continue to be a small community that not everyone can afford to live in. We don't have the kinds of high density problems that other areas have and we need to keep it that way by limiting or actually not allowing high density development.
This survey is incredibly ambiguous. It is extremely difficult for the average person to get a clear meaning of the survey questions. The classifications of questions is confusing. What exactly is "Senior's Housing?" How old are the seniors? Is it a care home for a 95 year old? or a luxury apartment for a newly retired 65 year old? The survey questions are likely to be construed by the people who designed the survey questions to elicit THEIR desired outcome. Where is the densification to occur? Is it to be integrated into established single family neighbourhoods of 60, 80, 100 foot lots in our mountainside community, or will you densify around flatter areas of West Van that are walkable to necessary services, with frequent (every 15 minute) bus transportation?
Yes, for seniors homes. Currently the wait list for public care facilities for seniors needing memory care is one year plus. They can't wait that long. The only alternative is private. Memory Care at Amica is \$17,000 per month!
The survey is set up to channel conclusions towards more density, smaller lots. Unfortunately.
We need to reduce the risk of developing denser housing alternatives for both home owners and developers. The District has adopted the regulations of Bill 44 but has remained apathetic in ensuring that the essence of this change is embraced. Happy to fill out another survey but let me be clear, the District is dragging it's heels in every possible way and it is costing it's long time residents, volunteers, businesses the very soul of the community.
The survey is skewed to avoid maintaining larger single family homes. The survey is also flawed in not mentioning possible increased density along transportation corridors- mainly Marine Dr. Take a look at DNV survey. Considering the provincial legislation re housing, perhaps increased housing may be achieved by yet maintaining WV characteristics.
Housing options need to address current needs and prepare for future needs if we are to create healthy communities within our district.
Incentivize or require Mass Timber for new large buildings to reduce embodied carbon.
The DWV should be very careful with managing growth. The guiding principle (or north star) should always be what is in the best interests (short-term and long-term) of the existing residents of WV, and not simply responding to external pressures, such as Provincial or Federal mandates or immigration levels. Most particularly, the DWV should never put the interests of developers ahead of the best interests of the existing residents of WV.
No questions about apartment buildings above 4 floors, which I would support up to a maximum of 12 floors. No questions about duplexes, which I would support.
My family has worked hard our entire lives to be able to live in west vancouver. There are many seniors who have lived here most if their lives and some will need subsidies and facilities to be able to continue to live here. We live here because jt is less densely populated. I would support attractive 3 plexes or 4 plexes that would be more affordable and low rise

development on top of commercial but not further high rise development. If I wanted that I would live elsewhere.
The problem is in our housing. The problem is the mass flood of cheap immigrant labour to Canada. Now they all need housing and healthcare, and it has destroyed our infrastructure. Now we are destroying neighbourhoods that we have worked very hard all our lives to live in by putting up more and more buildings and changing zoning regulations. In downtown Vancouver, you cannot even see the mountains anymore.
I support an increase in a diversity of housing to meet a diverse range of needs for both current residents and to attract new residents as well. Although I support an increase in height and density allowances to encourage needed housing development, I would not like to see height and density allowances out of scale with location, and/or diminishing the liveability of the neighbourhood.
Thank you for the opportunity for being involved in this Survey.
NO HIGH RISES or multi density zoning
Enable changes in single family residential areas such that triplexes and townhomes can be built - it will be more affordable housing for general population and also very useful housing for aging population that don't need to be in a care home!
Stagger heights, the higher up could be less height restrictions...why ruin the ambience of what little quaintness we have left by Dundarave and Ambleside...
If West Vancouver is ever going to be affordable to anyone other than the super rich, and if the district is ever going to actually contribute to addressing the housing crisis/homelessness epidemic in Metro Vancouver, we need to build WAY more housing and build it FAST, focus on multi-unit housing, and affordable/below market options.
I take exception to the provincial government dictating how we manage growth in our community. It is high time we recognize that perpetual growth is not sustainable. We need to rethink this insatiable quest to develop with ever increasing density. We have finite resources (water, land) and infrastructure (roads, sewage, hospital capacity, etc.). It is not possible to accommodate an infinite number of people, so the question that must be put forward is not how many can we accommodate, it is how many should we?
Unless housing prices come down, the majority of the population will rent. In the City of Vancouver, approximately 54.5% of households are renters. In Metro Vancouver, the percentage is nearly 40%. It is very clear that we are hitting hard times and this will mean more people will be forced to rent. If rental prices continue to go up and fewer apartments are available it will result in overcrowding in single apartments and people living in campers and in their cars. It is already a reality, I see it almost every day.
Take advice from those with experience - the retired community within DWV. As you said at the end this is a growing number; but every-time we have offered (unsolicited advice) to the DWV it is rejected. Solicited advise has been constrained by DWV Guidelines that reject demonstrated competent (for the purpose) people and accept demonstrated incompetent (for the purpose) people - accept lawyers to talk about engineering and engineers to talk about art.
we need young people with families to lift the businesses of west vancouver. We don't need more seniors who don't purchase anything but groceries. Other cities such as North Vancouver can handle more seniors. west vancouver is an iconic city for seniors. we can try to balance that
Work and implement without delay!
Densification is something that has many vital facets to consider the least of which is infrastructure. Because of our buildable land limitations, the mountains and the sea, our options for transportation, is very limited. Adding more population who will need to travel to

