

COUNCIL CORRESPONDENCE UPDATE TO MARCH 13, 2024 (8:30 a.m.)

Correspondence

- (1) 26 submissions, March 4-12, 2024, regarding Proposed Official Community Plan Amendment, Rezoning, and Development Permit for Lots C and D Daffodil Drive (Referred to the April 8, 2024 public hearing)**
- (2) March 5, 2024, regarding “Dog noise/centennial walkway”**
- (3) March 8, 2024, regarding “Trucks on 17th”**
- (4) 2 submissions, March 8 and 11, 2024, regarding Marine Drive Bike Lane 25th to 26th Street**
- (5) 3 submissions, March 8-11, 2024, regarding Urban Forest Management Plan**
- (6) 20 submissions, March 10-11, 2024, regarding Proposed Zoning Bylaw No. 4662, 2010, Amendment Bylaw No. 5325, 2024 (Ambleside Local Area Plan Proposed RM1 and RM2 Zoning Bylaw Amendments)**
- (7) 6 submissions, March 10-12, 2024, regarding Pay Parking in West Vancouver Parks**
- (8) 2 submissions, March 11 and 12, 2024, regarding Proposed 2024 Budget**
- (9) March 12, 2024, regarding “Pickleball Courts-Ambleside Park”**
- (10) Committee and Board Meeting Minutes – Awards Committee meeting February 7, 2024**

Correspondence from Other Governments and Government Agencies

No items.

Responses to Correspondence

No items.

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Monday, March 4, 2024 2:15 PM
To: correspondence
Subject: Housing development - Eagle Harbour

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

Hi,
>
> I wanted to reach out as I know there has been a lot of discussions about the potential housing project in Eagle Harbour.
>
> My family and I are in the community and think it would be a very positive thing for the neighbourhood. The idea of a new park and coffee shop plus lots of other younger families sounds like a huge plus on our end.
>
> We have so many friends that cannot afford the housing prices in a West Vancouver and I believe this helps a lot of families get to enjoy the beauty of Eagle Harbour and not have to have a 2-3 million dollar mortgage.
>
> My husband [REDACTED] s. 22(1) agrees it would only benefit the community. We would love to see all the land develop into a new more affordable community and think of it as only a positive development.
>
> Thank you and have a lovely day.
>
> Warmest regards,
[REDACTED] s. 22(1)
> West Vancouver BC
[REDACTED] s. 22(1)
>
> Sent from my iPhone

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Tuesday, March 5, 2024 4:17 PM
To: correspondence
Cc: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Subject: [SUSPECTED SPAM] Aquila Project

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

I'm in support of the Aquila Project!

Regards, [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
[REDACTED] s.22(1)
Bellevue, Wa.
[REDACTED] s.22(1)

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Wednesday, March 6, 2024 9:21 AM
To: correspondence
Subject: Aquila Living Project

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

To: West Vancouver Council
RE: Aquila Living Project

The Aquila Living project will be a welcome addition to the Eagle Harbour Community, and West Vancouver in general. It has been well thought out and fits beautifully in its natural surroundings. It will also add sorely needed inventory for our current housing mix.

Aquila Living is a welcomed new option for empty nesters and young families alike.

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Wednesday, March 6, 2024 3:28 PM
To: correspondence
Subject: Aquila Eagle Harbour

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


To whom it may concern, I would be in favour of the 36 unit Aquila development over the 10 unit detached home option already approved. It is a more practical, mid-price range product and can be completed much faster. It would help to resolve the need for viable inventory with little negative impact on the surrounding community.

--
Sincerely,

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

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

 Virus-free. www.avg.com

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Wednesday, March 6, 2024 9:31 AM
To: correspondence
Subject: Aquila Project

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

I fully support it, we need smaller and better housing options in WV.

--

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

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

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Wednesday, March 6, 2024 9:52 AM
To: correspondence
Subject: Aquila Project

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

Hello,

I wish to voice my support for the Aquila project. In my view a townhome development of this nature should be encouraged by the community wherever feasible. West Van does not have nearly enough housing options for current residents that wish to downsize or for those wishing to bring young families to our community. We have more than enough high priced condominiums, but for those of us the still want to putter around the garden. The choices are very limited.

As I understand it, the project would be similar in nature to the townhouse development at the bottom of Headland at Marine Dr. Our community could use more of these types of housing options.

Sincerely

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Wednesday, March 6, 2024 11:30 AM
To: correspondence
Subject: IN SUPPORT OF STERLING

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

I fully support Sterlings Development. of 17 buildings comprised of 34 half duplex homes plus 2 detached homes here in West Vancouver. Both our adult children want to eventually live here but the housing market at this time is a huge challenge for our younger generation even with post secondary education and good jobs.

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

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

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Wednesday, March 6, 2024 8:27 PM
To: correspondence
Subject: Sterling Development

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

Dear staff,

My extended family and I have been residents of west Vancouver for the [REDACTED] s. 22(1) years.

We are [REDACTED] s. 22(1) professionals and believe that we understand the challenges in housing not only as users but as [REDACTED] s. 22(1). It is pretty much human nature not to want change adjacent to our own back yards...

We wholeheartedly support a little more density in this area of the district of West Vancouver.

Respectfully

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

West Vancouver

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

Sent from my iPhone

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Wednesday, March 6, 2024 9:12 PM
To: correspondence
Cc: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Subject: Aquila Development

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

Dear Mayor and Council,

We understand the Aquila Development in Eagle Harbour is coming before council once again. As residents of West Vancouver, we would like to express our support and enthusiasm for this development. Aquila is a multi family housing project focused on providing homes for everyone from young families to those looking to downsize and hope to be able to remain living in their community. It clearly successfully checks numerous boxes on today's housing needs wish list.

Upon reviewing the plans, it is evident that Aquila is a development that has been designed to respect the landscape as well as the existing neighbourhood. Consider that nearby Caulfield Cove has been in existence since the mid 1970's and continues to thrive as a vibrant townhouse complex. It is home to a diverse group of homeowners who share a love of nature and community. That successful and valued development is a great example of the intention behind Aquila in that it too will present a fantastic opportunity for a multi generational living environment. In our view, this is precisely the type of inclusive housing development that council should be focused on supporting and creating.

We urge you to consider the future of the entire community and vote in favour of Aquila, thereby choosing to support the future of families and seniors who look forward to one day being able to call Aquila home.

Thank you so much for your time and consideration.

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

West Vancouver
[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Thursday, March 7, 2024 12:27 PM
To: correspondence
Subject: Aquila Development

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

I am in support of this development
If we want to provide affordable options (for west vancouver) we need this type of development.
Our aging population (oldest in Vancouver) does not see viable options to downsize if they don't want an apartment , which many don't .
Empty nesters that want to downsize and maintain extra bedrooms and have ground level access don't have options that allow them to take money off the table
Young families or single parent families don't have viable options that they can afford that are suitable for a young family .
Currently in West Vancouver we have 144 homes for sale over \$5,000,000 - we sold 61 in last 12 months - over two years supply , dramatic oversupply
We currently have 3 town homes or 1/2 duplex for sale , under highway(above is expensive and not comparable) west of Dunderave - in the last 12 months we sold 14 , dramatically under supply
Many people want some land to wash cars , have a garden , BBQ on the grass, etc. . The Options are older homes , or expensive townhomes and neither work for empty nesters or yong families or single parents
Aquila will have 60% of homes under \$2,000,000 and size are 1739-3600 sqft roughly \$800/sqft
Darwin's project is \$2,000,000/sqft and Pierwell project - estimated to be \$3,000,000/sqft
These are nice projects but do not satisfy the missing middle
I realize some people are concerned about living in the area, I think once this is done people will realize it's not a life changing event.
As an example , the Caulfield area has over 230 1/2 duplexes and townhomes , Sahalee ,Caulfield Cove etc. Most people dont even know these exist, and they sell very quickly and rarely come available . They fill the need that is missing , the stats are clear on this I believe.
My final comment is
We decide who lives in our community by what we build. I believe this not only keeps people in our community but will bring younger people to our community .

Thank you

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

--
[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

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

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Thursday, March 7, 2024 1:55 PM
To: correspondence
Subject: Sterling pacific support

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

Hello, Re Aquila development, Eagle harbor

I am fully in support of Sterling's proposed 36 units (for clarity 17 buildings comprised of 34 half duplex homes plus 2 detached homes) . And not ten \$5,000,000 homes

Thanks

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

Lions Bay BC

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

From: [Redacted] s. 22(1)
Sent: Thursday, March 7, 2024 2:38 PM
To: correspondence
Subject: Aquila Project

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

To West Vancouver City,

I just wanted to show my support for the “Aquila Development” in West Vancouver. I have been living in Horseshoe Bay and the North Shore my entire [Redacted] s. 22(1) and have seen a lot of developments over the years, some good some bad. I attended the public presentation of Aquila and found it to be very well planned, tasteful and respectful in terms of impact on the surrounding neighbours. It has my total support. I was astounded at how long the process had taken and hope that it will move forward soon, as you know delays only serve to increase prices to the buyers, and I hope to be a buyer.

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

Healthy Regards,

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

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Friday, March 8, 2024 2:11 PM
To: correspondence
Cc: Mark Sager; Christine Cassidy; Sharon Thompson; Peter Lambur; Linda Watt; Scott Snider; Nora Gambioli; Lisa Berg
Subject: Daffodil Drive Development (Aquila) - Official Community Plan Amendment, Rezoning, and Development Permit for Lots C and D Daffodil Drive

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

Dear Mayor and Council Members,

Thank you for taking the time to read this letter and review our concerns.

We are residents of Eagle Harbour and live on [REDACTED] s. 22(1). We purchased our home [REDACTED] s. 22(1) and have raised [REDACTED] s. 22(1) children here. We are extremely familiar with every corner of the Eagle Harbour neighbourhood - traffic patterns, pedestrian patterns, schools, transit, waterways, run off, drainage issues, wildlife, infrastructure, etc.

When all is said and done, we accept that there will be development – the issue at hand is the developer’s respect (or at times lack thereof) for the residents who will be most affected by this drastic change to the lay of the land in Eagle Harbour. **One would hope that by now the developer has gained an understanding of how truly passionate the members of this community are about protecting the environment and keeping Eagle Harbour as green as possible (you don’t know what you’ve got ‘til it’s gone). Once you change the lay of the land, it is changed forever and there is no going back.** In today’s world of heat domes, flooding, forest fires, extreme rains – this parcel of land and the surrounding neighbourhood needs to be planned for with the utmost respect for the environment.

Of note is the fact that there is now even more concern surrounding this development regarding erosion and environmental issues, due to the fact that the developer has now applied to the District subdivide [REDACTED] s.22(1) plot of land, directly to the north of the Aquila proposed project, into 3 separate lots. This will result in even MORE clear cutting, erosion, drainage, environmental, and infrastructure issues from development on this parcel located directly above Aquila. Given the lay of the land and steep slopes on this parcel of land – any development on either piece of property needs to be approached with the highest level of care in mapping out tree removal and preserving the natural environment that currently exists in this area.

In a recent article published by CBC News, "The risk of landslides in the North Shore region could quadruple by 2080s." ([CBC.ca/news, 2021](https://www.cbc.ca/news/2021)). We must be proactive and ensure that the necessary assessments have been completed to the highest standards

It was surprising to see 14 letters of support for Aquila posted to the correspondence section of the DWV website as of Wednesday morning (March 7th). Some of the letters noted Aquila will be discussed at the upcoming Council meeting on March 11th. After reviewing the DWV website on Wednesday morning, there was no notation of the discussion to take place on March 11th – with no agenda yet posted. Clearly the developer and his “supporters” knew what was up – however the rest of us had been left in the dark. **Where is the transparency of process in this?** You would think that someone from the DWV would have reached out to the residents who will be most impacted by this pushed through development, to advise of the upcoming meeting on March 11th, and to give an update on how this proposal is progressing.

Once again, the developer has attempted to rally support via the “back door” by asking his friends and real estate associates to submit letters of support prior to the Council Meeting agenda even being posted. **I am assuming this was the developer’s attempt to front load Council and the Mayor’s inboxes with emails, in an attempt to make it look like the community supports their plan, before any of the residents who will be directly impacted were even made aware there would be a meeting. Smoke and mirrors by the developer.**

The submission of these letters does not paint the true picture of how the majority of people in this neighbourhood, especially those who reside directly in the vicinity of the Daffodil Development, really feel – **the majority DO not support this application for many VALID reasons** – which have all been voiced many times previously – but here we go again!

It would be interesting to know where these letter writing supporters live – they may live in West Van, but they really do not understand the lay of the land, or care about the impact this will have upon those who are residing in the immediate area of Aquila – nor do they care about the environmental impact, traffic, parking, infrastructure issues, etc., as it will have no immediate effect upon them.

After reviewing the letters of support that were recently submitted it is noted:

- o two letters were submitted by real estate agents – who potentially stand to gain financially by having these units built
- o one claims that their child care provider will purchase a unit in Aquila, anything is possible, but a rather erroneous claim – the same person claims that their aging parents will live in a unit, again erroneous and given that these units will be multi level – does anyone really think they are geared for seniors as they continue to age? The developer needs to stop throwing this claim out there – as it is simply not true.
- o one claims they are happy to put up with increased traffic, construction noise and states “I want this development in my back yard” ... clearly they do not live close by and will not truly have Aquila in their backyard – **as many residents of Cranley/Daffodil/Westport will.**
- o **one submission is noted to be from someone in Vancouver – why are they even writing to support this? Clearly this will not have an impact on them. Maybe they are receiving a free dinner from the developer in exchange for their letter of support?**
- o Some claim that these units are affordable for young families and first time buyers ??? Really?? And one says everyone who already lives here, is here because of help from the “bank of mom and dad” ... that is definitely not true.

