

## **COUNCIL CORRESPONDENCE UPDATE TO OCTOBER 25, 2023 (8:30 a.m.)**

### **Correspondence**

- (1) 8 submissions, October 16-23, 2023, regarding Amendment to Animal Control and Licence Bylaw No. 4545, 2008 and Long-Term Dog Strategy in West Vancouver**
- (2) October 18, 2023, regarding “Can we ban gas powered lawn equipment?”**
- (3) October 18, 2023, regarding “Traffic concerns 1500 Block of Kings”**
- (4) 24 submissions, October 18-23, 2023, regarding Proposed Heritage Revitalization Agreement, Heritage Designation, and Development Permit for 1591 Haywood Avenue (Referred to the October 23, 2023 public hearing)**
- (5) 4 submissions, October 19 and 23, 2023, regarding Proposed Zoning Bylaw No. 4662, 2010, Amendment Bylaw No. 5264, 2023 (Ambleside Local Area Plan – Apartment Area) (Referred to the November 20, 2023 public hearing)**
- (6) October 24, 2023, regarding “Fireworks Ban - Boo!”**
- (7) Committee and Board Meeting Minutes – Code of Conduct Committee meeting September 18, 2023; and Memorial Library Board meeting September 20, 2023**

### **Correspondence from Other Governments and Government Agencies**

- (8) P. Weiler, M.P. (West Vancouver-Sunshine Coast-Sea to Sky Country) (2 submissions), October 20, 2023, regarding Federal Programs and Initiatives**

### **Responses to Correspondence**

- (9) Executive Assistant to the Director of Planning & Development Services, October 18, 2023, response regarding Proposed Heritage Revitalization Agreement, Heritage Designation, and Development Permit for 1591 Haywood Avenue (Referred to the October 23, 2023 public hearing)**
- (10) Community Planner, October 23, 2023, response regarding Proposed Heritage Revitalization Agreement, Heritage Designation, and Development Permit for 1591 Haywood Avenue (Referred to the October 23, 2023 public hearing)**
- (11) Community Planner, October 23, 2023, response regarding Proposed Heritage Revitalization Agreement, Heritage Designation, and Development Permit for 1591 Haywood Avenue (Referred to the October 23, 2023 public hearing)**
- (12) Acting Senior Manager of Parks, October 20, 2023, response regarding “Place for Sport engagement”**
- (13) Engineering & Transportation Services, October 20, 2023, response regarding “Traffic concerns 1500 Block of Kings”**
- (14) Manager of Park Planning & Development, October 23, 2023, response regarding “Eagle Harbour Creek Bridge - Repairs Needed!”**

**From:** s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Monday, October 16, 2023 9:49 AM  
**To:** correspondence  
**Subject:** Dogs on the Seawall

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 am a resident s. 22(1) and I am opposed to your plan to allow dogs on the seawall without requiring them to be on a separate path. Please reconsider this rash decision. The seawall is often a very crowded and busy place and there are many older and sometimes fragile residents of the area who regularly walk there, feeling it to be a safe and peaceful area. People go there to listen to the ocean and look at the view, not to hear barking and sidestep things on the path. Opening the seawall to dogs would bring dog walkers from many municipalities and overcrowd this beautiful space. At the very least, you should first seek input from the community on this move.

s. 22(1)

West Van.

---

**From:** s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 18, 2023 4:00 PM  
**To:** correspondence  
**Subject:** Re: Dogs on Seawall

**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 do not agree with allowing dogs on the Seawalk other than in the separated "Dog Walk".

I feel Council has underestimated the result of opening this beautiful walk to dogs and there will be a huge influx of walkers and dogs from all over the North Shore and further afield - not just from West Vancouver - resulting in overcrowding, especially on weekends and in summer. I understand that there are thousands of dog owners in adjacent North Vancouver alone, and wouldn't a good portion of them now literally jump at the chance to walk their dogs in West Vancouver on this most spectacular strip.

Parking is going to be a problem. If all those additional walkers are going to turn up, especially at prime times, how will this area be able to handle this issue, when parking spots are hard to find already to do one's ordinary business?

Since it is now a done deal, perhaps you could consider restricting the leashes to short ones to keep the dogs walking by owners' sides.

s. 22(1)

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

**From:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 19, 2023 8:19 PM  
**To:** correspondence  
**Subject:** Re: sea wall dog policy

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 Councillors,

We are writing to support the continuation of the existing dog walk rules and policy along the Ambleside Sea Wall. The present policy is the optimal balance of safety, access and consideration of all citizens.

Of particular note, the main stretch of the seawall that prohibits dogs and limits dogs to the path behind the fence ensures that vulnerable citizens who have mobility issues have one less concern as they walk. The flat and smooth surface of the sea wall is an ideal walk for citizens who are challenged by mobility issues. At times, the sea wall can be busy with a range of users, especially the "tighter" sections as one approaches Lawson Park and Dundarave beach.

The suggestion of walking dogs on a leash is very problematic due to the range of behaviours exhibited by dogs, the variety of control that owners display and the range of leash lengths. We have witnessed an elderly man fall when he was startled and "bounced" by an undisciplined medium-sized dog on a leash just past the 24th Street lookout nearing the access to the start of the off-leash dog path. The present guidelines allow vulnerable walkers (including toddlers) to enjoy a walk without dodging dogs on leashes, barking, dog spats or sniffing sessions and constant urination breaks along with dump stops. The present policy should be commended and valued for taking the present precautions minimizing risks for vulnerable walkers along a designated stretch of the seawall.

We should also commend the present policies in place near the Ambleside golf course for the off-leash and dog play areas. Dog owners enjoy a very scenic walk from the Capilano train bridge (view of First Narrows, Stanley Park, mouth of the Capilano, Siwash Rock, English Bay) to Ambleside Beach. The grass areas, trails, beach fronts are ideal areas for dogs to play and socialize. Citizens who walk in this area are aware they must share the space with exercising dogs. Fortunately, the District of West Van has other wonderful natural parks, trails, paths, roads and sidewalks for dogs and their owners to exercise not just the Ambleside sea wall.

In summary, we encourage the West Van Council to maintain the existing dog walking policies along the sea wall for the sake of safe inclusion of vulnerable walkers.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

West Vancouver

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

**From:** s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 18, 2023 6:38 PM  
**To:** correspondence  
**Cc:** Mark Sager; Christine Cassidy; Linda Watt; Sharon Thompson; Peter Lambur; Scott Snider; Nora Gambioli  
**Subject:** Dog Bylaws.  
**Attachments:** Ballantine\_(Dolly-Pekingese)06-23-2021 (3).jpg

**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 West Vancouver Mayor Mark Sager and all Councillors.

I wish to throw my grateful support behind Councillors Christine Cassidy and Linda Watt for bringing forward a proposal, at the 30th October, '23 council meeting, regarding making West Vancouver more dog friendly by allowing leashed dogs access to some presently off-limit areas.

Since 1970, I have had Pekingese dogs in West Vancouver. My recently deceased, and last dog, was admired wherever she went. She has to have been the most photographed dog in West Vancouver, whether around the streets of Ambleside or on the Ambleside waterfront allowed areas.

She was my constant companion and guardian. On one rainy night she awoke me and actually saved my apartment building from more extensive flooding due to a blocked roof drain - she was hailed as a hero! She also awoke me on another night to my hot water tank making ominous sounds, again, diverting a larger catastrophe.

She was a qualified St. John Ambulance Therapy Dog, an obedience trained dog and a multi Champion show dog and visited senior's homes and some schools putting smiles on everyone's face. She also participated in the West Vancouver "PumpkinFest" and the Community events in Ambleside Park with St. John Ambulance. She'd literally stop traffic and lit up the face of anyone walking towards her while we were out walking. People asked to pat her and asked questions about her and usually took her photo, many friendly conversations ensued to brighten our day. We'd listen to stories of their dogs, most particularly from the elderly no longer able to have a dog of their own.

Not only did I diligently clean up after her but, I'd offer my degradable clean-up bags to others and would often clean-up after other dogs. I felt it necessary to always set an example.

Well trained and licenced dogs, in the hands of responsible owners, are a very necessary benefit to the community, as my Pekingese proved to be. I am now bereft and lost without her and so now enjoy watching other's dogs while out and about.