jobs is a problem and will be more of a problem with more housing options. We need to keep this in mind.

It is apparent that greater density housing is needed. A group of homeowners on the north side of the [REDACTED] have written to the Mayor, Council and the Planning Dept. to express their interest in rezoning their properties for multi-residential [REDACTED]

The housing needs in West Vancouver is very great. It is therefore very important that once the plans and policies have been approved, immediate action should be taken to implement them.

This is an urgent issue. There is no housing in West Van. It takes so long to build, we must start right away.

3. OTHER INPUT

Phone and email correspondence was collected through this project as alternative methods to provide input. With the survey acting as the official platform to collect feedback, staff received very limited input by phone or email. Email correspondence received is presented on subsequent pages.

For those who wrote directly to Mayor and Council, or through the District's correspondence email, this is captured in 2025 Correspondence: [2025 Correspondence | District of West Vancouver](#).

From: [REDACTED]
To: [OCP Review](#)
Subject: I just completed your survey
Date: Tuesday, April 1, 2025 2:57:07 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the organization from email address [REDACTED]. 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.

Firstly, over the last 4 years I've completed several of your housing surveys and in spite of great questions nothing seems to have opened up for development in West Van. I'm sure you are aware of the bad rep this area has for builders as you inhibit projects with very tight building restrictions, lengthy re zoning applications and basically bend to NIMBY groups and an entrenched council.

As [REDACTED] we approached your team over a year ago when the new BC mandate for inclusion of multiplexes was announced and within half a day realized that the areas which could be available for your restrictions were so few and basically financially not feasible with your footprint restrictions.

I know the bad publicity surrounding your refusal to comply to the new by laws also scared away most potential builders who ended up going elsewhere on the North Shore.

I love West Vancouver, but you've done plenty of surveys to see what you have to do, so just get going.

Ps. Why are the results of this survey going to take 9 months? What was the cost?

It's a very sad situation.

[REDACTED]

Get [Outlook for Android](#)

From: [REDACTED]
To: [OCP Review](#)
Subject: Re: I just completed your survey
Date: Wednesday, April 2, 2025 10:50:31 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the organization from email address [REDACTED]. 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.

Thanks for answering my concerns.

I understand council will make final decisions on your department's suggestions coming out of the survey, but it's up to you to be bold and innovative in a stagnant West Van market.

It's up to your team to push through some fresh solutions, and present them to council. When the results of this survey are presented to Council will the public be invited for comment.?

[REDACTED]

Get [Outlook for Android](#)

From: [REDACTED]
To: [OCP Review](#)
Subject: FW: Shape our future housing options
Date: Thursday, April 3, 2025 8:12:47 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)

Comment from respondent.

[REDACTED] nks,
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
Communications Coordinator
Communications, Indigenous & Community Relationships | District of West Vancouver
t: 604-921-3421 | westvancouver.ca



We acknowledge that we are on the traditional, ancestral and unceded territory of the Sḵwx̱wú7mesh Úxwumixw (Squamish Nation), səliłwətał (Tsleil-Waututh Nation), and x̱məθḵ'əyəm (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]
Sent: Wednesday, April 2, 2025 6:10 PM
To: District of West Vancouver Communications <communications@westvancouver.ca>
Subject: Re: Shape our future housing options

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the organization from email address [REDACTED]. 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.

Forgot to say at the bottom of the survey, that I'm ticked at Eby for telling us what to do!!