Currently on the Aquila website the developer has noted that the cost of units will be between 1.4 to 2.3 million – we know the final listing prices will be higher – given the current cost of goods due to inflation – **again smoke and mirrors.** I can tell you that none of my s. 22(1) kids or their friends will be purchasing a unit – even when employed as s. 22(1) etc. – **again smoke and mirrors by the developer.**

We have all expressed to the Mayor and Council and DWV Planners our concerns, as outlined many times:

- **The height and profile of the units proposed are not in keeping with the neighbourhood** and will be staring down directly at their neighbours on Cranley Drive – even with the proposed “buffers” the style of Aquila looks very much like “Seascapes” north of Horseshoe Bay – **Eagle Harbour is not the place to build another “Seascapes”.**
- Entrance and exit to the development on Daffodil Drive – huge safety issues for pedestrians and cars alike- especially for entrance/exit from Daffodil & Marine (blind corner when turning onto Marine)
- Erosion, surface water and drainage, clear cutting, sensitive riparian areas all are issues (**now an even greater concern with the subdivision and development on the lot immediately to the north of Aquila**)

- Infrastructure – schools, medical clinics, daycare, water and sewer infrastructure – too many things to list here
- This proposal does not fall within the OCP as **EH is DEFINITELY not located near a “transit hub” and the residents of Eagle Harbour all use their cars to go about their daily lives** - trips to Caulfield Mall, drop off kids to school, driving to work, to the rec centre, going out for dinner – reality is, a very few number of people who live here take the bus or ride a bike to do go about their daily routine
- **NOBODY walks to Caulfield mall to buy groceries. The developer [REDACTED] s.22(1) – does he walk up the hill [REDACTED] s.22(1) to buy his groceries? Stop trying to claim this development is located in a “walkable” neighbourhood – for daily life (work/school/errands – it is NOT)**
- The entrance and exit from this project **MUST** have the majority of cars accessing from Westport Drive – using Daffodil Drive should not even be considered due to safety issues as well as the “country lane” feel of Daffodil Drive
- **NOISE** – as noted before – **the lay of the land in EH is like a bowl and sound travels down from the area of the proposed development.** When there are parties held up at the existing residence at [REDACTED] s. 22(1) – we can hear every word down here [REDACTED] s.22(1). Multiply that by 36 homes (both during construction and when occupied). So much for the sounds of nature! **We will be hearing a minimum of 36 cars making multiple trips in and out of the development each day**, not to mention delivery trucks, etc. So much for increasing density next to transit hubs – **this development is not fulfilling that mandate is it?**

I would suggest that if this was a developer that truly cared about the neighbourhood, they would take the time and energy to meet directly with the group of residents (along with the Mayor and Council members) who will be most affected by his proposed development to hear from them directly, and discuss in a constructive and calm fashion, in order to come to terms with the concerns that are not being addressed. We already attended the developer’s sales presentation back in 2023 at the golf course (under guise of being a public info meeting), which proved to be a very unproductive event – no questions answered and no formal presentation or Q&A offered to the attendees.

We look forward to further dialogue with the developer and the District.

Respectfully submitted,

[REDACTED]
s. 22(1)

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Friday, March 8, 2024 5:45 PM
To: correspondence
Cc: Mark Sager; Christine Cassidy; Peter Lambur; Sharon Thompson; Scott Snider; Linda Watt; Nora Gambioli
Subject: Aquila Development

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

To Mayor and Council

Appears Eagle Harbour residents need to answer the bell yet one more time regarding the proposed Aquila development and its adjoining lot rezoning applications. A good neighbour said something that resonated with our household. "You don't know what you've got till it's gone". Think Joni Mitchell said it first. Hope you as our elected representatives understand as well. We all purchased homes in a single family zoned neighbourhood. There was a reason for that. The whole narrative of the missing middle and providing affordable housing has proven to be a red herring. The blueprint is pretty much set. It's more than likely that most pre-sales will be to real estate investors. Developers aren't charities.

What would the impact be on our community, environmental and otherwise ? We're not convinced that a proper study has been done.

See you Monday March 11th.

Best regards, [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

From: s. 22(1)
Sent: Friday, March 8, 2024 6:09 PM
To: correspondence
Subject: Aquila Living in Eagle Harbour

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

Mayor and Council,

I am pleased to forward a letter of support to the Mayor and Council for Aquila Living in Eagle Harbour. It is a long overdue development that is desperately needed.

West Vancouver has been our home for the past s. 22(1) and it is our desire to continue living in this beautiful community. However, it has come time to downsize and it is with sheer frustration that the district does not offer reasonable housing options. Because of this lack of options we continue to live in our Caulfeild home.

What is most frustrating is there is nowhere to go that costs less than our house. Our options are new construction which is priced in the luxury price range or something that was built in the 70's or 80's. What is missing is new, nicely built, affordable housing; the missing middle.

Moving to North Vancouver is not an option as all our community services are here in West Vancouver and would cause us to return to West Vancouver several times a week.

If the Mayor and Council have been reluctant to build for downsizers, you certainly have not built for first responders, teachers and all those that service the municipality. Where is there housing for middle income people?

The Mayor and Council need to have the courage to conform to increased densification in Eagle Harbour without the threat of destroying the neighbourhood. It appears the shots are being called by the people who are against everything, such as the church re-development in Horseshoe Bay.

I hope the Mayor and Council take seriously the words of the Premier, that those municipalities that choose not to build will be encouraged to do so by the Province. Perhaps it would be better for the municipality not to wait to be mandated by the Province.

I hope the Mayor and Council say enough is enough and grant the necessary approvals to a project that has been underway since 2018.

It seems to me that Aquila Living checks all the boxes.

Sincerely,
s. 22(1)

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

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Saturday, March 9, 2024 1:08 PM
To: correspondence
Subject: Aquila

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

We are in support of this development , as a long term resident this type of product is what we need to meet the demand .

We actually live on [REDACTED] s. 22(1) in an older house, keep our [REDACTED] s. 22(1) and would like to down size in this neighborhood. Please let there be some new, smaller homes here.

Regards,

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

West Vancouver, BC.

From: David Marley <domarley52@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, March 9, 2024 1:45 PM
To: correspondence; Mark Sager; Christine Cassidy; Nora Gambioli; Peter Lambur; Scott Snider; Sharon Thompson; Linda Watt
Subject: Proposed Aquila development

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

I understand that, at long last, this proposal is coming before Council. I thought I'd resend my e-mail of June 17th last.

David Marley

From: David Marley <domarley52@gmail.com>
Date: June 17, 2023 at 5:57:59 PM PDT
To: Council DWV <correspondence@westvancouver.ca>
Cc: Cassidy Christine <ccassidy@westvancouver.ca>, Gambioli Nora <ngambioli@westvancouver.ca>, Lambur Peter <plambur@westvancouver.ca>, Sager Mark <mark@westvancouver.ca>, Snider Scott <ssnider@westvancouver.ca>, Thompson Sharon <sthompson@westvancouver.ca>, Watt Linda <lwatt@westvancouver.ca>
Subject: Proposed Aquila development

I have recently read a proposal concerning this development in the Eagle Harbour neighbourhood. My initial impression is that it is precisely the sort of housing which West Vancouver ought to be encouraging. It would appear to offer an attractive residential option for many, locals and newcomers alike, who otherwise will likely be precluded from either remaining in or moving to West Vancouver.

I have lived in West Vancouver for just over 32 years. It has so many natural advantages and great potential. Overall it is a much better than decent place in which to live. It is not, however, as wonderful today as many locals would like to believe.

For one thing, I have so often been struck by the rampant complacency and outright negativity of far too many residents toward various issues, including land use, as well as the "I'm all right, Jack" attitude of too many business operators and commercial property owners. This is a peculiar and decidedly unappealing aspect of our community. It is a psychological climate remarkably similar to one which used to exist, and may still, in Oak Bay, another enclave of entitlement in which I lived for five years in the 1980s.

Too many people in West Vancouver speak of 'preserving the status quo'. To my mind, this is not really doable. A community either moves forward by adapting to changing circumstances or it withers and declines. As I travel around Metro Vancouver and, indeed, to various cities elsewhere in North America or overseas I see all manner of welcome improvements being made to commercial and residential properties, along with impressive public infrastructure upgrades. Upon returning to West Vancouver I am struck by how 'down-at-heel' our principal commercial centres are increasingly becoming and also by the proliferation of single family houses which are absurdly disproportionate in size both to the lot upon which they sit and their surrounding neighbourhoods. Many are outright grotesque, in the conspicuous consumption sense.

Anyway, the proposal in question strikes me as attractive, proportionate in size relative to its location and likely to help meet an obvious and urgent housing need in our community. I wish the developer every success and strongly encourage Council to vote in support of this development.

I hereby request that my name and contact information not be redacted from this e-mail.

David Marley

s. 22(1)

West Vancouver, BC

s. 22(1)

604-926-8994

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Saturday, March 9, 2024 2:40 PM
To: correspondence
Subject: Aquila Development

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

To Council Members and Staff...

My wife and I are currently residents of West Vancouver at [REDACTED] s. 22(1). In fact we built our home back [REDACTED] s. 22(1) and raised [REDACTED] s. 22(1) children here.

I am writing this to you in full support of the development project known as Aquila that I have followed and reviewed. Our home today is significantly larger than our living needs. We would like to stay in West Vancouver for many reasons as we enjoy the community here. The problem we face like many other "empty nest" couples is that unless you are prepared to move into a high rise concrete project, which we are not prepared to do, there are few options of choice for lower density projects or townhouse style developments that have a look and feel of a single family home.

Aquila offers the look and feel of a single family residence.

This project should be fully supported by Council and Staff as West Vancouver is in dire need of providing this form of housing that is scarce in this municipality.

Without projects such as Aquila, West Vancouver will not be seen as a municipality that offers diverse housing to attract a variety of family needs.

We strongly encourage the municipality to approve this stage of the project so that it can continue to advance to development.

Thank you for giving this your full consideration.

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Saturday, March 9, 2024 5:16 PM
To: correspondence
Cc: Mark Sager; Christine Cassidy; Peter Lambur; Sharon Thompson; Scott Snider; Nora Gambioli; Lisa Berg; Jim Bailey; Michelle McGuire; Linda Watt
Subject: Eagle Harbour development proposal
Attachments: Letter to Mayor and Councillors.pdf; smime.p7s; ATT00001.txt; ATT00002.htm

Dear Mayor, Councillors and staff,

Please find the attached letter regarding the Proposed Development in Eagle Harbour.

Regards

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

To: Mayor Mark Sager
and Councillors:

March 9, 2024

Christine Cassidy
Peter Lambur
Sharon Thompson
Scott Snyder
Linda Watt
Nora Gambioli

Staff:

Lisa Berg
Michelle McGuire
Jim Bailey

District of West Vancouver
750 17th Street
West Vancouver, BC, V7V 3T3

PROPOSED AQUILA DEVELOPMENT/EAGLE HARBOUR

On April 8 2023, you all received a letter directed to the Developers with the concerns about this development from people who actually live in the Eagle Harbour neighbourhood.

Some subsequent meetings were held with Mayor and the Community and there were some vague promises that the Developer would listen to some of these concerns and make modifications.

The February 28, 2024, Council report by Lisa Berg file 1010-20-21-131 reads:

Point 2 .The applicant worked with the community to refine the designs of three buildings that back onto the properties located on Cranley Drive. To respond to resident concerns, the applicant revised those units by reducing their size, massing and number of storeys.

Actually, the applicant has NEVER worked with the community!

We fail to notice these mentioned changes as these buildings still show up to be three storeys high with views into the backyards of Cranley Drive neighbours.

There is a rendering showing that huge trees could be planted, which would also completely shade these neighbours' backyards, which obviously is not desirable.

As neighbours have previously pointed out in letters, there has been no dialogue with the neighbourhood by the developer/applicant and no consideration has been taken to the concerns that have been emphasized.

We notice that the roads in the property are now separated, meaning that 24 dwellings would need to drive out through the small Daffodil Drive onto the curve on Marine Drive. On top of that, as the Developer has requested a sub-division of s. 22(1) lot right north of the Development, into three lots, the traffic from all those future dwellings would be added to traffic onto Daffodil Drive.

Safety is a major concern.

We also note that even though it has been ignored by staff earlier, notice has been given that this development does actually **not fit into the OCP**, and therefore there is now a proposal to change the OCP in order to fit this development by changing a By-Law.

I.e.:

“Official Community Plan Bylaw

An incidental amendment to the Official Community Plan (OCP) is required to establish a Development Permit Area (DPA) and associated guidelines and to place the site within that DPA (Appendix C).”

Is this not putting the horse before the cart? Staff suggests an amendment to the OCP to fit this project as outlined in Appendix C!

“1.0 Purpose

To present to Council a proposed development application to rezone Lots C and D Daffodil Drive (Appendix A) to allow for a 36-unit residential development (see “Project Profile” – Appendix B). Presented as part of the development are:

- bylaws serving to amend the Official Community Plan and Zoning Bylaw;...“*

Furthermore:

*“OCP Policy 2.1.7 enables the consideration of proposals within neighbourhoods for site-specific zoning changes that are **not otherwise***

supported by policies in the OCP only in limited circumstances by:

- a. Reporting to Council after preliminary application review to allow an early opportunity for public input;*
- b. Considering sites or assemblies that present a degree of physical separation from adjoining single-family dwellings (e.g., adjacent to a green belt, grade change, park, school, or existing multi-family site);*
- c. Requiring demonstration of minimal impact to access, traffic, parking and public views in the neighbourhood;*
- d. Restricting to one or more a range of low-rise housing types including duplexes, triplexes, rowhouses, townhouses, seniors, rental and apartment buildings to a maximum of three storeys;*
- e. Reviewing form and character to support siting and designs that respond and contribute to neighbourhood context and character; and*
- f. Ensuring information meetings with public notification prior to formal Council consideration in accordance with District procedures.*

As there are watercourses and a wetland, areas of steep slopes on the site, and wildfire hazard considerations, a development permit subject to the following OCP policies and guidelines is required for the development proposal prior to issuance of a building permit:

- NE1: Wildfire Hazard*
- NE6: Sites with Difficult Terrain (Steep Slopes)*
- NE13: Watercourse Protection”*

We urge Mayor and Council to review in detail what is being recommended by staff.

We would also like to offer our support to a letter that was recently sent by a neighbour that outlines many of the points of concern from all our neighbours. To quote some of these points instead of just repeating them:

“It was surprising to see 14 letters of support for Aquila posted to the correspondence section of the DWV website as of Wednesday morning (March 7th).

Once again, the developer has attempted to rally support via the “back door” by asking his friends and real estate associates to submit letters of support prior to the Council Meeting agenda even being posted. **We are assuming this was the developer’s attempt to front load Council and the Mayor’s inboxes with emails, in an attempt to make it look like the community supports their plan, before any of the residents who will be directly impacted were even made aware there would be a meeting.**

The submission of these letters does not paint the true picture of how the majority of people in this neighbourhood, especially those who reside directly in the vicinity of the Daffodil Development, really feel – **the majority DO NOT support this application for many VALID reasons** – which have all been voiced many times previously – but here we go again!