I most sincerely hope that West Vancouver Council will recognise a well-behaved dog's importance and benefit within the community and grant more accesses to them. By putting up degradable bag dispensers and providing bins, there should be no reason for any 'land mine' issues! The issuing of dog licences should also cover this cost!

A proper dog training agility area has also long been on a wish list of mine! It would be great for exercise for both people and dogs and of an educational benefit to many as well as entertaining to watch for those without dogs.

Thank you.

Yours sincerely,

Christine Ballantine. (Please do not redact my name.)

[Redacted]

s. 22(1)

West Vancouver, B.C. [Redacted]


s. 22(1)

[Redacted]

s. 22(1)

**THE VERSATILE MINIATURE PEKINGESE**  
**RECENTLY CELEBRATED HER 12TH BIRTHDAY**

# DOLLY



*G & J Ramsden*  
BEST IN SHOW - RESERVE BEST IN SHOW - BEST VETERAN IN SHOW  
PRE-COMPANION DOG - CANINE GOOD NEIGHBOUR  
THERAPY DOG ADVANCED - ST. JOHN AMBULANCE THERAPY DOG BRONZE MEDALLION  
BIS RBIS CAN GCHEX & AM GCH LITTLELION CHINA DOLL PCD CGN THDA  
Owner/Handler: Christine Ballantine - Budockvean Perm Reg'd Pekingese since 1970

**From:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Saturday, October 21, 2023 10:25 AM  
**To:** correspondence  
**Subject:** Dogs on the Seawalk

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

Mayor and Council,

It was with shock that we read in the North Shore News recently that several councillors would be introducing a motion to allow dogs on the Seawalk.

That might be a win for dogs ... but it would be a blow for the very many West Vancouver residents who use the Seawalk on a regular basis. We urge the council to reject the motion if it is put forward.

The Seawalk is not wide enough to accommodate both people and dogs. If dogs were allowed on the people portion of the Seawalk it would adversely affect the safety of pedestrians ... especially the elderly and the young.

There are already many venues for dogs in West Vancouver. In fact, at the east end of the Seawalk is a huge off-leash area for dogs and their owners. As well, there is the dog walkway parallel to the pedestrian path of the Seawalk. It allows owners to be close to their dogs without adversely affecting the rest of us who use this West Vancouver gem.

Approximately 10 years ago council dealt with this same issue and made the decision to keep the Seawalk a people-only trail. What we have now has worked well for everyone. Allowing dogs on to the Seawalk ... leashed or unleashed would be a huge step backwards.

We urge council to keep the Seawalk as it is now ... for the benefit of walkers to enjoy.

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

**From:** s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Sunday, October 22, 2023 7:03 PM  
**To:** correspondence  
**Subject:** Fwd: Dog Bylaws.

**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 forwarding my response to s. 22(1) Christine's earlier letter as support for the proposed easing of dog bylaws.

s. 22(1)

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

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** s. 22(1)  
**Date:** October 22, 2023 at 6:32:11 PM PDT  
**To:** s. 22(1)  
**Subject:** Re: Dog Bylaws.

**From:** s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Sunday, October 22, 2023 6:04 PM  
**To:** s. 22(1)  
**Subject:** Re: Dog Bylaws.

Great letter, Christine ....again!... and maybe , hopefully, it will have some effect. Being recently in s.22(1) we must have seen hundreds of dogs, in the towns and on walking paths, even on trains, as well as in pubs and other indoor spaces, and never saw anything negative occur. It's all a matter of careful owners. It's so healthy and positive for people and the dogs to interact in a considerate way. We saw only one Scottie. No Pekes, tho'. Lots of small dogs, and all sizes, and all good walkers.  
Cheers, s. 22(1)

On Oct 18, 2023, at 6:38 PM, s. 22(1) wrote:

Hello West Vancouver Mayor Mark Sager and all Councillors.

I wish to throw my grateful support behind Councillors Christine Cassidy and Linda Watt for bringing forward a proposal, at the 30th October, '23 council meeting, regarding making West Vancouver more dog friendly by



allowing leashed dogs access to some presently off-limit areas.

Since 1970, I have had Pekingese dogs in West Vancouver. My recently deceased, and last dog, was admired wherever she went. She has to have been the most photographed dog in West Vancouver, whether around the streets of Ambleside or on the Ambleside waterfront allowed areas.

She was my constant companion and guardian. On one rainy night she awoke me and actually saved my apartment building from more extensive flooding due to a blocked roof drain - she was hailed as a hero! She also awoke me on another night to my hot water tank making ominous sounds, again, diverting a larger catastrophe.

She was a qualified St. John Ambulance Therapy Dog, an obedience trained dog and a multi Champion show dog and visited senior's homes and some schools putting smiles on everyone's face. She also participated in the West Vancouver "PumpkinFest" and the Community events in Ambleside Park with St. John Ambulance. She'd literally stop traffic and lit up the face of anyone walking towards her while we were out walking. People asked to pat her and asked questions about her and usually took her photo, many friendly conversations ensued to brighten our day. We'd listen to stories of their dogs, most particularly from the elderly no longer able to have a dog of their own.

Not only did I diligently clean up after her but, I'd offer my degradable clean-up bags to others and would often clean-up after other dogs. I felt it necessary to always set an example.

Well trained and licenced dogs, in the hands of responsible owners, are a very necessary benefit to the community, as my Pekingese proved to be. I am now bereft and lost without her and so now enjoy watching other's dogs while out and about.

I most sincerely hope that West Vancouver Council will recognise a well-behaved dog's importance and benefit within the community and grant more accesses to them. By putting up degradable bag dispensers and providing bins, there should be no reason for any 'land mine' issues! The issuing of dog licences should also cover this cost!

A proper dog training agility area has also long been on a wish list of mine! It would be great for exercise for both people and dogs and of an educational benefit to many as well as entertaining to watch for those without dogs.

Thank you.

Yours sincerely,

Christine Ballantine. (Please do not redact my name.)

s. 22(1)

West Vancouver, B.C.

s. 22(1)

s. 22(1)

<Ballantine\_(Dolly-Pekingese)06-23-2021 (3).jpg>

---

**From:** s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Monday, October 23, 2023 6:54 PM  
**To:** correspondence  
**Subject:** Allowing Leashed Dogs More Space

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 would like to voice my opinion that it is high time West Van allowed leashed dogs more access to outdoor, public spaces.

This move would bring West Vancouver in line with every other municipality as a dog friendly community.

My husband and I along with s. 22(1) have lived here for s. 22(1) and have owned 3 dogs throughout that time.

This will be discussed at the council meeting on October 30th, I believe.

My husband and I along with friends and family will be attending.

Thanks so much,

s. 22(1)

West Van

**From:** s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Monday, October 23, 2023 7:35 PM  
**To:** correspondence  
**Cc:** Linda Watt; Sharon Thompson; Scott Snider; Peter Lambur; Nora Gambioli; Christine Cassidy; Mark Sager  
**Subject:** Dog bylaw changes

**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 a s. 22(1) resident of West Vancouver. I have owned several dogs during these years, and most of my friends and neighbours also have dogs, or have had dogs. These dogs are part of our family, they are not just animals co-existing with us. I don't see why such a big section of the West Vancouver tax payers should be excluded from enjoying these sea-walks. I am getting older and I need to walk my dog on-leash on a flat surface, instead of the trails, due to an injury. Further, I don't agree that we should be limited to the off-leash park, and also forced to walk alongside the traffic.

I am very glad that finally we have a council that cares for all of the residents of this beautiful city, and I hope you will not be discouraged to do the right thing because of complaints from a few noisy anti-dog-access people.

s. 22(1)

*West Vancouver*

---

**From:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 18, 2023 12:13 PM  
**To:** correspondence  
**Cc:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Subject:** Can we ban gas powered lawn equipment?

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,

As you are no doubt aware, there has been a construction boom on the North Shore in recent years, and it seems like Dundarave, given its smaller lots and greater density, has been especially impacted.

I have also observed that West Vancouverites tend to be quite enthusiastic when it comes to lawn and garden maintenance, which requires the use of powered gardening equipment.

In the result, every day - all day - (with the exception of Sundays when the Noise By-law blessedly prohibits these activities) residents are treated to a loud and seemingly incessant cacophony. It doesn't take much imagination to appreciate that this significantly undermines the enjoyment of one's property, particularly in the summer months. Relaxing on one's patio or deck during the day is impossible.