We have all expressed to the Mayor and Council and DWV Planners our concerns, as outlined many times:

- **The height and profile of the units proposed are not in keeping with the neighbourhood** and will be staring down directly at their neighbours on Cranley Drive – even with the proposed “buffers” the style of Aquila looks very much like “Seascapes” north of Horseshoe Bay – **Eagle Harbour is NOT the place to build another “Seascapes”**.
- Entrance and exit to the development on Daffodil Drive – huge safety issues for pedestrians and cars alike- especially for entrance/exit from Daffodil & Marine (blind corner when turning onto Marine)
- Erosion, surface water and drainage, clear cutting, sensitive riparian areas all are issues (**now an even greater concern with the subdivision and development on the lot immediately to the north of Aquila**)
- Lack of Infrastructure – schools, medical clinics, daycare, water and sewer infrastructure – too many things to list here.
- This proposal does not fall within the OCP as **EH is DEFINITELY not located near a “transit hub”** and **the residents of Eagle Harbour all use their cars to go about their daily lives** - trips to Caulfield Mall, drop off kids to school, driving to work, to the rec centre, going out for dinner – reality is, a very few number of people who live here take the bus or ride a bike to go about their daily routine.
- **NOBODY walks to Caulfield mall to buy groceries. The developer s. 22(1) to the Aquila site – does he walk up the hill s.22(1) to buy his groceries? Stop trying to claim this development is located in a “walkable” neighbourhood – for daily life (work/school/errands) – it is NOT!**
- The entrance and exit from this project **MUST** have the majority of cars accessing from Westport Drive – using Daffodil Drive should not even

be considered due to safety issues as well as the “country lane” feel of Daffodil Drive.

- **NOISE** – as noted before – **the lay of the land in EH is like a bowl and sound travels down from the area of the proposed development.** When there are parties held up at the existing residence at [REDACTED] s. 22(1) – we can hear every word down here [REDACTED] s.22(1). Multiply that by 36 homes (both during construction and when occupied). So much for the sounds of nature! **We will be hearing a minimum of 36 cars making multiple trips in and out of the development each day,** not to mention delivery trucks, etc. So much for increasing density next to transit hubs – **this development is not fulfilling that mandate, is it?**

I would suggest that the developer take the time and energy to meet directly with the group of residents (along with the Mayor and Council members) who will be most affected by his proposed development to hear from them directly in a constructive and calm fashion, in order to come to terms with the concerns that are not being addressed. We have already attended the developer’s sales presentation back in 2023 (under guise of being a public info meeting), which proved to be a very unproductive event – no questions answered and no formal presentation or Q&A offered to the attendees.

We look forward to further dialogue with the developer and the District.”

With all this said and echoed by most of the neighbourhood, we would recommend that this project is delayed, the Public hearing is postponed and a fruitful dialogue with the Developer, their advisors and the community takes place.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Monday, March 11, 2024 9:01 AM
To: correspondence
Subject: Aquila Development

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

Dear West Van mayor and council,

I want to express my support for the Aquila development project in Eagle Harbour.

I am a [REDACTED] s. 22(1), raised in West Van, with soon to be a [REDACTED] s. 22(1). I live in North Van today but would like to return; however the inventory of affordable housing has limited my options.

Aquila is a compelling project at a good price point for young families and downsizers.

Please approve the project and more like it.

Thanks & sincerely,

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

From: s. 22(1)
Sent: Monday, March 11, 2024 10:59 AM
To: correspondence
Subject: Aquila project - Sterling Developments

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

Hello,

I am writing to you in regards to the support of the Aquila project by Sterling Developments. I would be interested in a project like this as I am a s. 22(1) year old that used to live in West Van and if I were to move back to west van would like to find a property that is affordable.

Regards,

s. 22(1)

s. 22(1)

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

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Monday, March 11, 2024 11:37 AM
To: correspondence
Subject: In support of Aquila Development Westport/Cranley

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

Hello West Vancouver Council...please take note of support for Aquila Development.

I am in support of Sterling's proposed 36 units.

(17 buildings comprised of 34 half duplex homes plus 2 detached homes) .

Here is why I believe in this project:

- The total building area of 36 homes is roughly the same as 10 large homes.
- West Vancouver is lacking in "affordable/appropriate" for our market - middle market - product that is not an apartment or condo.

This project will provide 36 units on 5 acres off Westport Road and Cranley Drive.

This development is well hidden and built into the slope and does not impact any views.

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

WV, BC [REDACTED] s. 22(1)

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Monday, March 11, 2024 12:00 PM
To: correspondence
Subject: Aquila Feedback

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

Hello, I support this project. I have known the developers for a number of years and generally found their builds work within the fabric the neighbourhoods with consideration given to both design and massing. There extensive knowledge of building in west vancouver will show in the end product which is sorely needed. I also look forward to opportunities where the developer can help augment surrounding public amenities.

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

West Vancouver

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

From: s. 22(1)
Sent: Monday, March 11, 2024 3:31 PM
To: correspondence
Subject: Aquila Development

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

Dear Mayor Sager & Council ~

I am writing to let you know my support of the Aquila development proposed for HSB. In my opinion this is exactly the type of home we need to build more of in West Vancouver.

My husband and I are empty nesters who currently live at s.22(1), a split duplex at the proposed price would suit our needs to a tee.

I'd like to see council support this initiative and others like it.

Sincerely,

s. 22(1)

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Monday, March 11, 2024 4:28 PM
To: correspondence
Subject: FW: Aquilina Project - Eagle Harbour

Importance: High

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

Hello,

I am writing in support of the Aquilina Project proposed for Eagle Harbour.

I understand it is going to 1st reading this evening.

I am the [REDACTED] s. 22(1) and have [REDACTED] s. 22(1)

Lack of supply, lack of diversity in housing, unaffordable housing has long been an issue in West Vancouver. Given BC's New Housing Legislation and the changes Mayor and Council will have to make

to address these issues, I would ask Mayor and Council to be forward thinking and start implementing some of the thought processes around this to the current application approval process.

West Vancouver desperately needs more affordable housing to meet the needs of what should be a growing population and retain downsizers and young families.

The current zoning for 9000+ square feet homes that will be valued at \$5,000,000 + does not fit the new model or service the needs of the community.

By approving the Aquilina project you will be adding housing inventory where it is needed most.

The following are the key points to consider:

- The total building area of 36 homes is roughly the same as 10 large homes
- West Vancouver is lacking in "affordable " (affordable for our market) middle market product that is not an apartment or condo. This project will provide 36 units on 5 acres off West Port Road and Cranley Drive. This development is well hidden and built into the slope and does not impact any views.
- the area has a good walkability score with easy access to the rest of the community and beyond.

-Currently, West Vancouver has 144 homes for sale over \$5,000,000 and sold only 61 in the last 12 months. That is over two years supply based on absorption, far too many for a diverse community.

- Currently, there are only 3 half duplex or townhomes available for sale under the highway (above are very expensive and not comparable) and west of Dunderave. In the last 12 months, 14 units have sold. That is under 3 months supply, clearly we lack this type of product.

- 2 weeks ago a home in lower Ambleside, listed at \$1.6m had **37 offers** on it....that is where the market is and housing is needed.

Please consider the current and future needs of the community with a broader scope and as a whole.

Sincerely,

s. 22(1)

s. 22(1)

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Tuesday, March 12, 2024 9:29 AM
To: correspondence
Subject: Aquila Project

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

As a long time West Vancouver resident I am very pleased to offer unconditional support for the Aquila Project. This thoughtful approach is badly needed to help address the housing challenges in our community.

Sincerely

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

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

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

From: s. 22(1)
Sent: Tuesday, March 5, 2024 10:52 AM
To: correspondence
Subject: Dog noise/centennial walkway

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

Hi: I'm complaining about some dog owners that bring their dogs on the centennial walkway (18th-25th) at all hours of the morning. I'm tired of hearing dog barks at 5:30-630a.m. and after 11:00pm at night. One needs to sleep and possibly some need to go to work in the morning. The district of West Vancouver needs to put some hour restrictions ie: not before 9:00 a.m. or after 9:00p.m. so people living on the waterfront do not have to constantly hear the noise. There are ignorant dog owners out there that just let their dogs bark whenever without putting a muzzle around the dogs mouth and are noisy and bring their dogs 24/7. This pathway is highly residential and many people live here down at the waterfront. There needs to be more restrictions for this to work or just cancel this altogether. s. 22(1)

s. 22(1) WV

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Friday, March 8, 2024 1:09 PM
To: correspondence; Nora Gambioli; Peter Lambur; Sharon Thompson; Mark Sager
Subject: Trucks on 17th

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

Hi Council: We are now into the fourth month. I can't tell you just how stressful the noise and intensity of the trucks has been. Today, Friday, has been particularly awful and it started, of course, at 7:15am. 6 days a week. I am not sure what the point of this letter is except to let off steam. Too bad some of you [REDACTED] s. 22(1). If you did, you might be inclined to help find ways to make this a bit easier on the community.

Regards,

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

West Vancouver

From: s. 22(1)
Sent: Friday, March 8, 2024 4:30 PM
To: Engineering Department; correspondence
Subject: Bike Lanes

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

s.22(1) I received yet another letter from your ENGINEERING DEPT Delivered to us on Mar 8th asking for yet more input from Residents regarding Bike lanes on the block of 25th to 26th & mentioned the notification delivered on the 1st week of Feb dated the end of January & we sent a lengthy well set out response to the ENGINEERING DEPT & Mayor Sager & a response from the Mayor back assured us there was no intention to put a bike lane on this block & it was well understood that PARKING was needed on both sides of the street as we suggested & we had probably already heard, that as evidently another notice had been delivered in the meantime requesting Ideas & input from residents. which we had just done. & had NOT HEARD but we were very relieved To hear from the Mayor at that time! Now we get another notice Dated Mar 8th from ENGINEERING & TRANSPORT asking for MORE input & to respond by Mar 11th for another Council meeting as if you are reopening the Question although I don't see the matter on the agenda & I understood from the June Council Meeting that Council had justifiably come to the conclusion that as Mayor Sager suggested in his response to us that it was understood that parking on this BLOCK was NEEDED! ESPECIALLY for RESIDENTS! Has something changed? If anything has changed it's that parking on this block will be even MORE needed for some of the workers on the upcoming DUNDARAVE upgrade that's in the works! The Bike Lanes are not needed in this block & are a bad idea as MOST of Council concluded way back in June's meeting! & even less practical now with what's in store with construction on it's way. This last minute notice to respond is a little unfair to us residents considering what's in store for our block for the near future. Our BLOCK of Residents is rightly concerned! even though we look tentatively forward to the improvements coming to our beloved Dundarave

I am including my original letter if I can or I will send it separately! Thanks for listening

s. 22(1)

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Monday, March 11, 2024 5:13 PM
To: Mark Sager; Christine Cassidy; Nora Gambioli; Peter Lambur; Scott Snider; Sharon Thompson; Linda Watt; correspondence
Subject: Marine Drive Bike Lane from 25th to 26th

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

Dear Mayor and Council - I was pleased to hear that you are considering an extension of the westbound bike lane from 25th to 26th on Marine Drive. You may recall I sent you a note regarding this issue when this was being considered in June of 2023 with the creation of the lanes from 26th to 31st. I have included those comments below in italics. I live [REDACTED] s. 22(1) Dundarave on the [REDACTED] s. 22(1), and I ride this stretch of Marine multiple times each week. The fact remains that the westbound section from 25th to 26th remains the most treacherous. Although I frequently commute into downtown Vancouver and ride on streets there, I often find myself riding Bellevue and Park Lane on my way home from work to avoid this little nasty stretch ascending from 25th up Marine with lots of cars "jockeying" for position with a merge and bus stop. Thank you for reconsidering this important safety issue for active transportation.

From June of 2023:

Dear Mayor and Council - I understand there has been more discussion about the proposed bike lane on Marine Drive west of Dundarave, particularly as it relates to parking on the north side of Marine Drive from 25th to 27th streets. As a frequent biker, walker and yes driver between Dundarave and my home on the [REDACTED] s. 22(1) [REDACTED] s. 22(1) I want to highlight how important it is to NOT allow parking on the north side in this section. As a cyclist, today the most uncomfortable section of the entire proposed bike lane is the westbound ascent from 25th to 26th. There is a bus stop just west of 25th, it's a hill, and the vehicles go from 2 lanes to 1 basically at the bus stop. When riding westbound from Dundarave, I am going super slow on my bike (as I am climbing the hill), cars are jockeying for position ahead of the parked cars, and there is often a bus there. Today, I just take Bellevue to avoid this section, and it's easier to stay on Bellevue westbound than climbing up and rejoining Marine. The start of the bike lane from Dundarave needs to be done correctly with no parking and flexible barriers as in the original proposal by staff.

Regards,

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

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

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

From: Claudia van der Vorm [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Friday, March 8, 2024 2:45 PM
To: Mark Sager; Sharon Thompson; Linda Watt; Nora Gambioli; Peter Lambur; Scott Snider; Christine Cassidy; correspondence
Subject: Endorsement of Urban Forest Management Program for Council Meeting Monday 11th March

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

Subject: Endorsement of Urban Forest Management Program

Dear Council and Mayor,

I am writing to you as chair of the Environment Committee to express my strong support for the Urban Forest Management Program (UFMP). I believe that the UFMP presents a critical opportunity to enhance the environmental sustainability and quality of life within our community for years to come.

The UFMP, as outlined in its recommendations, represents a comprehensive and forward-thinking approach to managing our urban forest resources and maintaining our canopy cover. We commend the efforts made thus far in developing this plan, and we firmly believe that its implementation will yield numerous benefits for our community, both now and in the future.

As stewards of our environment, the Environment Committee is committed to supporting initiatives that promote the conservation and enhancement of our natural assets. The UFMP aligns perfectly with our goals and objectives, and we are eager to see it move forward.

We fully endorse the direction outlined in the UFMP and urge the Council to take proactive steps to incorporate its recommendations into annual work plans. Furthermore, we ask for supportive funding as part of the annual budget process for the next fifteen years to ensure the successful implementation of the UFMP.

The Environment Committee is dedicated to supporting the implementation of the UFMP through our ongoing work. We are prepared to collaborate closely with Council, municipal staff, and other stakeholders to ensure that the UFMP achieves its full potential and delivers lasting benefits to our community.

In conclusion, we urge Council and the Mayor to prioritize the UFMP and provide the necessary resources to bring this important initiative to fruition. Together, we can create a healthier, more sustainable, and more vibrant community for generations to come.

Thank you for your attention to this matter, and we look forward to your support of the UFMP.

Sincerely,

Claudia van der Vorm
Chair Environment Committee

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

s.22(1)

Caring for our environment one step at a time
Saying no to the status quo
Say yes to stepping up

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Sunday, March 10, 2024 8:18 PM
To: Mark Sager; Christine Cassidy; Nora Gambioli; Peter Lambur; Scott Snider; Sharon Thompson; Linda Watt
Cc: correspondence; Jim Bailey; Heather Keith
Subject: Urban Forest Management Plan - introduce a bylaw that protects trees >20 cm in diameter during development / construction on private property

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

Dear Mayor and Council,

I'm writing to you about the Urban Forest Management Plan (UFM) Council Report that you'll consider during on March 11, 2024 Council meeting.

First and foremost, kudos to Heather Keith and all involved in moving the UFM forward. The work in 2023 in implementing some of the UFM recommendations is commendable: building a tree replacement list, school tree-planting resulting in 5 trees planted with associated education, public tree-planting to compensate for the loss of dead trees and resulting in a total of 108 trees planted, and building a public tree inventory.

In 2024, I urge you to prioritize the UFM recommendation to **introduce a bylaw that protects trees >20 cm in diameter during development / construction on private property**. Why? The UFM report states that the decrease in canopy cover between 2018 and 2021 by approximately 2% was primarily due to land-clearing for private property redevelopment. Therefore it makes good sense strategically that most of our resources and efforts are aimed at solving root causes. This will be necessary to achieve our "no net loss" target. I will also remind you that the UFM resident engagement process shows that the majority of residents support more regulation to protect trees.

During your March 11, 2024 Council meeting, please provide strategic direction that ensures action is aimed at addressing the biggest factor resulting in tree loss in our district – private property development.

Many thanks for the leadership you've shown to date in this area.

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

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Monday, March 11, 2024 8:51 PM
To: correspondence
Cc: Mark Sager; Christine Cassidy; Nora Gambioli; Scott Snider; Linda Watt; Peter Lambur; Sharon Thompson
Subject: Urban Forest Plan and Riparian Area Protection

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

Good Evening Mayor and Council,

Re: the discussion about the point of having public input on an already approved Urban Forest Management plan, as a member of the public that has taken enormous amounts of time to provide professional input based on the Riparian Area Protection Act, I agree with Councilor Cassidy and Watt that it would be tokenism to have a public input session on a plan that has already been approved. Survey type public input from a year or more ago, when apparently nothing changed in the Urban Forest Plan as a result of them, (I see no public input that caused a change in the Urban Forest Plan) does not count as public input in my view.

The notes from tonight that I provide here to be on record were:

My comments are specifically regarding and requesting the protection of riparian trees as they are “ecologically important assets and we need to “develop a strategy to protect and manage these features and the associated ecosystem services they provide.”

If we cut the environmentally protected riparian trees and shrubs and grasses, according to biologists and riparian experts, the price will not only be the loss of all of the usual benefits that trees provide, but the price for cutting riparian trees will undoubtedly be paid by future generations in a lack of fish supply and wildlife.

Page 2 of the Urban Forest Management plan quotes WV policy 2.6.5 which says it will “Balance tree retention, replacement, or compensation for their ecological value with consideration to access to sunlight and significant public views.” It does not delineate riparian trees with their special environmental protections from other trees.

Since the provincial Riparian Area Protection Act prohibits cutting healthy quote “trees, shrubs and grasses” end quote in riparian areas for the very reason of *preventing* direct sunlight into the riparian areas, is the above WV policy in direct conflict with the RAPR, or at least the views of the vast majority of West Vancouver residents to protect the environment?”

I believe it will also save West Vancouver time and money on riparian area issues to have the type of clear information like Coquitlam’s, provided in an earlier email, communicated within the District.

This seems like a perfect opportunity in the Urban Forest Management plan to once and for all give clear protection to the riparian areas.

s. 22(1)

s. 22(1)








West Vancouver

From the: Riparian Areas Protection in Coquitlam Summary Guide. City of Coquitlam

Can we do a version of this in West Vancouver?

“

My property falls within the Riparian Assessment Area. Does the RAPR apply to my development if...

I am building a new home, shed, garage, retaining wall or other permanent structure on my property?		Yes. The RAPR applies to new residential, commercial and industrial developments within the Riparian Assessment Area.
I am subdividing my land, applying for an Official Community Plan (OCP) amendment, applying for Rezoning (RZ), applying for a Development Variance Permit (DVP) or applying for a Temporary Use Permit (TUP)?		Yes. The RAPR applies to subdivisions of land, Official Community Plan amendments, Rezoning, Development Permits, Development Variance Permits and Temporary Use Permits within the Riparian Assessment Area.
I am demolishing existing permanent structures, such as a home, commercial or industrial building or shed on a foundation?		No. Future developments will be subject to the RAPR, however.
I am building a new home, shed, retaining wall or other permanent structure on an existing foundation?*		No. If no changes are made within the existing development footprint, the RAPR does not apply.
I am repairing an existing retaining wall or foundation?*		No. If no changes are made to the footprint of the existing retaining wall or foundation, the RAPR does not apply.
I am building or developing for farm activities on my agricultural property?		No. The RAPR does not apply to areas modified for agricultural use or normal farm practices under the Right to Farm Act.
My proposed works have been authorized by Fisheries & Oceans Canada (DFO) under the <i>Fisheries Act</i> ?		No. The RAPR does not apply to development authorized by DFO under the <i>Fisheries Act</i> .

It is the responsibility of the applicant to follow all other relevant federal and provincial regulations and City policies including, but not limited to, those related to stormwater management, flood risk management, steep or unstable slopes, and wildlife protection.

* Contact Environment Division about foundation repairs.

Riparian Areas Protection Regulation (RAPR) in Coquitlam

What activities are permitted in the SPEA?

Building on an existing foundation, or repairing an existing foundation?*		Yes, if no changes to the existing foundation or building footprint are made.
Removing hazardous trees?		Yes. Hazard trees that pose a safety risk, as identified by a Certified Arborist, may be removed from the SPEA. A Tree Cutting Permit may be required from the City for the removal of a hazard tree in the SPEA.
Removing trees or vegetation (including mowing) for aesthetic reasons?	 	No. Trees and vegetation cannot be disturbed or removed from the SPEA for aesthetic reasons. However, if an area within the SPEA has sustained historical human disturbance that preceded RAR or RAPR, such as a mowed lawn or garden, this area may continue to be maintained so long as there is no change in the footprint of the disturbed area. Contact the City of Coquitlam for more information.
Removing weeds or invasive vegetation?	 	General weeding is not permitted in the SPEA. However, invasive plant species may be removed (with City permission) if they are preventing native species from establishing. Examples of invasive species are Japanese knotweed and Himalayan blackberry. Please contact the City of Coquitlam for more information on invasive species: ParksCustomerService@coquitlam.ca
Planting trees, shrubs, flowers or other vegetation?	 	Planting vegetation in the SPEA is permitted only as part of a City-approved restoration program.
Building a new foundation for a home, shed, commercial/industrial building or other permanent structure?		No. New permanent structures, such as those requiring foundations, are not permitted in the SPEA.
Constructing an overhanging feature, such as a floating porch or roof extension?		No. Additional overhangs (cantilevering) are not permitted within the SPEA.
Building a garden shed, treehouse, footbridge or pathway?		No. New structures are not permitted within the SPEA. Following a detailed RAPR assessment, old structures may be required to be removed from the SPEA.
Hanging birdhouses, birdfeeders or bat boxes?		No. Wildlife houses or feeders must be maintained and, therefore, would require ongoing human disturbance within the SPEA. The intent of the SPEA is to preserve a naturalized riparian area.

*Contact Environment Division if foundation repairs are part of a new development or redevelopment.

523 Riparian Areas Protection Regulation in the City of Coquitlam.

Can we do a version of this detailed and clear version of the RAPR in West Vancouver?

“(1) Definitions in this Section In this Section 523 only:

ACTIVE FLOODPLAIN, in relation to a stream, means land that is:

- (a) adjacent to the stream;
- (b) inundated by the 1 in 5 year return period flow of the stream; and
- (c) capable of supporting plant species that are typical of inundated or saturated soil conditions and distinct from plant species on freely drained upland sites adjacent to the land.

ALLOWABLE FOOTPRINT, for a site subject to undue hardship, has the meaning given to it in Sub-sections (a) and (b) below:

- (a) if the area of human disturbance on the site is less than or equal to 70% of the area of the site, the allowable footprint is 30% of the area of the site; and Partial information only. Refer to City of Coquitlam Zoning Bylaw. 5-22
- (b) if the area of human disturbance on the site is greater than 70% of the area of the site, the allowable footprint is 40%.

AREA OF HUMAN DISTURBANCE means an area that is subject to enduring disturbance as a result of human occupation or activity and includes, without limitation:

- (a) footprints of buildings and other structures;
- (b) areas where soil or vegetation has been added, removed or altered; and
- (c) without limiting Sub-sections (a) and (b), the following areas:
 - (i) areas modified for agricultural use, including, without limitation, for crops pasture, range, hayfields and normal farm practices;
 - (ii) areas that are or have been used for resource extraction and have not been restored to their natural conditions; and (iii) areas occupied by invasive plant species to an extent that precludes the unassisted reestablishment of native plant species.

ASSESSMENT REPORT means a report prepared:

- (a) by or under the direction of a primary qualified environmental professional; and
- (b) in accordance with:
 - (i) Sections 15 to 19 of the Riparian Areas Protection Regulation; and
 - (ii) the technical manuals. DETAILED ASSESSMENT means an assessment of a proposed development for the purposes of the Riparian Areas Protection Regulation that is carried out:

(a) by one or more qualified environmental professionals; and

(b) in accordance with:

(i) a method that determines the streamside protection and enhancement area based on the location of natural features, functions and conditions that support the life processes of protected fish; and

(ii) the technical manuals.

DEVELOPABLE AREA in relation to a site, means the area of the site other than:

(a) the streamside protection and enhancement area; and

(b) the naturally and legally restricted areas of the site.

DEVELOPMENT includes the following:

(a) the addition, removal or alteration of soil, vegetation or a building or other structure;

(b) without limiting Sub-section (a), the addition, removal or alteration of works and services described in Sub-section 506(1) of the Local Government Act; and

(c) subdivision as defined in Section 455 of the Local Government Act. Partial information only. Refer to City of Coquitlam Zoning Bylaw. 5-23

FISH HABITAT means water frequented by fish and any other areas on which fish depend directly or indirectly to carry out their life processes, including spawning grounds and nursery, rearing, food supply and migration areas. FOOTPRINT in relation to a building or other structure, means the area covered by:

(a) the structure; or

(b) a projection from the structure, whether or not the projection is in contact with the ground.

LEGALLY RESTRICTED AREA, in relation to a site, means the area of the site that is unavailable for development because of restrictions imposed or rights granted under enactment, including, without limitation, easements, rights-of-way, setback requirements and restrictive covenants.

MEASURE, in the case of a detailed assessment, means recommended measures to be taken to avoid any potential hazards posed by the proposed development to natural features, functions and conditions in the streamside protection and enhancement area that support the life processes of protected fish.

MINISTER means the responsible minister for the Province of British Columbia for the Riparian Areas Protection Regulation.

NATURAL FEATURES, FUNCTIONS AND CONDITIONS include the following:

(a) large organic debris that falls in or around streams, including logs, snags and root wads;

(b) areas for channel migration, including active floodplains;

(c) side channels, intermittent streams, seasonally wetted contiguous areas and floodplains;

(d) the multi-canopied forest and ground cover adjacent to streams that:

- (i) moderate water temperatures;
- (ii) provide a source of food, nutrients and organic matter to streams;
- (iii) establish root matrices that stabilize soils and stream banks, thereby minimizing erosion; or
- (iv) buffer streams from sedimentation and pollution in surface runoff;
- (e) a natural source of stream bed substrates; and
- (f) permeable surfaces that permit infiltration to moderate water volume, timing and velocity and maintain sustained water flows in streams, especially during low flow periods.

NATURALLY RESTRICTED AREA, in relation to a site, means the area of the site that is unavailable for development because of natural features that preclude development.

NORMAL FARM PRACTICE has the same meaning as in Section 1 of the Farm Practices (Right to Farm) Act. Partial information only. Refer to City of Coquitlam Zoning Bylaw. 5-24

PRIMARY QUALIFIED ENVIRONMENTAL PROFESSIONAL means an individual that:

- (a) is a qualified environmental professional; and
- (b) has completed and achieved a passing grade on a course of study, approved by the Minister, relating to assessments and assessment reports.

PROTECTED FISH means all life stages of:

- (a) salmonids;
- (b) game fish; and
- (c) fish that are listed in Schedules 1, 2 or 3 of the Species at Risk Act (Canada).

QUALIFIED ENVIRONMENTAL PROFESSIONAL means an applied scientist or technologist, acting alone or together with another qualified environmental professional, if:

(a) the individual is one of the following professionals:

- (i) an agrologist;
- (ii) an applied technologist or technician;
- (iii) a professional biologist;
- (iv) a professional engineer;
- (v) a professional forester;
- (vi) a professional geoscientist;
- (vii) a registered biology technologist; or
- (viii) a registered forest technologist;

(b) the individual is registered and in good standing in British Columbia with an appropriate professional organization constituted under an Act for the individual's profession; and

(c) when carrying out that part of the assessment, the individual is acting:

(i) within the individual's area of expertise;

(ii) within the scope of professional practice for the individual's profession; and

(iii) under the code of ethics of the appropriate professional association and is subject to disciplinary action by that association.

RAVINE means a narrow, steep-sided valley that is commonly eroded by running water and has a slope grade greater than 3:1.

RIPARIAN AREAS PROTECTION REGULATION means B.C. Reg. 178/2019 as amended or superseded.

Partial information only. Refer to City of Coquitlam Zoning Bylaw. 5-25 RIPARIAN ASSESSMENT AREA

means that area around a stream that is determined in accordance with Sub-sections (a) and (b) below:

(a) subject to Sub-section (b), the riparian assessment area for a stream consists of a 30 metre strip on each side of the stream, measured from the stream boundary; and

(b) if a stream is in a ravine, the riparian assessment area for the stream consists of the following areas, as applicable:

(i) for a ravine less than 60 metres wide, a strip on each side of the stream measured from the stream boundary to a point that is 30 metres beyond the top of the ravine bank; and

(ii) for a ravine 60 metres wide or greater, a strip on each side of the stream measured from the stream boundary to a point that is 10 metres beyond the top of the ravine bank.

RIPARIAN DEVELOPMENT means a development that:

(a) is a residential, commercial or industrial development;

(b) is proposed to occur in a riparian assessment area of a stream that provides fish habitat to protected fish; and

(c) the City has the power to regulate, prohibit or impose requirements on under Part 14 of the Local Government Act.