I appreciate that much of this is unavoidable. Homes must be built, lawns must be cut, hedges must be trimmed and leaves (apparently) must be gathered.

That said, in my respectful submission, there are a couple of measures that can be undertaken to mitigate this noise pollution and make life better for residents:

1. Follow the lead of Vancouver and phase out gas powered lawn equipment, starting with an immediate ban on gas powered leaf blowers and trimmers. (Noise aside, this equipment also reportedly results in significant noxious emissions - see link below - which are, given present technology, completely unnecessary)
2. Consider limiting, defining, and thereby coordinating - the days on which professional landscaping companies work in each neighbourhood. (I envision something similar to the garbage collection map - obviously with smaller defined areas - that restrict lawn maintenance to, say, two days a week or, if more flexibility is required, even/odd numbered days.) I mention professional companies. If you were open to extending this to private lawn maintenance, all the better.

West Vancouver is a wonderful place to live. We can't fix the traffic but we can easily do something to mitigate the noise.

Thanks for your consideration.

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

---

**From:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 18, 2023 4:05 PM  
**To:** correspondence; Mark Sager; Christine Cassidy; Nora Gambioli; Peter Lambur; Scott Snider; Sharon Thompson; Linda Watt  
**Subject:** Traffic concerns 1500 Block of Kings  
**Attachments:** Kings Ave.pdf

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

Dear Mayor and Council,  
Please see the attached letter regarding traffic concerns in the 1500 Block of Kings.

Regards,  
[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

To: Mayor and Council

Cc: 1500 Block Kings Ave s.22(1)

Subject: Traffic concern – 1500 block of Kings Avenue – West Vancouver

Dear Mayor Sager and Councilors,

I am writing to express my concerns about the 1500 Block of Kings Avenue. As you may know, s. 22(1) is open to 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue. 17<sup>th</sup> (North of Inglewood) is the main entrance to West Vancouver Secondary School, and the large parking lots for the school, the fields, and Kay Meek Arts Center.

I would describe s. 22(1) as a side road – it is narrow (under 20 feet wide), with cars parked on the south side (and sometimes on the north side). Taking into account parked cars, Kings Ave has about 12 to 13 feet of width for cars to travel on. It's a one-lane street and certainly not designed for significant street traffic or as a main roadway to the school. There are obvious safety issues for neighbors, their children and pets.

During before and after school hours, s. 22(1) is used by parents, students, and staff to access the school drop-off and parking lots. It's a shortcut to using the main entrance to 17<sup>th</sup> off Inglewood. It is used as an access and egress to 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue (even though there is a no-entry sign on 17<sup>th</sup>). During these school hours, it makes trying to get out s. 22(1) difficult; furthermore, many of the cars drive fast down the street (likely as they are late for drop off).

We believe this issue is only going to get worse with the construction of the West Vancouver Place for Sport. Our fear is that dump trucks and other heavy equipment will find a way to use Kings Avenue to get to the job site. Once complete, users of the Place For Sport could use s. 22(1) to access the facility and/or use our street for parking (which is already tight).

#### Common Sense Recommendation

1. Block off Kings at 17<sup>th</sup> (even with removable bollards if you want to retain access for emergency vehicles)
2. Signage at 15<sup>th</sup> and Kings that road has no exit and for local traffic only
3. Move the No Parking Sign on the north-west side of Kings (near 17<sup>th</sup>) further east to allow residents a way to turn their cars around.

As mentioned, this is currently an issue and one that will only get worse with the construction of the Place for Sports.

I understand that you may need to study the issue; so as an interim step, for safety reasons, I would suggest the following happen ASAP:

- Move the school zone signage and speed zone back to the 15<sup>th</sup> and Kings. It was recently moved to 17<sup>th</sup>.
- Add speed bumps to Kings to force people to slow down
- Move the No Parking Sign on the north side of Kings (near 17<sup>th</sup>) further east to allow residents a way to turn their cars around.

I am happy to discuss this further with you.

Regards,

s. 22(1)

West Vancouver



**From:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 18, 2023 4:25 PM  
**To:** Cindy L. Mayne  
**Cc:** correspondence  
**Subject:** RE: Council correspondence - The RAPR and Possible Precedent of 1591 Haywood Application

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

Good Afternoon Ms. Mayne,

Thank you for your email. I feel sad however because I'm getting the impression that Staff is frustrated and/or annoyed with my pinpointing environmental issues in my correspondence. Be assured my correspondence is respectfully careful and accurate relying on published documents, and checked where necessary with a riparian environmental expert. There is no need to repeat to me what the QEP report for 1591 Haywood says. I have read it and responded to it at a detailed level as articulated in my previous correspondence. It also makes me sad because your statements below do not speak to the specific issues in my correspondence giving me the impression I'm not being afforded the courtesy of reading and responding to the points I am raising, before replying. Perhaps you are just very busy, but please read my specific concerns before replying.

Contrary to your sentiment that the "1591 Haywood Avenue does not set a precedent for development within riparian areas in the District of West Vancouver": as you will know, it is the nature of decisions that they set a precedent. Please see for example, so you know what I mean, recent council meetings and the stated concerns on various applications that they will be setting a "precedent" in various circumstances, if not legally or officially, in reality.

Contrary to your statement that "Staff reviewed and are processing the application consistent with the OCP Guidelines NE13 for [brochure for the] Watercourse Protection and Enhancement Areas in Existing Neighbourhoods": please see the Staff Planner's (respectful) response to another resident expressing riparian area concerns citing the legislated Environmental Development Permit as the measure for the application [not the language of the Watercourse Brochure], and my correspondence agreeing that it is the WV EDP, which is derived from the principals of the provincial RAPR, that is applicable.

Staff may have found that "the project was found to meet [the Watercourse brochure's] guidelines": however the provincial biologists expert in riparian areas may not (maybe most likely will not) find it meets all the RAPR criteria.

Contrary to your statement that "there will be no net loss of riparian habitat within 15 m of the top of watercourse bank [and you go on to recite the application]": there would be a net habitat loss of  $-37\text{m}^2$ . Please see my correspondence directly addressing the "habitat balance equation" that borrows environmental meters from Lot A to give it to Lot B creating the appearance that Lot B does not have a negative habitat balance, when it has a  $-37\text{m}^2$  habitat loss; and using Staff's stated methodology that the two lots are to be treated individually.

Contrary to your statement that "Invasive plant removal and re-planting are not proposed in exchange of habitat loss (since there will be no net loss of riparian habitat) but rather, are proposed to enhance the riparian area and watercourse": there would be a net habitat loss (see above and based on observable facts) and moreover, unless the developer is offering to do riparian area revitalization outside of their own property up and down Vinson creek (and please let me know if that is the case), the riparian area revitalisation offer in the application is for the purposes of arguing in favour of this particular development. This type of revitalization work is something that volunteers and/or Staff do in other communities, especially on our own public land, without offering up habitat loss to developers.

Sincerely,

s. 22(1)

---

**From:** Cindy L. Mayne <clmayne@westvancouver.ca>

**Sent:** Wednesday, October 18, 2023 2:49 PM

**To:** s. 22(1)

**Cc:** correspondence <correspondence@westvancouver.ca>

**Subject:** Council correspondence - The RAPR and Possible Precedent of 1591 Haywood Application

Dear s. 22(1),

Thank you for your letter to Mayor & Council, it has been forwarded to the Planning & Development Services Department for a response. The development proposal for 1591 Haywood Avenue does not set a precedent for development within riparian areas in the District of West Vancouver. Staff reviewed and are processing the application consistent with the OCP Guidelines NE13 for Watercourse Protection and Enhancement Areas in Existing Neighbourhoods, and the project was found to meet these guidelines. Specifically, there will be no net loss of riparian habitat within 15 m of the top of watercourse bank. Lot B will have new development within 15 m of the top of the watercourse bank, but consistent with the guidelines, new development will be as far from the watercourse (in fact farther) than any existing development and will encompass a smaller footprint than existing. Also, the area within 5 m of the top of the watercourse bank will be kept free of new development. Existing development will be removed from this area and the areas will be revegetated.