RIPARIAN PROTECTION STANDARD has the meaning given to it in Sub-sections (a) to (d) below:

(a) subject to Sub-sections (b) to (d), a proposed development meets the riparian protection standard if the development:

(i) will not occur in the streamside protection and enhancement area; and

(ii) in the case of a detailed assessment, will not result in any harmful alteration, disruption or destruction of natural features, functions and conditions in the streamside protection and enhancement area that support the life processes of protected fish;

(b) subject to Sub-sections (c) and (d), a proposed development on a site that is subject to undue hardship meets the riparian protection standard if:

(i) the development:

i.i) will not occur in the streamside protection and enhancement area, other than in a part of that area that is already an area of human disturbance;

(i.ii) will be situated and otherwise designed so as to minimize any encroachment into the streamside protection and enhancement area; and Partial information only. Refer to City of Coquitlam Zoning Bylaw. 5-26

(i.iii) in the case of a detailed assessment, will not result in any harmful alteration, disruption or destruction of natural features, functions and conditions in the streamside protection and enhancement area that support the life processes of protected fish; and

(ii) the areas of human disturbance on the site after the development is complete will not exceed the allowable footprint for the site;

(c) Sub-sections (a) and (b)(i) do not require:

(i) a building or other structure that exists before the development occurs to be removed, if the structure will remain on its existing foundation and within its existing footprint; or

(ii) any other area of human disturbance that exists before the development occurs to be returned or allowed to return to a natural condition, if the area will not be extended and the type of the disturbance will not be changed; and

(d) a proposed development that involves a subdivision of a parcel or strata lot does not meet the riparian protection standard if the subdivision would create:

(i) a parcel that has a developable area that is less than the allowable footprint for that parcel; or

(ii) a strata lot that has a developable area that is less than the allowable footprint for that strata lot.

SIMPLE ASSESSMENT means an assessment of a proposed development for the purposes of the Riparian Areas Protection Regulation that is carried out: (a) by one or more qualified environmental professionals; and

(b) in accordance with:

(i) a method based on measurement from the stream boundary or, if the stream is in a ravine, from the top of the ravine bank; and

(ii) the technical manuals.

SITE, in relation to a proposed development, means:

(a) the parcel on which the development is proposed to occur; or

(b) if the development is proposed to occur on a strata lot, the strata lot. STRATA LOT has the same meaning as in Section 1(1) of the Strata Property Act.

STREAM means: (a) a watercourse or body of water, whether it usually contains water or not; and
(b) any of the following that is connected by surface flow to a watercourse or body of water referred to in Sub-section (a):

(i) a ditch, whether or not usually containing water;

(ii) a spring, whether or not usually containing water; or

(iii) a wetland. Partial information only. Refer to City of Coquitlam Zoning Bylaw. 5-27

STREAM BOUNDARY, in relation to a stream, means whichever of the following is farther from the centre of the stream:

(a) the visible high water mark of a stream where the presence and action of the water are so common and usual, and so long continued in all ordinary years, as to mark on the soil of the bed of the stream a character distinct from that of its banks, in vegetation, as well as in the nature of the soil itself; or

(b) the boundary of the active floodplain, if any, of the stream. STREAMSIDE PROTECTION AND ENHANCEMENT AREA means for a stream, the portion of the riparian assessment area for the stream that: (a) includes the land, adjacent to the stream boundary, that:

(i) links aquatic to terrestrial ecosystems; and

(ii) is capable of supporting streamside vegetation; and

(b) in the case of a simple assessment, extends far enough upland from the stream that development outside the streamside protection and enhancement area will not result in any harmful alteration, disruption or destruction of natural features, functions and conditions in the area referred to in Sub-section

(a) that support the life processes of protected fish, and without limiting Sub-section (a)(ii), an area of human disturbance must be considered to be capable of supporting streamside vegetation if the area would be capable of supporting streamside vegetation were the area in a natural condition.

STREAMSIDE VEGETATION, in relation to a stream, means:

(a) riparian vegetation; and

(b) upland vegetation that exerts an influence on the stream. SUBDIVISION has the same meaning as in Section 455 of the Local Government Act.

TECHNICAL MANUAL means a manual published under Sub-section 13.1(1) of the Riparian Areas Protection Act.

TOP OF THE RAVINE BANK means the first significant break in a ravine slope where:

(a) the break occurs such that the grade beyond the break is flatter than 3:1 for a minimum distance of 15 metres measured perpendicularly from the break; and

(b) the break does not include a bench within the ravine that could be developed.

UNDUE HARDSHIP, for the purposes of this Section 523, applies to a site if:

- (a) the site was created by subdivision in accordance with the laws in force in British Columbia at the time the site was created;
- (b) the developer has sought and received a decision on every variance that would reduce the legally restricted area of the site; and
- (c) the developable area of the site is less than the allowable footprint for the site. Partial information only. Refer to City of Coquitlam Zoning Bylaw. 5-28

VARIANCE means any of the following:

- (a) a variance that a board of variance may order to be permitted under Section 542 of the Local Government Act;
- (b) a variance that a local government may permit under Section 498 of the Local Government Act; and
- (c) an amendment to a zoning bylaw.

WETLAND means land that is inundated or saturated by surface water or groundwater at a frequency and duration sufficient to support, and that under normal conditions does support, plant species that are typical of inundated or saturated soil conditions, including swamps, marshes, bogs, fens, estuaries and similar areas that are not part of the active floodplain of a stream.

(2) Applicability Subject to Sub-section 523(3), this Section 523 applies to the exercise of local government powers by the City under Part 14 of the Local Government Act.

(3) Exceptions This Section 523 does not apply in relation to a development that consists only of:

- (a) repairs or other non-structural alterations or additions to a building or other structure, if the structure:
 - (i) will remain on its existing foundation and within its existing footprint; and
 - (ii) is not damaged or destroyed to the extent described in Section 532(1) of the Local Government Act; or
- (b) the maintenance of an area of human disturbance, other than a building or other structure, if the area is not extended and the type of disturbance is not changed.

(4) Development Proposals in Riparian Assessment Areas Subject to Sub-section 523(3), in respect of development proposals related wholly or partially to riparian assessment areas within the City, the City must not approve or allow a riparian development to proceed unless the development proceeds in accordance with Sub-sections 523(5), 523(6), or 523(7) and otherwise complies with all other applicable requirements.

(5) Requirements for Riparian Development Approval based on the Simple Assessment Methodology The City may approve or allow a riparian development near a stream to proceed if:

- (a) the City has developed a map by which the streamside protection and enhancement area width for the stream is delineated based on the Simple Assessment methodology; and

(b) the development is entirely located outside the predetermined streamside protection and enhancement area for the stream. Partial information only. Refer to City of Coquitlam Zoning Bylaw. 5-29

(6) Requirements for Riparian Development Approval based on the Detailed Assessment Methodology Subject to Sub-section 523(5), the City must not approve a riparian development unless the City:

(a) has received an assessment report from the Minister in relation to the development that has not expired pursuant to Section 7 of the Riparian Areas Protection Regulation; and

(b) imposes as a condition of the approval that the development proceed as proposed in the assessment report and comply with any measures recommended in the assessment report.

(7) Fisheries Act Authorization Notwithstanding Sub-sections 523(5) and 523(6), the City may allow a riparian development to proceed if the City has received from the owner a copy of an authorization issued under Sub-sections 35(2)(b) or 35(2)(c) of the Fisheries Act (Canada) for the development.

(8) Amendments In the event that the Riparian Areas Protection Regulation should change, such changes are deemed to be incorporated by reference into the applicable provisions of this Section 523.

(9) Species at Risk Act The City may, before allowing a riparian development to proceed, require a qualified environmental professional to ensure that the streamside protection and enhancement area specified in an assessment report satisfies the requirement for critical habitat protection of wildlife species under the Species at Risk Act (Canada) including any order thereunder.”

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Sunday, March 10, 2024 9:52 AM
To: [REDACTED] s. 22(1) Christine Cassidy; Linda Watt; Nora Gambioli; Peter Lambur; Scott Snider; Sharon Thompson; Mark Sager; correspondence
Subject: 50 million donation and Increase FAR = +

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

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

10 Mar 2024

Dear Mayor Sager and Councillors
District of West Vancouver

50 million donation and Increase FAR

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

This Council seems to be out of control. Why are you giving 50 million to businesses in West Vancouver. Why are you increasing the FAR to 3.0 for developers (Toronto based firm who now own Pink Palace). Who gains from all these "give aways" It certainly isn't the residents. Who is driving this?

Thank you.

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Sunday, March 10, 2024 10:14 AM
To: [REDACTED] s. 22(1); Christine Cassidy; Linda Watt; Nora Gambioli; Peter Lambur; Scott Snider; Sharon Thompson; Mark Sager; correspondence
Subject: Development at 1550 Esquimalt (Wall rental property) and others = +

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

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

West Vancouver [REDACTED] s. 22(1)

10 Mar 2024

Dear Mayor Sager and Councillors
District of West Vancouver

Development at 1550 Esquimalt (Wall rental property) and others

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

I am not in favour of Council "gifting" opportunistic developers/property owners a higher FAR and the problematic results that will ensue. I thought the key word of our provincial and municipal governments' mandate was AFFORDABILITY. This inane plan will in fact increase rents in the end for our citizens, a great percentage of whom are SENIORS. These resultant unaffordable rents will not draw people to our community but drive them away.

I hope West Van Mayor and Council will vote a resounding NO to the issue and go back to find a resolution that adopts COMMON SENSE! We, your citizens, are keenly watching the outcome of this vote on March 11th.

Thank you.

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

Thank you.

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

From: Dawson Campbell [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Sunday, March 10, 2024 10:22 AM
To: dawsoncampbell44@gmail.com; Christine Cassidy; Linda Watt; Nora Gambioli; Peter Lambur; Scott Snider; Sharon Thompson; Mark Sager; correspondence
Subject: \$50 Million gift! =+

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

Dawson Campbell
111 18th St #8
West Vancouver
V7V3V3

10 Mar 2024

Dear Mayor Sager and Councillors
District of West Vancouver

\$50 Million gift!

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

This does not sound like a wise way to spend my taxes!

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

Thank you.

Dawson Campbell
dawsoncampbell44@gmail.com

From: Lea Chmelauskas [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Sunday, March 10, 2024 11:00 AM
To: leamay@elus.net; Christine Cassidy; Linda Watt; Nora Gambioli; Peter Lambur; Scott Snider; Sharon Thompson; Mark Sager; correspondence
Subject: redevelopment of rental properties = +

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

Lea Chmelauskas
1290 Ottawa Avenue
West Vancouver
V7T 2H5

10 Mar 2024

Dear Mayor Sager and Councillors
District of West Vancouver

redevelopment of rental properties

My name is Lea Chmelauskas and I am a resident of West Vancouver.

I do not approve of gifts to pay owners for the redevelopment of rental properties. If the vote is tomorrow, this notice to residents seems to be too late to be considered. Why isn't this notice sent out earlier???

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

Thank you.

Lea Chmelauskas
leamay@elus.net

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Sunday, March 10, 2024 11:01 AM
To: [REDACTED] s. 22(1); Christine Cassidy; Linda Watt; Nora Gambioli; Peter Lambur; Scott Snider; Sharon Thompson; Mark Sager; correspondence
Subject: rezoning of apartments in Ambleside = +

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

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

10 Mar 2024

Dear Mayor Sager and Councillors
District of West Vancouver

rezoning of apartments in Ambleside

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

How could you possibly think of rezoning the apartments that are rented to elderly seniors which would result in an upheaval to their life?

Thank you.

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Sunday, March 10, 2024 11:04 AM
To: [REDACTED] s. 22(1); Christine Cassidy; Linda Watt; Nora Gambioli; Peter Lambur; Scott Snider; Sharon Thompson; Mark Sager; correspondence
Subject: development pink palace =+

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

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

west vancouver bc [REDACTED] s. 22(1)

10 Mar 2024

Dear Mayor Sager and Councillors
District of West Vancouver

development pink palace

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

Against the infill development on the Pink Palace property.

Thank you.

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

From: Gillian Shipman [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Sunday, March 10, 2024 12:14 PM
To: gillianshipman@outlook.com; Christine Cassidy; Linda Watt; Nora Gambioli; Peter Lambur; Scott Snider; Sharon Thompson; Mark Sager; correspondence
Subject: Concern about Ambleside planning =+

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

Gillian Shipman
1013 Sinclair Street
West Vancouver
V7V 3W1

10 Mar 2024

Dear Mayor Sager and Councillors
District of West Vancouver

Concern about Ambleside planning

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

I am a 50+ resident of the North Shore, in West Vancouver since 1976. I have become increasingly concerned with the lack of proper forward-planning with respect to all aspects of living on the North Shore - roads, housing, and facilities of all kinds. The people making the decisions do not seem to have a clear understanding of the way people live. It is not sufficient to say that because you live right on a bus route to your place of work, you will not have a car. Any family with children involved in sports activity of any kind, knows how impractical it is to transport adults, children and all required equipment on public transport. I agree completely that West Vancouver needs more senior-friendly housing, and that affordable housing should be made available for those who work in the Municipality. But I do not believe the current proposals will have a positive impact on either of those groups. Why always try to re-invent the wheel? Solutions to most issues have already been considered and successfully implemented in other Municipalities in BC and across Canada. Tax payers here don't need another debacle like the half-empty towers at the bottom of Taylor Way.

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

Thank you.

Gillian Shipman
gillianshipman@outlook.com

From: Richenda <richenda@shaw.ca>
Sent: Sunday, March 10, 2024 3:09 PM
To: correspondence
Cc: Mark Sager; Christine Cassidy; Nora Gambioli; Peter Lambur; Scott Snider; Sharon Thompson; Linda Watt
Subject: Planning Depts' report to Council regarding recommendations for the zoning amendment and including details regarding the Tenant Protection policy

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

Please **do not redact anything in the body of my email.**
Please leave my name and email address intact and only redact my address and phone number - thank you

=====
Dear Mayor and Council:

Re: Planning Departments' report to Council regarding recommendations for the zoning amendment including details regarding the Tenant Protection policy

First I wish to thank the Mayor and Council members for the support you have shown to tenants in the existing purpose built rental buildings - it's greatly appreciated.

Going forward however I do have some concerns/comments. I am a single disabled senior living on a fixed income in a studio suite in one of the 30 listed buildings.

In the report, there is no mention of the new units being rented for the same amounts as the old units - was this not something that was discussed at the Town Hall meeting, together with moving costs, first refusal on new units etc ?

As I am disabled, in my current building I have a parking spot (cost \$60 per month) which I must have as I cannot walk very far. Street parking is out of the question.

If my building is redeveloped will there be any protection that I can be guaranteed a similar on-site parking stall? will I be able to get a stall at any temporary rental building?

will the temporary rental buildings be on the North Shore? I have several health issues and have doctors and specialists on the North Shore.

The report mentions using CMHC data to determine the rent that tenants pay upon returning to a newly developed building. As a long time tenant, my rent is quite low compared to todays' rents.

However, it now appears that being a "long-time" tenant will have it's distinct disadvantages when it comes to using the CMHC data to determine the rents.

This may sound like a stupid question but as the saying goes " If you ask a stupid question, you may feel stupid; if you don't ask a stupid question, you remain stupid."

In the report there is constant and consistent referral to "number of bedrooms" I'm concerned that this might prove to be a legal loop hole for some Landlords/Owners.

I live in a studio suite (no bedroom) There are 24 studios suite in my building. Why does this document only refer to "existing number of rental bedrooms" when there are many buildings such as mine that have a number of studio suites? I think that this item definitely needs addressing.