Invasive plant removal and re-planting are not proposed in exchange of habitat loss (since there will be no net loss of riparian habitat) but rather, are proposed to enhance the riparian area and watercourse, consistent with OCP Guidelines NE13.

Regards,

**Cindy Mayne**

Executive Assistant to the Director of Planning & Development Services | District of West Vancouver  
t: 604-925-7178 | [westvancouver.ca](http://westvancouver.ca)



---

**From:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 19, 2023 9:58 AM  
**To:** correspondence  
**Subject:** FW: Public Hearing - October 23, 2023  
**Attachments:** October 16.pdf

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

Good Morning

Kindly include the above-noted pdf in the discussion regarding 1591 Haywood Ave on October 23, 2023

Thank you

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

West Vancouver

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

October 19, 2023

**Legislative Services**

750 17<sup>th</sup> Street

West Vancouver, B.C.

V7V 3T3

Sirs:

Re: **1591 Haywood Ave. West Vancouver, B.C.**

I am writing in support of the proposal regarding a Heritage Revitalization Agreement Bylaw No 5234, 2023.

Support for this proposal is three-fold.

- 1) An older home with the potential to be designated a “Heritage Home” can be saved from possible demolition to preserve the history and culture of West Vancouver.
- 2) An additional building lot could be established to provide much needed additional housing within the core of West Vancouver near schools and shopping.
- 3) The Proposal calls for the retention and enhancement of the riparian area of Vinson Creek

Respectively submitted

s. 22(1)

Resident West Vancouver

To West Vancouver Mayor and Councillors  
cc Erika Syvokas, Community Planner  
October 20 2023

**RE: 1591 Haywood Ave Heritage Revitalization Agreement Bylaw No.5234,2023 and  
Heritage Designation Bylaw No. 5235, 2023**

My name is [redacted] s. 22(1) I live at [redacted] s. 22(1)  
[redacted] s. 22(1)

This redevelopment proposal is certainly an improvement from the original proposal from Jan 2022. I do have a few concerns however.

1. The proposal for a separate garage on the proposed north lot must stay as such and have a covenant on it to maintain this purpose not allowing any residential component to it.
2. At the original first meeting of January 25 2022, it was commented by the owner that the proposed redevelopment would not be all done right away but over 10 years. This type of timeline would be unacceptable for quality of life to [redacted] s. 22(1) There has to be a significantly shorter time frame to carry out this proposal if it is approved.
3. Off street parking must be maintained. There should be no allowances for decreasing off street parking due to a heritage designation. This block of Haywood Ave has a footbridge at the east end making it a walking route for many. There are no sidewalks so it must not be "overparked" on a day to day basis. "Overparking" on 16th street also needs to be considered, no sidewalks here either and regularly have high school students walking down this street.) I repeat, there needs to be enough off street parking to match the increased density.
4. Calling this proposed project a Heritage revitalization agreement is a stretch to me quite frankly. The increase of density that it allows is plenty of incentive and the financial incentives, in particular the request for a 20 year tax exemption is quite unpalatable.

Thank you for your attention to this matter

[redacted] s. 22(1)

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

**From:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Saturday, October 21, 2023 11:03 AM  
**To:** correspondence  
**Subject:** Support for [REDACTED] s. 22(1) development proposal for Clegg House

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 Council,

I'm writing to voice my unequivocal support for the [REDACTED] s. 22(1) development proposal for Clegg House.

[REDACTED] s. 22(1) I moved to West Vancouver [REDACTED] s. 22(1) and bought a [REDACTED] s. 22(1) [REDACTED] s. 22(1). This would be utterly inconceivable today. [REDACTED] s. 22(1) I have raised [REDACTED] s.22(1) in this wonderful community, but we are becoming increasingly concerned that they will never be able to afford to live in West Vancouver.

Like me, I know that Council understands the fact that increasing density is the only way to ensure West Vancouver remains a safe and vibrant place for future tax-paying generations. West Vancouver must not become a retirement community or a second or third home base for the ultra-wealthy.

The Clegg House proposal would subdivide a double size lot and add two (just two!) housing options - the coach house above the garage, and the basement suite within the Clegg House itself - in keeping with the aesthetics of the neighbourhood. West Vancouver needs MORE people to do what [REDACTED] s. 22(1) are proposing to ensure that our community continues to add diversity of housing options, so that hopefully one day, my kids can also afford to raise their families here. And finally, preserving the Clegg House's heritage value rather than banishing another piece of West Vancouver history to our landfills is the right thing to do for the environment.

I strongly urge Council to vote in favour of the Heritage Revitalization Agreement (HRA) regarding the Clegg House at 1591 Haywood Avenue.

Sincerely,  
[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

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

**From:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Saturday, October 21, 2023 9:02 PM  
**To:** correspondence  
**Cc:** Erika Syvokas  
**Subject:** 1591 Haywood Ave, Oct 23 meeting, Heritage Revitalization  
**Attachments:** letter to council re 1591.pdf

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

To West Vancouver Mayor and Councillors  
cc Erika Syvokas, Community Planner  
October 20 2023

**RE: 1591 Haywood Ave Heritage Revitalization Agreement Bylaw No. 5234, 2023 and Heritage Designation Bylaw No. 5235, 2023**

My name is [REDACTED] s. 22(1), I live at [REDACTED] s. 22(1).

This redevelopment proposal is certainly an improvement from the original proposal from Jan 2022. I do have a few concerns however.

1. The proposal for a separate garage on the proposed north lot must stay as such and have a covenant on it to maintain this purpose not allowing any residential component to it.
2. At the original first meeting of January 25 2022, it was commented by the owner that the proposed redevelopment would not be all done right away but over 10 years. This type of timeline would be unacceptable for quality of life to [REDACTED] s. 22(1). There has to be a significantly shorter time frame to carry out this proposal if it is approved.
3. Off street parking must be maintained. There should be no allowances for decreasing off street parking due to a heritage designation. This block of Haywood Ave has a footbridge at the east end making it a walking route for many. There are no sidewalks so it must not be "overparked" on a day to day basis. "Overparking" on 16th street also needs to be considered, no sidewalks here either and regularly have high school students walking down this street.) I repeat, there needs to be enough off street parking to match the increased density.

Thank you for your attention to this matter

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

To West Vancouver Mayor and Councillors  
cc Erika Syvokas, Community Planner  
October 20 2023

**RE: 1591 Haywood Ave Heritage Revitalization Agreement Bylaw No.5234,2023 and Heritage Designation Bylaw No. 5235, 2023**

My name is [redacted] s. 22(1) I live at [redacted] s. 22(1)  
[redacted] s. 22(1)

This redevelopment proposal is certainly an improvement from the original proposal from Jan 2022. I do have a few concerns however.

1. The proposal for a separate garage on the proposed north lot must stay as such and have a covenant on it to maintain this purpose not allowing any residential component to it.
2. At the original first meeting of January 25 2022, it was commented by the owner that the proposed redevelopment would not be all done right away but over 10 years. This type of timeline would be unacceptable for quality of life to [redacted] s. 22(1) There has to be a significantly shorter time frame to carry out this proposal if it is approved.
3. Off street parking must be maintained. There should be no allowances for decreasing off street parking due to a heritage designation. This block of Haywood Ave has a footbridge at the east end making it a walking route for many. There are no sidewalks so it must not be "overparked" on a day to day basis. "Overparking" on 16th street also needs to be considered, no sidewalks here either and regularly have high school students walking down this street.) I repeat, there needs to be enough off street parking to match the increased density.

Thank you for your attention to this matter

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



I am not familiar with the normal financial incentives that are granted for this sort of redevelopment project though they seem very rich, I will only comment on the design.

4. (I unfortunately had [REDACTED] s. 22(1) [REDACTED] and the restoration and repair workers' truck showing how important off street parking is.

**From:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Sunday, October 22, 2023 11:51 AM  
**To:** correspondence  
**Subject:** Fwd: Clegg House - Heritage Revitalization Agreement, 1591 Haywood Avenue

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

Dear Council of West Vancouver,  
I live [REDACTED] s. 22(1) in the Ambleside area and I am very proud of our wonderful District of West Vancouver! I walk by the Clegg House [REDACTED] s. 22(1) and believe the project as proposed will be a great addition to the neighbourhood. I love the fact that [REDACTED] s. 22(1) are willing to preserve and restore it - most wouldn't dream of taking this on. The project perfectly aligns with West Vancouver's Official Community Plan. It respects the neighborhood's character and introduces sensitive infill units like the coach house above the garage and the basement suite within the Clegg House. Additionally, it subdivides a double-sized lot. This project checks all the boxes in our official community plan and is a model for what can and should be done in West Vancouver. I appreciate the Council taking my comments into consideration.