Due to my disability I am unable to attend the Council Meetings in person however as the decisions you make can greatly affect my life, I will be watching on video.

Thank you

Richenda Heaton\

s. 22(1)

West Vancouver, BC

s.22(1)

richenda@shaw.ca

s. 22(1)

1.

From: Henning Freybe [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Sunday, March 10, 2024 5:28 PM
To: freybehennig@gmail.com; Christine Cassidy; Linda Watt; Nora Gambioli; Peter Lambur; Scott Snider; Sharon Thompson; Mark Sager; correspondence
Subject: Rezoning Rental Highrises = +

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

Henning Freybe
4225 Rockridge Road,
West Van
V7W 1A3

10 Mar 2024

Dear Mayor Sager and Councillors
District of West Vancouver

Rezoning Rental Highrises

My name is Henning Freybe and I am a resident of West Vancouver.

Please do not rezone areas with existing rental highrises.
Let them be as is, and allow current renters to enjoy the
rents they are used to. Instead rezone single dwelling areas to enable more rental high rises to be built; and
yet
limit the height so that they don't disturb the view too much for folks living further up the mountain.

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

Thank you.

Henning Freybe
freybehennig@gmail.com

From: Ian Baggott [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Sunday, March 10, 2024 5:32 PM
To: ian@baggott.ca; Christine Cassidy; Linda Watt; Nora Gambioli; Peter Lambur; Scott Snider; Sharon Thompson; Mark Sager; correspondence
Subject: Zoning bylaw change =+

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

Ian Baggott
2226 Haywood Av.
West Vancouver
V7V 1X5

10 Mar 2024

Dear Mayor Sager and Councillors
District of West Vancouver

Zoning bylaw change

My name is Ian Baggott and I am a resident of West Vancouver.

I am very much opposed to Council's currently proposed changes to Zoning Bylaws affecting rental properties in West Vancouver. Staff have addressed Financial Implications in Item 4. of the Council Report March 5, 2024:

"The proposed amendments MAY lead over time to:

- an incrementally increased residential tax base
- off-site improvements from private development
- the receipt of Development Cost Charges for District roads, utilities and parks.

The financial "benefits" could take years to be realized and be less than actual costs. CACs are immediate and calculable.

I would recommend Council approach each application on an individual basis.

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

Thank you.

Ian Baggott
ian@baggott.ca

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Sunday, March 10, 2024 6:56 PM
To: correspondence
Cc: Mark Sager; Christine Cassidy; Nora Gambioli; Peter Lambur; Scott Snider; Sharon Thompson; Linda Watt; Ambleside Local Area Plan
Subject: Letter from Argyle Point Strata regarding the Ambleside LAP and Zoning Bylaw Amendment
Attachments: Letter re Proposed Building.docx

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

We would appreciate a response to our concerns outlined in this letter.

Thank you,

Gene Macdonald
101 22nd Street, West Vancouver, BC V7V 4B8
Strata President

TO: Mayor and Council

FROM: Argyle Point Strata VR 2384

RE: Ambleside Local Area Plan (LAP) and Zoning Bylaw No. 4662, 2010, Amendment Bylaw No. 5325, 2024

INTRODUCTION

It is with great concern that we, at Argyle Point, write to you regarding the LAP and the Bylaw Amendment noted above. We are particularly concerned with the proposed rezoning of 30 existing rental sites to a new Multiple Dwelling Zone 6 (RM6) which provides the option of a maximum 3.0 FAR from 1.75. Our low-rise building is adjacent to the historic Pink Palace, one of the properties proposed to be designated in Zone 6. We received this information from a neighbour, along with the Ambleside LAP Apartment Area Visualization Appendix C, pages C.6 and C.7. Allowing that these Visualizations are illustrative only, it is surprising to us that we had no forewarning from Council that such changes were in the works.

COMMUNICATION WITH DISTRICT

We have received no notice from the District of the proposed changes. It has been our understanding that this Council would be transparent and involve the community in any major changes. This is not the case when it comes to the Ambleside LAP and proposed Zoning Bylaw Amendment.

As far back as June 14, 2021, Council “deferred setting a public hearing for the Foreshore Development Permit Area bylaw changes.” Instead of holding a public hearing, staff were directed to engage in and complete more public consultation by reaching out to all homeowners in the proposed development permit area via a mail-out that included a link to the Foreshore DPA Council report and appendices, as well as staff contact information. We received no mail-out, no link, no staff contact information. We wonder who received these mail-outs, as we did not.

After this ‘outreach’, there were to be two or three workshops/round table discussions. Who was invited to attend these and when were they held? We, at Argyle Point, heard nothing about them.

By July 2023, there had been “significant community engagement”, according to District planners, and the option to provide maximum 3.0 FAR using density bonus zoning was proposed shortly afterwards. We were never notified about community engagement. When Mark Sager was running for mayor, he stated: “ I find there is currently too much dissension in our community. I don’t know if this is a result of social media or poor communication, but I see the job as mayor, first and foremost, as getting the community to

work cooperatively and respectfully together. We will never see constructive change without that kind of genuine appreciation for other people's views. (May 13, 2022, <https://horshoebayartwalk.com>).

We would suggest that there is still an issue with communication, as Argyle Point did not receive any information from the District regarding the Ambleside LAP and the Zoning Bylaw Amendment regarding infill development. Surely, the apartment buildings along the Foreshore, and especially those adjacent to the proposed RM6 sites should have been informed in a timely manner, instead of hearing about it just before Council's first reading of the proposal. There should have been out-reach, discussions and input from affected property owners, particularly those living next to properties being up-zoned.

EFFECTS ON ARGYLE POINT OF PROPOSED ZONING BYLAW AMENDMENT and 10- STOREY TOWER BUILT ON PINK PALACE PROPERTY

We understand that this is meant to increase the pool of rental units in West Vancouver, but what could the rationale possibly be to construct another 10-storey tower along the Foreshore, and right next to a low-rise 4-storey building, thereby obstructing the views of the Argyle Point building as well as the long- established view corridors that many residents enjoy.

The current buildings along the Foreshore have areas of green space between them to allow view corridors from Bellevue Ave and north of Bellevue Ave, and to afford unobstructed south, east and west views for Foreshore condominiums. The Zoning Bylaw Amendment will alter the unique character of the Foreshore and could have a detrimental effect on view corridors. What is needed along this already highly developed part of Ambleside is more green space, not less. Some city planners believe that it is the space between buildings that creates connection, innovation and vibrancy in a community, not more buildings in the 'infill' areas.

Why is the District contemplating a Zoning Bylaw Amendment and altering the character of the Foreshore buildings with no input or consultation from those most impacted? The proposed 10-storey tower will not fit with the spacing of the other Foreshore structures because of its reduced distance from Argyle Point, the FAR increases for the Pink Palace property, and the subsequent loss of green space.

Such a change will have an impact on a large number of residents in the neighbourhood but especially on Argyle Point. Residents in that building will lose privacy, sunlight, and views. They will experience reduced enjoyment of their homes and devaluations of their property. Many other WV residents will lose their view corridors and corresponding enjoyment of their properties. With increased density and construction, Argyle Point and the surrounding neighbourhood will be impacted by a major increase in parking issues on Argyle Ave. Years of ongoing construction, noise, dust, debris and traffic congestion will accompany construction. And, ironically, West Vancouver taxes will surely go up to pay for increased infrastructure, even as the value of those homes most impacted declines.

If affordable rental housing is the District's goal, the proposed tower next to Argyle Point will do little or nothing to alleviate the shortage of affordable rental stock in West Vancouver. **Presently, a two -bedroom suite in the Pink Palace costs \$4500 per month. A new tower will demand even higher rents.** If the proposed new structure on the Pink Palace grounds is for the purpose of increasing the rental stock of affordable units, Council may be mistaken. Developers will look to maximize their returns, and while there might be more rental units available, building this tower certainly won't create affordability.

Why is the District gifting millions of dollars of density to the owners of West Vancouver rental properties? When Grosvenor Ambleside was built, developers had to pay the District many millions for increased density. Yet, council is giving increased density away for nothing while there are thousands of acres available north of the highway.

It appears that, to preserve and increase rental property, Council's solution is to agree to developers wishes by allowing them increased FAR for higher density buildings and increased property values, while negatively impacting other residents' property values.

ENVIRONMENT

Council's *Strategic Plan* for 2024-2025 includes a goal to "protect our natural environment, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and adapt our community to become more resilient in a changing climate." (p.1)

Erecting a 10-storey tower along the Foreshore will not help to achieve this goal, no matter what 'energy performance standards' are met. There will still be additional CO2 emissions during and after construction of a new cement building. The shoreline itself could be impacted.

How does the Ambleside LAP and Zoning Bylaw Amendment enhance Livability, Affordability, our Environmental Footprint and Climate Change? The legacy and success of a Mayor and Council can only be measured by the improved quality of life they strive to provide for all of their residents.

The Ambleside LAP and Zoning Bylaw Amendment would do a serious disservice to residents of Argyle Point, and it is our hope that you will defer it or reconsider it, especially as it pertains to the proposed 10-storey tower on the Pink Palace property.

Yours truly,
Argyle Point Strata

Gene Macdonald	Owner	Murray Good	Owner	Yan Wood	Owner
Hans Fruehauf	Owner	Tony Grieve	Owner		
Andy McLaren	Owner	Eloise King	Owner		
Anne Stevens	Owner	Debbie Salzman	Owner		
Sharon White	Owner	Rico Sito	Owner		

From: Ambleside Tenants Association <amblesidetenantsassociation@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, March 10, 2024 6:13 PM
To: Mark Sager; Christine Cassidy; Nora Gambioli; Peter Lambur; Scott Snider; Sharon Thompson; Linda Watt; correspondence
Cc: Rick Wagner
Subject: Fwd: Additional comment on Rental Zoning Bylaw and Tenant Protections - Report from Planning

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

Dear Mayor and Councillors,

FYI - The message is being re-sent without the unintended content at the bottom of the message:
Please delete previous email.

Further to my correspondence of Friday, March 8th, I wanted to bring your attention to what the Ambleside Tenants Association feels is an important oversight in the Report that you will be considering on Monday, March 11th. The proposed zoning bylaw article of concern is 306.05 (2), as it is only applicable to an FAR over 2.0.

Although a 1.75 - 2.0 FAR redevelopment would need to be rental only, there is unfortunately no requirement for an owner to provide any of the protections/conditions that come into effect as soon as the redevelopment is more than 2.0 FAR.

There may be an assumption that an owner would be highly unlikely to rebuild a new rental only building at 2.0 or less FAR. However, if there is no limit on the rents that can be charged to new tenants, and a complete absence of obligations to existing tenants (not even a provision of first right of refusal to return), it may in fact provide a very strong incentive for an owner to rebuild at the 2.0 or less FAR.

As the bylaw revision is currently written in the Report to Council, if a redevelopment under 2.0 FAR was to occur, even though the original amount of rental stock is maintained, existing tenants would have no right of first refusal to return to their new home; no cap on the rent to be paid on the new build; and nothing to mitigate the costs of being demovicted.

To retain the affordable housing that exists in the purpose built rental buildings/zone, and to provide security for current tenants who live in those buildings, it is critical that the provisions of 306.05 (2) be applicable to any FAR level of redevelopment.

That equitable treatment on FAR would create fairness for tenants, and meet the District's goal of protecting both rental stock and renters.

We would respectfully request that you direct Planning to close this potential "loophole" in the bylaw, and that First Reading approval be withheld by Council pending further consultation and revisions to the Bylaw proposal.

In closing, I would again like to make the point that although some general community consultation on the OCP and LAP occurred last summer, there has not been a thorough and targeted community consultation with Ambleside tenants (who are key stakeholders) residing in the 30 purpose built apartments. Also, comprehensive consultation has not fully occurred in relation to the recently proposed Tenant Relocation and Protection policy and the Rental Zoning bylaw.

Although the process would be delayed by having more consultation, the benefits of further dialogue and collaboration would be beneficial for all.

Thanks again for your consideration and support.

Rick Wagner (on behalf of the Ambleside Tenants Association)
s. 22(1)

Tenants are a vital segment of our Ambleside Community.

From: J. Salter [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Monday, March 11, 2024 1:14 AM
To: Dianasalter@shaw.ca; Christine Cassidy; Linda Watt; Nora Gambioli; Peter Lambur; Scott Snider; Sharon Thompson; Mark Sager; correspondence
Subject: 50 million Ambleside = +

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

J. Salter
2338 Nelson Ave.,
West Vancouver B.C.
V7V 2R2

11 Mar 2024

Dear Mayor Sager and Councillors
District of West Vancouver

50 million Ambleside

My name is J. Salter and I am a resident of West Vancouver.

I do not agree to the 50 million dollars being used for housing in Ambleside as it is being proposed.

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

Thank you.

J. Salter
Dianasalter@shaw.ca

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Monday, March 11, 2024 9:34 AM
To: correspondence
Subject: LAP - Apartment Zone

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

Dear Mayor and Council,

I appreciated receiving the LAP update as I was unable to attend the Town Hall meeting on the Apartment Zone. I do have some comments and questions.

DENSITY

In the Town Hall discussion summary # 12, Mayor Sager made the comment “ this is what we describe as gentle density. “

If I am understanding the proposed Zoning Bylaw Amendment correctly, the bonus density for RM6 of a 3.0 FAR does not appear to be gentle density when 306.15 of the Bylaw allows the number of storeys to be a maximum of 20. Does this mean, for example, that as long as a developer/owner follows the Tenant Support Policy, he can demolish a 6 storey rental building and potentially replace it with a 20 storey building (lot size taken into account) as long as there is the same number of rental suites as before, and then add more rental , or Strata ?

I also have a question about 306.05 (1) 2.0 maximum floor area ratio restricted to residential rental tenure. Does this mean that any re-development of a rental building with a FAR of 2.0 would not have to abide to the proposed Tenant Support Policy?

If this is correct, does that then mean that only the rental tenure of the BUILDING is protected, and NOT the TENANTS? If so, I hope Council will reconsider this and that the Tenant Support Policy will be in effect for ALL of the 30 rental buildings in the District.

I would really appreciate a clarification on what 306.15 , and 306.05 of the Zoning Amendment Bylaw means.

TENANT SUPPORT POLICY

I applaud Council for taking this bold step on rental tenure and protection by making support for tenants a Policy should their building be re-developed. But could you, or should you, do more?

The Tenant Resource Advisory Center (TRAC) has listed on their website 14 municipalities that have Tenant Relocation and Protection Plans. Many offer more financial support than West Vancouver proposes , even basing this financial support on length of tenancy. While West Vancouver’s proposed Right of First Refusal allows a tenant to return at current CMHC rates, the policy of many municipalities have rents discounted at 10%, 20% below starting market rents, or even at what was their current rent before re-development (plus applicable RTA rent increases during the time displaced,) or a 20% discount whichever is less.

In the Town Hall discussion summary #11, Mayor Sager stated “ but we can protect the people who live there. The new rental building policy could include tenant protection like rental rate protection.” The ‘ policy could ‘ but it doesn’t. I hope Council will consider that it should, or will, have a rental rate protection in the proposed policy.

Did District staff investigate other municipalities Tenant Protection Plans in the short time frame from being given direction from staff at the Council meeting February 26, and receiving community comments at the Town Hall on February 29, to the Zoning Amendment Bylaw document dated March 5? If so, why is West Vancouver's proposed policy not on par with many other municipalities? It would certainly show Council's concern for the many renters, many senior renters, in this community .

Thank you for your time and consideration. I do hope to receive a reply.

Respectfully submitted,

s. 22(1)

West Vancouver, B.C. s. 22(1)

s. 22(1)

Sent from my iPhone

From: Stephanie La Porta [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Monday, March 11, 2024 9:56 AM
To: stephanie@eagleisland.ca; Christine Cassidy; Linda Watt; Nora Gambioli; Peter Lambur; Scott Snider; Sharon Thompson; Mark Sager; correspondence
Subject: Rental Housing Strategy Proposal =+

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

Stephanie La Porta
5826 Eagle Island
West Vancouver, BC
V7W1V5

11 Mar 2024

Dear Mayor Sager and Councillors
District of West Vancouver

Rental Housing Strategy Proposal

My name is Stephanie La Porta and I am a resident of West Vancouver.

Please vote NO on March 11, 2024 to the very flawed rental housing strategy proposal. This United Nations agenda (BLOCKEDunhabitat[.]org/un-habitat-hosts-global-meeting-on-planning-compact-citiesBLOCKED) further increasing densification of our community has many unintended consequences to the renters it purports to aid and all with the help of West Vancouver taxpayers money. This is a lose-lose for all but the Developers. With our money, renters can be incentivized to leave while densification is completed, given "first right of refuse" then discover doubled rents on smaller footprints later. Meanwhile the community of West Vancouver is changed forever. Council voted to increase the already outrageous West Vancouver property taxes, I must ask, is council working for West Vancouver residents or the United Nations? Please show your commitment to the folks who voted you in and vote NO on March 11, 2024 to the absurd Rental Housing strategy proposal.

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

Thank you.

Stephanie La Porta
stephanie@eagleisland.ca

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Monday, March 11, 2024 10:24 AM
To: [REDACTED] s. 22(1); Christine Cassidy; Linda Watt; Nora Gambioli; Peter Lambur; Scott Snider; Sharon Thompson; Mark Sager; correspondence
Subject: Where are the CAC\$ =+

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

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

West Vancouver, BC

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

11 Mar 2024

Dear Mayor Sager and Councillors
District of West Vancouver

Where are the CAC\$

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

I am requesting that WV Council clarify for me whether or not Community Amenity Contribution \$ will be included in the future proposed rezoning of the Ambleside apartments. If CAC\$ are included, please provide an estimate of the DWV CAC\$ payable to DWV, and if not, please explain why not.

We need CAC\$ to pay for the renewal of existing infrastructure and the infrastructure for new development. Our roadways continue to be over-run with more and more vehicles with inadequate attention being paid to addressing our transportation and municipal works challenges while we blindly embrace more density.

Additionally I am concerned with the potential for a WALL of 10 to 20 story apartment buildings being built side by side along the Ambleside Marine Drive/Bellevue corridor as the part of any Ambleside LAP. I do not support any additional 10 to 20 story (or higher) apartment buildings along our waterfront. I do support in-filling available areas with 4 to 5 story buildings.

Thank you.

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

From: Traci O'Sullivan [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Monday, March 11, 2024 12:01 PM
To: traci.psy@gmail.com; Christine Cassidy; Linda Watt; Nora Gambioli; Peter Lambur; Scott Snider; Sharon Thompson; Mark Sager; correspondence
Subject: rental housing strategy =+

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

Traci O'Sullivan
8593 Bedora Place
West Vancouver, BC
V7W 2W4

11 Mar 2024

Dear Mayor Sager and Councillors
District of West Vancouver

rental housing strategy

My name is Traci O'Sullivan and I am a resident of West Vancouver.

I am writing in regard to rental housing strategy. I am requesting you vote no on this strategy due to the unintended consequences and potential problems of this densification plan upon the local people of west Vancouver. We need your support as our elected officials.

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

Thank you.

Traci O'Sullivan
traci.psy@gmail.com

From: David Marley <domarley52@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, March 11, 2024 12:24 PM
To: correspondence; Sager Mark; Christine Cassidy; Nora Gambioli; Peter Lambur; Scott Snider; Sharon Thompson; Linda Watt
Subject: Act in haste, repent at leisure....

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

I write with regard to a proposal before Council this evening concerning the “protection of tenants” in the Ambleside area. You ought not to vote in favour of this proposal at this time as there has not been the opportunity for a proper amount of consideration to be given to it by interested members of the public.

What is being proposed strikes me as being of huge consequence, not only in terms of potentially providing the building owners concerned with a very large financial ‘gift’ from DWV taxpayers but, more importantly, in terms of the likely disruptive impact on the lives of many Ambleside area tenants.

Where are these tenants to re-locate, and for how long, while their apartment building is being renovated or replaced? What is the likelihood that they will be able to afford the new rents upon the building’s availability for re-occupancy? I suspect many of the tenants to be displaced are elderly, and most likely have lived here for a very long time. No doubt many are paying relatively modest rent by today’s standards. No wonder building owners would like to see these people replaced. They ought to be patient as God will take care of this soon enough. :-)

Census data indicates that there are a not insignificant number of people living in the Ambleside area who have surprisingly low incomes. They are exceedingly vulnerable in the current economic and housing conditions. This is no time to be forcing people out of their homes, not that there is ever a good one.

I hereby request that neither my name nor contact information be deleted from this communication.

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

604-926-8994

From: Ambleside and Dunderave Residents Association
<adrawestvan@send.mailchimpapp.com>
Date: March 10, 2024 at 5:10:46 PM PDT
To: david Marley <domarley52@gmail.com>
Subject: NEWSFLASH
Reply-To: adrawestvan@gmail.com



Ambleside and Dundarave Residents Association

adrawestvan@gmail.com

<http://adrawestvan.ca>



Dear ADRA Member,

This is short notice on a short notice from DWV on a very important matter. Mayor and Council will be giving consideration to moving forward with the rezoning of 30 rental apartment buildings with the intent of preserving rental stock on **MONDAY, MARCH 11TH @ 7PM COUNCIL MEETING.**

ADRA is not opposed to protecting purpose-built rental and securing tenant support where an existing rental building is redeveloped. ADRA is however, highly concerned about the proposed strategy to achieve this outcome.

At first glance, protecting purpose built rental housing seems as positive, given high housing costs throughout Metro Vancouver. However, the DWV is approaching the rezoning in a manner that could result in a loss of approximately \$50 million of Community Amenity Contributions (CAC). This amount could be higher, based on a calculation of 2000 extra units at \$30,000 per unit.

Considering Council just voted a 7.54% property tax increases how does it make sense to loose all the CAC revenues?

In the past, developers have applied to the DWV to have a property rezoned to a higher density. If approved, CACs are also calculated. The DWV receives the money promptly, deciding on its use in the community.

In the current situation, it is the DWV rezoning the properties and hence the loss of any CACs.

Staff have addressed Financial Implications in Item 4. of the Council Report March 5, 2024:

“The proposed amendments MAY lead over time to:

- an incrementally increased residential tax base
- off-site improvements from private development
- the receipt of Development Cost Charges for District roads, utilities and parks.”

The financial “benefits” could take years to be realized and be less than actual costs. CACs are immediate and calculable.

ADRA does not support this Zoning Bylaw change as currently proposed. Some questions at this point:

1. Has Planning received any formal applications to change a purpose built rental building to a strata? If so, how many?
2. Should the zoning changes be approved, how many units will be added to the existing 3300 rental units?
3. Under the proposed rezoning, will new units be strata or rental? (CACs are higher on strata units.)
4. What consideration has been given to loss of greenspace, privacy, loss of views, etc. that come with increased density?

Why not proceed with applications on an individual basis from each property owner? The “one size fits all” is not always the best solution. Let’s work together for a better future for all residents.

Consider making your views known to Mayor and Council:

Mayor Mark Sager	mark@westvancouver.ca
Councillor Christine Cassidy	ccassidy@westvancouver.ca
Councillor Nora Gambioli	ngambioli@westvancouver.ca
Councillor Peter Lambur	plambur@westvancouver.ca
Councillor Scott Snider	ssnider@westvancouver.ca
Councillor Sharon Thompson	sthompson@westvancouver.ca
Councillor Linda Watt	lwatt@westvancouver.ca

Copyright © 2024 Ambleside & Dundarave Residents Association, All rights reserved.

adrawestvan@gmail.com <http://adrawestvan.ca>

Our mailing address is:

Ambleside & Dundarave Residents Association
772 - 20th Street
West Vancouver, BC V7V 3Y7
Canada

Add us to your address book

Want to change how you receive these emails?

You can update your preferences or unsubscribe from this list.



From: M Slater <melroy1058@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, March 11, 2024 12:43 PM
To: correspondence
Cc: Christine Cassidy; Nora Gambioli; Peter Lambur; Scott Snider; Sharon Thompson; Linda Watt; Mark Sager
Subject: March 11, 2024 Council Agenda Item # 7: Ambleside Local Area Plan (LAP): Proposed RM1 and RM2 Zoning Bylaw Amendments (File 2520-17 / 1610-20-5325).

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the organization from email address melroy1058@gmail.com. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. If you believe this e-mail is suspicious, please report it to IT by marking it as SPAM.

Dear Mayor and Council,

I am appalled at the prospect of increasing the Floor Area Ratio (FAR) from 1.75 to 3.0 for 30 purpose-built rental sites within the Ambleside apartment area.

- How will this density increase contribute to the preservation of neighbourhood character, access to sunlight, view corridors and green space? (All of which residents have repeatedly said are important quality of life factors).
- This massive increase in density is completely at odds with most residents' preference for "gentle" growth.
- If we want to encourage redevelopment, (and that's a big *IF* given existing housing stock is always substantially more affordable than any new build), we should be looking at options that won't transform our neighbourhoods with unacceptable levels of density.
- I support the recently rejected option to limit the form of tenure on existing purpose-built rental sites and encourage Council to reconsider this.
- While I gather there were some concerns about the financial implications a tenure restriction may have on the owners of these 30 properties, has any consideration been given to the quality-of-life implications a large density increase will have on existing residents?
- It is not up to the district to ensure that it is financially feasible for property owners to redevelop or that developers can make a profit.
- Rental building owners absolutely deserve to make a living, but not at the expense of the livability of our community.
- Strata buildings face the same maintenance issues as rentals – will they be granted a 3.0 FAR?
- Why not grant extra density to strata buildings who redevelop if they provide rental?
- What will Ambleside look like if the entire apartment area goes to 3.0 FAR? (That's the logical conclusion of where this is heading).
- Concerns that owners will fail to maintain their buildings can be addressed by other means, including looking to other levels of government for financial support, fines or forcing those who don't maintain to sell.
- Market ownership and market rental are at the very top of the (unaffordable) housing pyramid and market rental will not solve this housing affordability crisis.

- I take exception to infill housing on sites that were originally granted extra height/density in exchange for leaving a portion of their land undeveloped. These areas were purposely left undeveloped to provide open and/or green space, view corridors and access to sunlight.
- Allowing infill equates to double-dipping at the “density trough” and rejects quality of life aspects that are so important to the livability of our neighbourhood.
- It's disturbing that staff reports don't mention these points and simply refer to “underutilized site area(s)”, completely ignoring the history and purpose of why these areas are “underutilized”.
- Most people aren't even aware of this proposal, let alone what the implications are.

While the objective of preserving rental stock is fine, how you are going about it is completely misguided. **Such a significant change to the OCP deserves far more public explanation and scrutiny. Yet this zoning change wasn't even discussed at the Town Hall Meeting held Feb 29 specifically to address the Ambleside LAP apartment area. Outrageous!**

I ask Council to immediately reject this proposed bylaw amendment.

Yours truly,

Melinda Slater
1058 Keith Road
West Vancouver

Please do not redact

From: Linda Jando [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Monday, March 11, 2024 1:46 PM
To: linda@pacificortho.ca; Christine Cassidy; Linda Watt; Nora Gambioli; Peter Lambur; Scott Snider; Sharon Thompson; Mark Sager; correspondence
Subject: NO to gifted land! = +

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

Linda Jando
910 Leyland Street
West Vancouver, BC
V7T 2L4

11 Mar 2024

Dear Mayor Sager and Councillors
District of West Vancouver

NO to gifted land!

My name is Linda Jando and I am a resident of West Vancouver.

There is no housing infrastructure in West Vancouver to grow. We experience water shortages, sewage issues, electricity cost escalations (not enough), highways in/out of our community have not developed in decades to downtown/east Vancouver. This all needs to be in place PRIOR to more land development. NO FREE LAND should be given away. We need our land for parks, recreation, shops, transport, etc.

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

Thank you.

Linda Jando
linda@pacificortho.ca

From: s. 22(1)
Sent: Sunday, March 10, 2024 11:03 AM
To: correspondence
Subject: Just got off the phone with Impark re: parking at Lighthouse Park

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

I contacted them to confirm whether those like myself who do not have a data plan could park paying via a credit card. Their answer effectively excludes me from being able to enjoy Lighthouse or Whytecliff parks again.

I live in Vancouver and every so often would visit these parks. I am a senior on a limited budget. Yes, I do own a car. And yes I try to use public transportation as often as I can. I am able to afford the gas because I budget for other things like a phone plan that does not have data or cut costs in other things. I have a “dumb” phone. So if I wished to visit these parks now; I would have to buy some \$50+/month plan in order to have access to some app and payment option – in essence pay \$500+ a year (or whatever ever increasing cost cell phone providers charge) just so I can spend some time in the park. I do not use the park in summer – which leads me to the other aspect of international visitors renting a vehicle and possibly not having the ability to pay via an app – at least not without jumping through a lot of hoops.

I do appreciate cost upkeep and managing traffic especially in the summer. But why make it so restrictive that one cannot pay just by credit card without an app/cell phone/data plan?

Thus, I am now effectively barred from visiting these parks I have known for 60+ years (and lived in West Van in my childhood until priced out of living there when older). I would have to find someone to accompany me with an app to pay for the parking. And frankly, at my age, I have a very small pool of people who can fit the bill. Or have the time. And catching a bus? Well, I just looked up translink. It would take me about 3 hours round trip– plus walking a narrow roadway from the bus stop and back to the park. And woe if there is some Lions Gate issue and I can’t get a bus due to traffic snarls instead of being able to take the Ironworkers as an alternate by car.