Kind regards,  
[REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
[REDACTED] West Vancouver, B.C., [REDACTED] s. 22(1)

---

**From:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Sunday, October 22, 2023 12:32 PM  
**To:** Mark Sager; Christine Cassidy; Nora Gambioli; Peter Lambur; Scott Snider; Sharon Thompson; Linda Watt; correspondence  
**Cc:** Erika Syvokas  
**Subject:** Letter to Council - 1591 Haywood Avenue (The Clegg House) proposal.  
**Attachments:** Letter to Council.pdf

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

Dear West Vancouver District Mayor and Council Members:

I am writing to Council in regards to 1591 Haywood Avenue (The Clegg House) proposal. I would like to express our concerns and ask Council to evaluate the integrity of this "heritage application," and the negative impact it proposes on the existing site and community. Please see the attached letter.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

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

October 22, 2023

Re: proposal for 1591 Haywood Avenue.

Dear West Vancouver District Mayor and Council Members:

My family has resided in West Vancouver for s. 22(1). We live at s. 22(1). This is our primary residence and we moved here specifically for the character and value of this community.

I am writing to Council to express our deepest disappointment and the lack of consideration put into the proposed plan. I would like to express our concerns and ask Council to evaluate the integrity of this “heritage application,” and the negative impact it proposes on the existing site and community.

### **Heritage Revitalization**

The proposed project is financially driven rather than revitalizing heritage architecture. We are not opposing the proponents’ revitalizing the Clegg House if that is their true intention. If the intention is to keep the character and integrity of the existing structure, then the proposed plan is conflicting with its purpose. The proposed plan is jeopardizing the integrity of the Clegg House, which will become unrecognizable.

Does the existing structure need to be relocated for it to be revitalized? Does relocating the structure add any further heritage value or protection to the existing structure?

If not, the proponent should not be permitted to relocate and alter the heritage value/elements. According to West Vancouver Community Planner, Ms. Syvokas, the existing lot does not qualify for a two-lot subdivision under current policy as it is constrained by Vinson Creek traversing the property. Therefore, this entire proposed plan should be considered as a rezoning application rather than a preservation application. In addition, approving such variances would drastically change the character of the exterior of the Clegg House and landscape of the neighborhood.

If Council is supporting Heritage Revitalization in our neighborhood, I believe Council should take the time to ensure that this is done responsibly and appropriately to protect both the setting and architecture elements of heritage sites. Otherwise, this will set precedence for many to apply for rezoning of the existing bylaw in disguise of heritage revitalization.

### **Cost-Benefit Analysis**

I would also like Council to investigate the cost-benefit of the proposed project and consider whether moving the existing house is *absolutely* necessary for heritage preservation.

The financial benefits the proponents seek include subdivisions, creating stratified garden suites, building a coach house, and receiving 20 years of tax incentives. These are appalling requests that are coming out of all West Vancouver taxpayer's pocket and at immediate neighbors' expenses. The proponents claim that the heritage revitalization is expensive, and because of these expenses, they are requesting subdivisions and tax incentives. Then, it is further imperative not to justify and elevate the proponents' cost by moving the existing house from its current location. It is outrageous that the West Vancouver taxpayers are being asked to pay on behalf of the proponent. Council has the due diligence to do more investigating to protect the overall public/taxpayers' interests rather than allowing financial benefits/incentives of a few.

In addition, I would like Council to consider setting provision to ensure that the densification is truly intended to allow affordable housing for the "missing middle." Will the District set regulations to avoid short-term rental, so Airbnb is not being exploited? Will rental of the garden suite and the coach house be fixed or below the market value to meet the affordable housing requirements? What is the length of time for the proposal to be completed? Do the proponents have the financial means and time to complete the proposal, or will this be sale off to the next developer?

I raised some of the many questions that we have as a community for you to consider. I hope Council takes the time to evaluate the *necessity* to subdivide and relocate the Clegg House. The proposed project should not be allowed to diminish the integrity and value of the site and its community, while profiting from a rezoning application.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

s. 22(1)

West Vancouver

West Vancouver residents for s. 22(1)

---

**From:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Sunday, October 22, 2023 5:40 PM  
**To:** correspondence  
**Subject:** Development Proposal for 1591 Haywood Ave

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

To Whom it May Concern.

I am writing to express my support for the development proposed for 1591 Haywood Ave, West Van. I live in the Ambleside/Sentinel Hill area and am thrilled to see that such a thoughtful addition is proposed. I think that this is an excellent example of balance between much needed density and maintaining the character of the neighbourhood!! It would be such a loss to see an historically significant and beautiful house replaced instead of being given the care that it deserves. Adding several smaller units (which will be more affordable to rent or purchase) to this underutilized piece of property is a great idea! It's proximity to local schools as well as employment opportunities and transit on Marine Drive make this a perfect location for a young family to reside.

Thank you for your time!

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

[REDACTED] West Vancouver

**From:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Sunday, October 22, 2023 5:48 PM  
**To:** Erika Syvokas  
**Cc:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1); Michelle McGuire; Mark Sager; Christine Cassidy; Scott Snider; Linda Watt; Sharon Thompson; Nora Gambioli; Peter Lambur; correspondence  
**Subject:** Re: Clegg House HRA 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.

Mayor and Council:

I write further to my Oct 6 email below to provide you , and the proponent, advance notice of the oral submission which I request permission to make during the Public Hearing regarding this proposal tomorrow evening Oct 23.

**A. An Objective Cost Benefit Analysis Must be Required**

The proponent seeks various benefits:

- 1) density bonuses
- 2) set back waivers
- 3) subdivision of an otherwise unsubdividable lot
- 4) a stratified suite
- 5) a rental suite
- 6) waiver of otherwise standard development charges
- 7) waiver of otherwise applicable building code requirements
- 8) waiver of otherwise applicable property taxes, etc.

The basis for these requests is the speculative and vague assertion that “preservation of heritage is expensive”.

At the Information Meeting the assigned Municipal planner indicated that the filing of an objective cost benefit analysis is not required in support of an HRA application.

**It is submitted that an objective cost benefit analysis should be required as part of an HRA proposal in both this and every subsequent application of it’s type that is brought before Council.**

Why?

- a) rational decision making must be reasoned;
- b) the benefits the proponent seeks imposes burdens on the entire community;
- c) it is impossible for this Council to assess which , if any, benefits it should confer upon the proponent without taking into account the actual cost of “preservation of heritage” in the various scenarios that present themselves;
- d) acting upon the basis of speculation, when that is unnecessary, is the antithesis of rational and reasoned decision making, especially when a proponent requests benefits the cost of which will be imposed upon the community as a whole.

To illustrate:

Many members of the public have described Clegg House's as "a modest farm house set on a rise next to a creek". In sum, that the true heritage value of the Clegg House is in it's setting, not in the absent filigree on it's eaves.

The proposal for permission to move the House to within the set backs otherwise required , and strictly enforced , within the community (and which define the historic nature and spatial character of the community) is said to be necessary so that the proponent can then subdivide and then presumably sell the newly created lot: it will be for an Assessor to decide, but a probable benefit of ~\$2M.

In addition, the proposal to build a stratified garden suite under the House (based upon the increased SFR and set back waivers) requests a further probable benefit of ~\$1M.

In addition the proposal for a rental suite above a garage requests a further significant continuing financial benefit.

Then the requests for the waiver of standard development charges, otherwise applicable property taxes , etc , would confer even further financial benefits.

In sum, the granting of all of these requested benefits without an analysis of whether they are required "to preserve heritage" would be perverse.

Why?

For example, other than to confer very substantial profits on the developer ,there is no need for the Clegg House to be moved from its present location.

Instead it could be raised in place, renovated and a stratified suite installed underneath it. The sale of the stratified suite might well pay for both its creation and the renovation of the House. If more was required then perhaps a coach house could be authorized to be built in the south east corner of the lot to accommodate the asserted desire for parental housing , or additional recurring revenue.

Other alternatives suggest themselves.

**The simple point of this illustration is to demonstrate that without an objective cost benefit analysis Council simply cannot evaluate and make any reasoned decision related to this application.**

Will it cost \$1M to merely raise , stratify and renovate the House? If so , permission to create a stratified suite should pay for it. In which case the true heritage quality of the House will be preserved and the spatial character of the community need not be destroyed.

Will it cost \$2M to move and renovate the House? If subdivision is granted why would there also be a need for a stratified suite , a rental suite, waiver of development charges, waiver of property taxes , etc?

## **B. The Costs Proposed to be Imposed on the Community are Real and Substantial**

For most members of the Historic Ambleside Community (specifically from 15th to 21st between Fulton and Mathers) their home is their most important investment in life.

Most of us have worked hard all of our lives to be able to afford to live in this community. Many of us have maintained our heritage homes and have housed our children and parents within the bounds of the established SFR ratios and setbacks. We have all paid all of our municipal taxes.

Most members of this Community support this



Council's inclination that Ambleside densification efforts should be concentrated below Gordon , adjacent to transportation corridors and services, perhaps with incentives to create more affordable rental housing accessible to the mid market.

As the decision before Council with respect to Clegg House will set a precedent for Historic Ambleside as a whole , **the Community requests that Council very carefully assess this application and insist that it be provided with the data required for it to rationally choose the least intrusive means by which to “preserve heritage” without destroying the essence of what it purports to protect.**

This is not Heritage Ambleside Community “nimbyism”.

Instead it is simply a request that Council maintain its determination to uphold it's prior Ambleside planning policy determinations and the Rule of Law.

Respectfully,

s. 22(1)

West Vancouver, BC s. 22(1)

s. 22(1)

Privileged and Confidential

s. 22(1)

On Oct 6, 2023, at 12:34 PM, s.22(1) wrote:

Thank you for your prompt response Erika.

In the interests of brevity I respond concisely:

- 1) of course the impacted community understands that this application does **not** fall within the proposed Ambleside LAP , the thrust of which is to properly concentrate densification below Gordon (to encourage rational development closer to transit and commercial corridors) and to discourage “ad hoc” spot rezoning as is proposed here;
- 2) the consensus view of the impacted community is that what is proposed here has **absolutely nothing to do with preserving heritage** (as the repositioned renovated Clegg House simply ends up appearing as a new build craftsman , albeit without otherwise required setbacks) and is very obviously animated simply by a desire to profit through subdivision and densification;
- 3) procedurally, it is disingenuous to suggest that the impacted community should constantly check council agendas to ensure that they are able to respond to applications such this and then for it to be given only three weeks (intersected by two statutory holidays) to organize so as to ensure that it speaks with one voice at a Public Hearing in opposition to this substantive spot rezoning application.

Put another way why on earth would this developer not have been required to give actual Notice to the impacted community of it's Sept 25 application to Council for heritage designation , relief from existing zoning requirements , tax exemption, etc , ?

Obviously , the impact of this lack of Notice prior to Sept 25 was that Council was left to make decisions , including the setting of a premature Public Hearing date, based only upon Staff recommendations and without the benefit of any actual community input.

s. 22(1)

West Vancouver, BC

s. 22(1)

s. 22(1)

Privileged and Confidential

s. 22(1)

On Oct 6, 2023, at 10:22 AM, Erika Syvokas <esyvokas@westvancouver.ca> wrote:

Hello s. 22(1)

Thank you for your follow up email. Please find responses to your comments below. I have copied Michelle McGuire as well Mayor and Council as requested.

[Policy 2.1.15 of the Official Community Plan](#) (OCP) allows consideration of heritage projects within a local area plan (LAP) boundary, prior to the adoption of a local area plan, by applying relevant District-wide policies with the OCP. Additionally, the current study area for the Ambleside LAP, as approved by Council does not include the subject site. On July 24, 2023, Council approved a series of resolutions related to the Ambleside Local Area Plan, including one directing staff to proceed based on a revised LAP study area (see the report to Council [here](#)). The revised study area, as shown on Map 1 of the report to Council, does not include the subject site.

The proposal for 1591 Haywood Avenue is following the standard staff review and public consultation process for this type of development application in accordance with the [Preliminary Development Proposal and Public Consultation Policy](#) and the [Development Procedures Bylaw](#) including:

1. Prior to submitting a formal application, the applicant submitted a preliminary development proposal and undertook preliminary public consultation to allow for initial staff review and public input.
2. The preliminary process included the applicant notifying surrounding property owners based on the Preliminary Development Proposal & Public Consultation Policy and hosting a Preliminary Public Consultation Meeting.
3. The Heritage Advisory Committee reviewed the proposal at the preliminary proposal stage, as well as part of the formal application process. Committee meetings are public meetings, and the meeting minutes are available online.

4. The applicant is holding a Public Information Meeting on October 10, 2023, to provide the public an opportunity to learn about the proposal and ask questions prior to the Public Hearing scheduled for October 23, 2023.

The application has also gone through all standard and required notification and Council meeting/consideration procedures including:

1. A project page, including information regarding the proposal and proposed plans, has been available on the website since prior to the preliminary public consultation meeting and has been updated throughout the process.
2. The agenda for the September 25, 2023 Council meeting where Council gave 1st reading of the proposed bylaws and added the Clegg House to the Community Heritage Register was posted in accordance with legislative requirements.
3. A development application sign indicating the details of the Public Information Meeting and the details of the Public Hearing has been erected on site.
4. The applicant sent out a notice and information package regarding the applicant-led information meeting to be held on October 10, 2023 to all properties within 100 m of the subject property.
5. A notice of the upcoming Public Hearing on October 23, 2023 was mailed out by the District on October 5, 2023 to all properties within 100 m of the subject property.
6. Notice of the Public Hearing will also be placed in the North Shore News on October 11 and 18, 2023.

Sincerely,

**Erika Syvokas**

Community Planner | Planning and Development Services | District of West Vancouver  
t: 604-921-2914 | [westvancouver.ca](http://westvancouver.ca)

---

**From:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 5, 2023 12:18 PM  
**To:** Erika Syvokas <esyvokas@westvancouver.ca>; Mark Sager <mark@westvancouver.ca>  
**Cc:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Subject:** Re: Clegg House HRA proposal

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside the organization from email address [REDACTED] s. 22(1). Do not click on 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.

Thank you Erika.

Again I express very emphatic surprise that this application is being aggressively fast tracked by Staff notwithstanding that the Ambleside LAP has not been completed.

I, and I am very certain, the rest of the community that is directly impacted by this, had assumed that this application had been put on hold pending the completion of the LAP which completely counter indicates this application. In sum, to the best of my

knowledge, no one in the directly impacted community had any idea that this application would be discussed at the Sept 25 Council meeting.

It seems absurd and totally contrary to Natural Justice standards that the community would be given actual Notice of an “Information Meeting” scheduled for Oct 10 but not be given Notice of an actual Sept 25 Application to Council to designate the subject property as a Heritage asset, to set fast track dates for a Public Hearing , etc.

I also note that the circular distributed on or about Oct 1 to those within 100 meters makes no reference to an Oct 23 Public Hearing notwithstanding that it is now apparent that that date was set by Council before the circular was distributed.

It also seems highly anomalous that your Report to Council would be so gushingly and embarrassingly supportive of this Application prior to any meaningful public input.

In this regard I note your reference to various “inputs” in relation to a facially absurd early 2022 proposed application that included an additional coachhouse, a B+B etc. As indicated above, from the perspective of the directly impacted community , that application appeared to have been properly abandoned , without more. We now belatedly discover that you and your colleagues have been burrowing away on this application in secrecy.

I also note your insistence that this application does not seek rezoning but that is the real world effect of what is proposed—if it looks, walks and sounds like a rezoning application then that is what it is , no matter what costume it wears. It is thus inexplicable that there has been no calculation of the forgone CAC that that this disguised rezoning application requests that West Vancouver taxpayers are being asked to pay on behalf of this proponent.

*Without this information, and adequate time for the impacted community to prepare to be heard , this Public Hearing should be summarily adjourned.*

As Ms McGuire’s email address is not immediately available on your website please forward this email to her and to Mayor and Council.