What a shame. And frankly discouraging and disheartening that these parks are no longer accessible to me in any way.

Yours truly,

s. 22(1)

Vancouver

s. 22(1)

From: s. 22(1)
Sent: Sunday, March 10, 2024 4:30 PM
To: correspondence
Subject: Pay Parking at Whytecliff Park, Lighthouse Park, Etc.

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

To our Honourable Mayor and Council.

After visiting and exercising at these parks for the past 36 years , I find it outrageous that there is now pay parking at these beautiful locations. So much for Super Natural British Columbia.

I am a very fit s.22(1) male living in West Vancouver but I am sorry to say that I and our family will not be visiting these areas in the future . West Vancouver and Vancouver in general are very expensive places to live in and we do not need to fork out more money just to visit a park! I cannot imagine any tourist or resident wanting to pay \$3.75 an hour . \$20 annual fee for a West Van. resident is also unacceptable.

Please give it some consideration to remove these fees. Thank you. s. 22(1)
Unit s. 22(1) , West Vancouver, s. 22(1)

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Monday, March 11, 2024 9:49 AM
To: correspondence; Info
Subject: Re: Parking at parks in west van

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

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

On Sun, Mar 10, 2024 at 8:00 AM [REDACTED] s.22(1) wrote:

Forward to council

As the weather begins to show signs of spring I am beginning to think of my west van hikes. \$5/h I think not. I would pay \$20 for an annual pass but I am not a west van resident. Is there a max for the day? No!!!! Every time I go for a hike I figure I will spend time either at the great west can restaurants for lunch, coffee, or shop at Stores that we don't have on this side of the bridge.

Getting to West Van is hard enough due to the bridge and the trek through downtown Vancouver but we do it for the beauty and uniqueness, we enjoy our visits.

When making the decision to go for a hike you have just put a No in the decision tree.

I could compromise if there was a max for a 6 or 12 hour visit, say \$8, but I just inputted 4h and it is \$20, absurd.

Time to find somewhere else.

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

Vancouver, BC

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Monday, March 11, 2024 11:14 AM
To: correspondence
Subject: Pay parking instituted - unequitable

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

It is not equitable that West Vancouver instituted pay parking that requires a smart phone and data plan.


How could Council possibly agree to this staff plan? What were you thinking?

I was in [REDACTED] s. 22(1) business from the early 70s and choose not to carry around a smartphone as I have no need to be in touch, except through a simple old-fashioned simple phone.

There is essentially no transit access, except by walking in a dangerous situation on a road with no proper sidewalks or even shoulders for 2 kilometres.

In these challenging financial times, this has also restricted access to nature as one retired couple who visited your parks regularly would now need to spend \$100 WEEKLY. This is just a pure and simple cash grab.

You need to do better and install parking meters that take credit cards.

 Thanks, [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
[REDACTED] s. 22(1), vancouver

A Vancouver resident who visits West Vancouver 2-3 times a month to see [REDACTED] s. 22(1).

From: Judith Kasiama [REDACTED] s.22(1)
Sent: Monday, March 11, 2024 8:10 PM
To: correspondence
Subject: Concerns Over New Parking Fee Regulations Impacting Community Accessibility

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

To Whom it May Concern,

My name is Judith Kasiama and I am the founder of Colour the Trails, our work focuses on creating opportunities for BIPOC to access the outdoors in a more affordable way.

I am writing to express my concerns about the recent implementation of parking fees at Lighthouse Park, Whyte Lake/Nelson Canyon Park, and Whytecliff Park. While I understand the need for township regulations to manage traffic and overcrowding, the imposed fee of \$3.75 per hour poses a significant burden, particularly for communities of color which our organization actively supports.

For seven years, we have strived to make nature accessible to our community, yet this new cost barrier contradicts our efforts. This policy further perpetuates the notion that enjoying nature is a luxury, available only to those with financial means and private transportation. Accessibility is also hindered by limited public transport options, with Whytecliff Park being notably inaccessible by transit. The lengthy and often delayed travel times from Vancouver to West Vancouver via bus are impractical and unfair.

The parking fees disproportionately impact diverse communities, especially those new to outdoor activities and organizations like ours that promote education and engagement with nature. While residents of West Vancouver are offered a \$20 annual parking pass, this fee is negligible for a predominantly affluent local population. In contrast, many communities, including but not limited to BIPOC groups, are grappling with the rising cost of living.

Moreover, this regulation overlooks those without access to smartphones and data, crucial for digital payment in areas with poor reception. It also fails to consider the needs of families with elderly members, individuals who require wheelchairs, or others with limited mobility.

In conclusion, without a comprehensive plan to ensure infrastructure supports accessible parks for all, this policy reinforces the narrative that nature is exclusive. Post-COVID, as people rediscover the importance of nature and public parks, policies should encourage rather than discourage this engagement. An equitable solution might include offering a limited period of free parking, such as 4 hours, before applying charges.

I urge the township to reconsider these regulations and work towards making our parks truly accessible to everyone.

Sincerely,
Judith Kasiama

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

Burnaby BC [REDACTED] s. 22(1)

--

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)



@colourthetrails
BLOCKEDcolourthetrails[.]comBLOCKED

colour the trails

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Tuesday, March 12, 2024 3:25 PM
To: correspondence
Subject: Pay Parking at Whytecliff Park:

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

West Van Council,

If it is not bad enough that you have now excluded everyone but the rich, from visiting our **publicly funded** parks, you have exclude this 75 year old altogether 😡😡😡. I do not have a cell phone, so I have nothing to put an app on - so I cannot even pay if I was able to. So now you have excluded the poor and the technically disadvantaged. How is a 75 yr old supposed to walk the considerable distance along a sidewalk-free, winding road lacking any shoulders, in the scorching heat of summer, from the Horseshoe Bay bus stop in order to try to cool down with a swim?

West Vancouver is one of the wealthiest ridings in Canada and this is the best that you can do? Shame on you! You better alter your mission statement for your parks to read "only for the young, fit and wealthy".

At the very least, enable the bandits to accept credit cards. This is completely unconscionable and unacceptable. This needs to change.

A decades long user of Whytecliff Park,

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

Vancouver BC

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

From: Jennifer Lord <jennifer.wvcac@shaw.ca>
Sent: Monday, March 11, 2024 2:16 PM
To: correspondence; Mark Sager; Christine Cassidy; Nora Gambioli; Peter Lambur; Scott Snider; Sharon Thompson; Linda Watt
Cc: Michael Martino; Catherine Schachtel
Subject: WVCAC Budget follow-up & request for funding

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

Dear Mayor Sager & Councillors Cassidy, Gambioli, Lambur, Snider, Thompson and Watt,

Thank you for the opportunity to speak with you about the budget at the Council meeting on February 26th.

We can certainly understand the challenges Council faces when trying to balance the financial demands of the District with a need to moderate the increase in taxes to the community. Having said that, we were very disappointed to find that our request for an increase in our annual fee for service would not be considered in this fiscal year budget. As we mentioned at the meeting, our annual grant from the District has remained at \$25,000 since 2006. That's an 18 year period where our support has remained the same while costs have risen. Over that span, we have grown from an organization with a \$150,000 budget to one with a \$250,000 budget as we continue to develop and expand our programming.

The West Vancouver Community Arts Council operates the Silk Purse Arts Centre and offers unique programs, services and community connection to the citizens of West Vancouver. Many of these participatory arts and cultural programs are not offered elsewhere in our District and are truly appreciated by our community. Our membership is loyal and long standing and we welcome nearly 20,000 visitors to the Silk Purse annually.

Finances in our sector have been impacted dramatically over the past 5 years by the pandemic, inflation, and increased administrative requirements in areas such as best practices in Equity, Diversity and Inclusion and the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. Our current draft budget for the 2024.25 year projects an operating loss of approximately \$40,000.

Salaries make up roughly 60% of our expense budget. Our team is at the core of everything we do and over the last 5 years we have grown from 1.7 to 3 FTE to support the diverse and expanded programming offered to our community. In order to attract and retain a professional team in a rising cost environment it is paramount that we compensate fairly. In the past, our salaries were more in line with minimum wage than the living wage. Since 2018 minimum wage in BC has risen by 38% and the current living wage in Metro Vancouver is \$25.68/hr. To reward staff performance and meet the rising cost of living we have implemented salary adjustments.

Although the pandemic certainly provided challenges and we are still recovering from it, the inability to obtain an increase in our fee for service over the past 18 years has resulted in revenues not keeping pace with rising costs.

Given the recent deferral of our request for an increase in our fee for service, we respectfully request a contribution for this year of \$35,000, in addition to our annual fee for service, to help us close the gap. We understand that this is a significant ask and would certainly be grateful for any additional contribution.

Thank you for your consideration of this request and we look forward to a continued conversation.

With regards,

Jennifer Lord, Executive Director
Michael Martino, Advisor to the Board of Directors
Catherine Schachtel, President Board of Directors

Jennifer Lord,
Executive Director
West Vancouver Community Arts Council
At the Silk Purse Arts Centre
1570 Argyle Avenue
West Vancouver, BC V7V 1A1
Phone: 604 925 7292
Website: [BLOCKEDwestvanartscouncil\[.\]ca](http://BLOCKEDwestvanartscouncil[.]ca)BLOCKED

From: Mike Franczak [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Tuesday, March 12, 2024 10:21 AM
To: jmfranczak1@gmail.com; Christine Cassidy; Linda Watt; Nora Gambioli; Peter Lambur; Scott Snider; Sharon Thompson; Mark Sager; correspondence
Subject: West Van 2024 Tax Hike =+

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

Mike Franczak
4432 Stone Crescent
West Vancouver, BC
V7W1B7

12 Mar 2024

Dear Mayor Sager and Councillors
District of West Vancouver

West Van 2024 Tax Hike

My name is Mike Franczak and I am a resident of West Vancouver.

I am writing to express my dismay and anger at the recent decision of council to raise our West Vancouver tax rate by over 7% this year and I implore it to embrace its election mandate - meaningfully cut costs, focus on efficient delivery of core services and hold rate hikes at or ideally below the rate of inflation.

As someone on a fixed pension income, this rate hike materially impacts on my ability to make basic ends meet.

Remember that this tax hike also comes on top of not only general inflationary pressures, but also David Eby's recent wealth tax cash grab on unrealized property value gains. (I note with some irony that not only is this tax is not a "school tax" as these funds go into general revenue provincial but that the government has now driven the debt and deficit to new highs. I would also note that the deferral of taxes as "relief" by kicking the tax can down the road is an option only for a select few unfortunately).

The city council I voted for in the last election pledged to reduce costs, keep inflationary rate hikes in line and focus on improving core services and accountabilities especially in the area of infrastructure.

I see no evidence of any real attempt to do any of this. Vanity arts projects remain on the books for places like Ambleside yet basic needs like improving reported roadway safety conditions (poor/blocked drainage, signage, speeding, deteriorating roadways etc) are going unaddressed despite requests made directly to the city engineering department.

Where is the focus and accountability?

The mayor is compromised and clearly can't manage money or be trusted at the most basic professional level. Key departments like engineering department are over staffed yet deliver below par results. Safety concerns go unaddressed. There is a lack of accountability.

Council needs to step up, clean house, focus on costs, delivery and accountability.

I urge council to step up, do its job and reverse this tax hike and adopt a new plan for 2024.

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

Thank you.

Mike Franczak
jmfranczak1@gmail.com

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Tuesday, March 12, 2024 2:15 PM
To: Jill Lawlor; correspondence
Subject: Pickleball Courts-Ambleside Park

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

I have just received the Ambleside Update of March 12th regarding the New outdoor Pickleball courts coming to Ambleside Park. I am not against Pickleball, but I'm a Par 3 Golfer at Ambleside Park.

I think you should have sent a map with your announcement. I used Google and the map section and put in Ambleside for the address to get the exact area.

My main concern is parking. If there are 4 courts, and participants are playing doubles, there may be 16 parking spots required. If you have a similar number waiting to play - you need 32 parking spots. Assuming there are no new parking spots, this will cause conflict with the Par 3 parking next door and the rest of the park. A possible solution would be a high wire fence along the edge of the park next to the road from the courts to the golf course to create a barrier to the golf parking.

Other questions would be hours open, washrooms, who will monitor the operations, etc.

I'm sure you will get more correspondence on this topic. An update with more information would help clarify these and other issues which will come up.

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

**THE CORPORATION OF THE DISTRICT OF WEST VANCOUVER
AWARDS COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
RAVEN ROOM, MUNICIPAL HALL
WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 2024**

Committee Members: C. Burns (Chair), L. Endler, A. Hendi, S. Hennessy, P. Mayan, L. Paton, M. Ware, J. Waterhouse; and Councillor S. Thompson attended the meeting in the Raven Room, Municipal Hall. Absent: S. Mani.

Staff: C. Rosta, Cultural Services Manager (Staff Representative); and A. Nomura, Cultural Services Department Secretary (Committee Clerk) attended the meeting in the Raven Room, Municipal Hall.

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 6:05 p.m.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the February 7, 2024 Awards Committee meeting agenda be approved as circulated.

CARRIED

3. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the January 10, 2024 Awards Committee meeting minutes be adopted as circulated.

CARRIED

REPORTS / ITEMS

4. Council Liaison Update

Councillor Thompson updated the Committee on the following items:

- Council is currently engaged in the 2024 budget approval process.
- Committees of Council are being restructured to maximize efficiency and use of volunteer time. Many committees are moving into an advisory panel format.
- Council is considering reintroducing the award “Key to the City” and is seeking the input of the Awards Committee.

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the verbal report regarding Council Liaison Update be received for information.

CARRIED

5. Review Award Categories

The Committee reviewed the awards categories from the previous year. It was suggested that the Committee should recognize individuals or organizations that support Truth and Reconciliation either as a stand-alone award or within each existing category. Staff will connect with members of the Squamish Nation to discuss and receive guidance on how to address this in a meaningful way.

The addition of a Lifetime Achievement Award was discussed by the Committee. The Committee will work to define what this award encapsulates and what the criteria should be to receive it.

The Committee also discussed marketing and outreach techniques to solicit nominations from the community. Members suggested placing an ad in the North Shore News and creating a dedicated Instagram account.

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the discussion regarding Review Award Categories be received for information.

CARRIED

6. Planning Process

Staff reviewed the work plan and timing moving forward. The Committee will confirm the awards categories at the next meeting and discuss how they should proceed with a Lifetime Achievement Award. The awards ceremony is scheduled for June 13th.

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the discussion regarding Planning Process be received for information.

CARRIED

7. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

There were no questions.

8. NEXT MEETING

Staff confirmed that the next Awards Committee meeting is scheduled for March 6, 2024 at 6 p.m. and held in-person in the Raven Room, Municipal Hall.