If a formal application to adjourn this ill scheduled Public Hearing is required please advise when that application might be heard so that I may arrange to attend to speak to it.

s. 22(1)

West Vancouver, BC s. 22(1)

s. 22(1)

Privileged and Confidential

s. 22(1)

On Oct 5, 2023, at 8:24 AM, Erika Syvokas  
<[esyvokas@westvancouver.ca](mailto:esyvokas@westvancouver.ca)> wrote:

Hello s. 22(1)

Thank you for your email regarding the proposal for 1591 Haywood Avenue.

Please find responses to your specific questions in **red** below.

a) the specific amendments to, or variations from, the current existing and applicable zoning that would be required to implement the current proposal as outlined in Notice of Development served last weekend;

The Report to Council (see link [here](#)) for the proposed Heritage Revitalization Agreement, Heritage Designation and Development Permit describes the proposed variances (see pages 11-12 of the PDF). Specific variances to the zoning bylaw are identified on Page A-4 (page 99 of the PDF) of the architectural plans attached as Appendix C to Heritage Revitalization Agreement Bylaw No. 5234, 2023.

b) the nature and amount of the financial development charges, etc, that would otherwise be applicable to this development proposal if it was to be pursued and approved as a rezoning application rather than as a purported heritage preservation application.

The applicant pays development applications fees per the Fees and Charges Bylaw, 5199, 2022. Any additional or administrative costs are considered cost recoverable and are borne by the applicant. If the proposal is approved, the applicant would also be required to provide applicable Development Cost Charges for one new residential single family lot at the building permit stage.

In accordance with the District's Public Amenity Contribution Policy, developments where a rezoning is necessary are expected to deliver a Community Amenity Contribution (CAC). The value of the CAC is proportional to the increased potential of land use in comparison with existing zoning and land uses onsite. CAC's are not applicable to HRA proposals. As such, an evaluation of the CAC that would be applicable if this was a typical rezoning application (by a 3rd party financial consultant using a land residual approach) has not been completed for this project.

Please note that the Public Hearing and concurrent public meeting is scheduled for October 23, 2023 (not October 25).

Sincerely,

Erika Syvokas

Community Planner | Planning and Development Services | District of  
West Vancouver  
t: 604-921-2914 | westvancouver.ca

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
Sent: Wednesday, October 4, 2023 3:54 PM  
To: Erika Syvokas <[esyvokas@westvancouver.ca](mailto:esyvokas@westvancouver.ca)>  
Cc: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
Subject: Clegg House HRA 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.

Good afternoon Erika.

[REDACTED] s. 22(1) and I own [REDACTED] s. 22(1), [REDACTED] s. 22(1) of this proposal site, [REDACTED] s. 22(1).

I was very surprised to see this rezoning (aka HRA) application being brought forward on very short notice prior to the completion of the Ambleside Local Area Plan.

In light of the short notice I have been unable to retain a development consult to assist me to conduct a full cost benefit analysis of this project prior to Oct 10 and 25.

In these circumstances and in order to permit me to assess the costs and benefits of this proposed application and to meaningfully participate in these processes could I please ask you to provide me with a list and description of:

a) the specific amendments to, or variations from, the current existing and applicable zoning that would be required to implement the current proposal as outlined in Notice of Development served last weekend;

b) the nature and amount of the financial development charges, etc, that would otherwise be applicable to this development proposal if it was to be pursued and approved as a rezoning application rather than as a purported heritage preservation application.

Thank you very much in advance for your anticipated assistance.

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

s. 22(1)

Privileged and Confidential

s. 22(1)

**From:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Sunday, October 22, 2023 5:54 PM  
**To:** correspondence  
**Cc:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Subject:** Overwhelming support for the Clegg House sustainable 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.

Dear district officials:

We are writing to express our wholehearted support for the Clegg House project currently under consideration. We are long term residents of West, Vancouver, [REDACTED] s. 22(1). We deeply value our community's heritage and future and believe that this project aligns perfectly with the District of West Vancouver's Official Community Plan (OCP).

One of the key merits of this project is its commitment to the restoration and permanent preservation of the Clegg House. It is crucial that we make every effort to retain our heritage structures, a goal that is explicitly endorsed in the DWV OCP, which we read even outlines financial incentives for such preservation.

We have watched our city grow from family homes, some passed on by generations to massive, very unattractive homes that are hardly inhabited! This project's proposal for the subdivision of a large lot into two similarly sized lots is in harmony with the character of our neighbourhoods. This approach respects the existing fabric of our community while accommodating the need for gentle density, which is essential for diversifying housing options. It is important to consider the future of our community, ensuring that it remains accessible to our children. Without diversifying our housing options, it will become increasingly difficult for them to afford living here, especially if every lot remains single-family. We are raising [REDACTED] s. 22(1), one of whom has [REDACTED] s.22(1), and there is no way he will be able to afford living in the community in which he grew up.

We are not stake holders in the Dundarave community, and do not have a vested interest in this specific project but we wanted to express our support as we believe this is the way for a sustainable future. We not only believe Clegg's house should be permitted, but also all similar project throughout all our neighbourhoods.



**We understand that there may be some opposition to this project, but we encourage you to ignore these whiners who are just resistant to any change without proper education on sustainable future planning. We firmly believe that change is necessary for the growth and preservation of our community. Different housing options are very lacking in West Vancouver's aging populations and we would love to see our children and their friends being able to afford smaller, standalone homes or town houses in unique development, such as Clegg Heritage House!**

**We urge you to pass the Clegg House project and all similar projects that provide a thoughtful and balanced approach that adheres to the principles set forth in the DWV OCP.**

**Regards,**

s. 22(1)

**West Vancouver**

s. 22(1)

**From:** s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Sunday, October 22, 2023 5:56 PM  
**To:** correspondence  
**Subject:** 1591 Haywood

**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.

Re Proposed Bylaws 5234, 5235, 2023

We take issue with the following:

**Designation of this project as a heritage revitalization.**

The existing house was occupied by s. 22(1) for more than 40 years and is known to residents as s. 22(1) house, not the Clegg House. This house is set in the middle of the lot among a grove of cedar trees. The project would remove 6 of these trees, move the house forward to the southwest corner of the lot and raise it to provide a garden level suite. Moving it and raising it destroys any heritage value to our way of thinking. The proponent does gain a significant advantage in heritage designation in issues such as Floor Area Ratio (FAR) which can be increased to 0.5 from 0.3. We recommend that this application for heritage revitalization be defeated.

**Application for a tax exemption**

A tax exemption would create a new category of tax exemptions, which we understand are limited to non-profit organizations, housing societies and places of worship. We are not in favour of categories relating to real estate development and recommend that this exemption request be turned down.

In summary, we disagree with the heritage designation of the proposed moved, raised house at 1591 Haywood. And we certainly are against any tax exemptions for this project.

Thank you for considering our opinion.

s. 22(1)

---

**From:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Sunday, October 22, 2023 6:33 PM  
**To:** correspondence  
**Cc:** Erika Syvokas  
**Subject:** Oct 23 council meeting re 1591 Haywood Ave. proposed Heritage revitalization Agreement  
**Attachments:** letter to council re 1591.pdf

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

**Further to:**  
**RE: 1591 Haywood Ave Heritage Revitalization Agreement Bylaw No. 5234, 2023 and Heritage Designation Bylaw No. 5235, 2023**

I have submitted a comment about the physical plan of this redevelopment proposal but feel I need to also comment on the financial and density incentives being proposed..

Honestly, in my opinion this lot was likely to be subdivided eventually, obviously needing variances both waterway and street. With new legislation coming down from provincial government new attitudes and pressures on municipal governments to densify, these variances are more likely to be granted.

Below is the ammended document that I have added #4 concern to. This matches the document that I placed in the drop box at city hall. [REDACTED] s. 22(1)

To West Vancouver Mayor and Councillors  
cc Erika Syvokas, Community Planner  
October 20 2023

**RE: 1591 Haywood Ave Heritage Revitalization Agreement Bylaw No. 5234, 2023 and Heritage Designation Bylaw No. 5235, 2023**

My name is [REDACTED] s. 22(1) I live at [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

This redevelopment proposal is certainly an improvement from the original proposal from Jan 2022. I do have a few concerns however.

1. The proposal for a separate garage on the proposed north lot must stay as such and have a covenant on it to maintain this purpose not allowing any residential component to it.
2. At the original first meeting of January 25 2022, it was commented by the owner that the proposed redevelopment would not be all done right away but over 10 years. This type of timeline would be unacceptable for quality of life to [REDACTED] s. 22(1) There has to be a significantly shorter time frame to carry out this proposal if it is approved.
3. Off street parking must be maintained. There should be no allowances for decreasing off street parking due to a heritage designation. This block of Haywood Ave has a footbridge at the east end making it a walking route for many. There are no sidewalks so it must not be "overparked" on a day to day basis. "Overparking" on 16th street also needs to be considered, no sidewalks here either and regularly have high school students walking down this street.) I repeat, there needs to be enough off street parking to match the increased density.
4. Calling this proposed project a Heritage revitalization agreement is a stretch to me quite frankly. The increase of density that it allows is plenty of incentive and the financial incentives, in particular the request for a 20 year tax exemption is quite unpalatable.

Thank you for your attention to this matter

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

I am not familiar with the normal financial incentives that are granted for this sort of redevelopment project though they seem very rich, I will only comment on the design.

5. (I unfortunately had [REDACTED] s. 22(1) [REDACTED] and the restoration and repair workers' trucks made for a very difficult parking situation, showing how important off street parking is.

**From:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Sunday, October 22, 2023 8:07 PM  
**To:** correspondence  
**Subject:** Support "The Clegg House" Application

**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 [REDACTED] s. 22(1) resident of Ambleside. My home [REDACTED] s. 22(1). I am fully supporting the approval of The Clegg House HRA Application. I know some of the owners in the Vinson and Rush House coach houses and the main character homes that were restored and they include [REDACTED] s. 22(1). These are home owners that significantly contribute to a diverse and inclusive neighbourhood. If we don't approve projects like the Clegg House we will just continue to see older homes torn down and building Mansions in Ambleside sold to offshore buyers who leave the homes vacant and destroy neighbourhoods...this is already the case in most of Ambleside. We desperately need infill housing projects in Ambleside..and it appears that the BC government is going to allow more density on single family lots throughout BC with legislation they are expected to introduce this year regardless of what BC cities have previously controlled. Let's get ahead of the changes coming and support the Clegg application. I have seen all the details of the project, the design and it will totally fit within other projects in the area such as the Rush, Vinson House and the house on Gordon and 16th that is a housing project for those with handicaps. Let's be an inclusive community that supports diverse and inclusive projects like the Clegg House application.

I am very educated regarding West Vancouver's Official Community Plan for Ambleside and Dundarave and I am equally knowledgeable with the HRA that West Van introduced about 5 years ago with a "MISSION" of saving our heritage homes. The Clegg House could not be a better example of what kind of properties we as a community should be trying to save. The Clegg House is totally within the same character, vintage as the Rush and Vinson approved projects. Thank goodness these homes were also saved from the wrecking ball.

The [REDACTED] s. 22(1) application is totally in alignment with the Rush and Vinson House projects. I have heard some people say that this is a money making venture for the sellers which is totally wrong. The previous Rush and Vinson projects that were done primarily for development purposes had virtually no profit to the developers. The [REDACTED] s. 22(1) are lifelong residents of WV and obviously have a love for character homes as any previous HRA approved projects equally have had people who love WV's history and are willing to put in a significant investment to keep the Clegg house a part of WV for future generations.

West Vancouver has been labeled a community that does not build enough homes by BC NDP Premier David Eby. The BC government has given us a failing grade on not approving developments and now has mandated that 1,432 units be built in WV by 2028. In order for WV to meet these targets we need projects like the Clegg House and many more projects that our new Officially Community Plan in Ambleside and Dundarave has failed to approve so far.

Please support this very worthwhile application!

Regards

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

**From:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Sunday, October 22, 2023 9:16 PM  
**To:** correspondence  
**Cc:** Mark Sager; Sharon Thompson; Peter Lambur; Christine Cassidy; Linda Watt; Scott Snider; Nora Gambioli  
**Subject:** Clegg House - Purported Heritage Preservation Applicati

**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,

Once again, we have a WV citizen coming before council, cap in hand with claims of financial hardship. This time, I am referring to the Proposed Heritage Revitalization Agreement (HRA), Heritage Designation and Development Permit for 1591 Haywood Avenue (Clegg House).

Here are my three points for your consideration.

1) The truth about the real heritage value of the Clegg House has been stretched and embellished. IMO the wool was clearly pulled over council's eyes when they voted on Sep 25th/23 to add it to the Community Heritage Registry (CHR) with no questions even asked. WV taxpayers deserve and demand answers from the staff (and Heritage Advisory Committee members) responsible for this travesty.

a) How was the Clegg House permitted to go from heritage **support building** status in 1987/88 to full heritage status in Sep 2023 aka listed on the CHR (and thus now eligible for an HRA and all its financial and non-financial incentives)?

b) What has changed the Clegg House so significantly (per the 2023 criteria for selection i.e. history, aesthetic, social/cultural/spiritual, educational, scientific values) to have dramatically increased its 1987/88 heritage score from 35 out of 100 to a score that now made it eligible for addition to the CHR? For that matter, what is its revised 2023 heritage score?

Per the DoWV Heritage Inventory 1987/88 report, the Clegg House achieved a measly 12 out of 45 score for its architectural history, 10 out of 35 score for its cultural history, 20 out of 20 score for its landscaping, neighbourhood, and visual/symbolic context for a total score of 42 out of 100 but then, most importantly, its heritage score was then downgraded to a 35 out of 100 due to its Integrity rating because '**Alterations considered recognizable**'. So even 60 years after it was built, it was neither considered a primary nor even a secondary heritage building by the DoWV!

Per the Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada, it clearly states 'Do not move a part of a historic place if its current location is a character-defining element'. As shown by that perfect 20 out of 20 context score in 1987/88, it's the placement of the Clegg House and its resulting relation to Vinson Creek and its generous setback and gardens that is the character-defining element and thus is what elicits the highest heritage value of the criteria evaluated. That integrity will all be lost with the proposed relocation of the Clegg House.

Here you can see for yourself why it received such a low heritage value score in 1987/1988. The house had already been recognizably altered by 1970 i.e. bay window added, mismatched siding, porch supports altered, missing window boxes, paint and trim colour altered, windows altered, etc.



Clegg House Circa 1930





Clegg House circa 1970

c) [REDACTED] s. 22(1) is the district's go-to heritage expert and it was he who evaluated and poorly scored this property's heritage value in that 1987/88 evaluation. Wouldn't it have been prudent to have sought his objective opinion on eligibility for adding the Clegg House to the CHR, rather than having relied on the subjective reports from the applicant and their heritage consultant, especially when it was so obvious that the real motive behind the development application is less about heritage preservation and more about getting their hands on the HRA benefits - i.e. permitted variances, extra density, waived Community Amenity Contribution, etc.

There was no proper heritage evaluation done! All that staff said during the Sep 25th/23 Council meeting was 'Based on documentation provided by the applicant's heritage consultant, it is eligible for addition to the CHR'. This is just not good enough! BTW The applicant authored Statement of Significance (SOS) has been read by me and IMO neither does it contain anything remarkable about the house or the Clegg family nor did its flowery language in any way justify this uprating in its heritage value. Furthermore, the applicant's heritage consultant's Conservation Plan provides no further clarity on the heritage value.

2) As if the aforementioned HRA incentives weren't enough, this applicant has also asked for a 20-year property tax holiday on the Clegg House (presumably for the two properties - i.e. both the upper main house and its future stratified basement suite) estimated to be \$96,000 but sure to be even more. This is a nonstarter and IMO any council member, as wardens of the public purse, would be committing political suicide if they were to vote in favour of this not to mention the precedence setting move this would be if it were approved.

It is outrageous for this applicant to push their tax burden on all other WV taxpayers because the applicant says 'It's so expensive to maintain a heritage house'. Not our problem, nobody forced them to buy it in 2021. Just like it's not our problem that the applicant wants to sub-divide when it would be considerably cheaper for them to preserve the Clegg House in place (or demolish it and build anew, we don't really care). Anyway, IMO it's no longer going to look anything like the original 1929 house let alone a heritage house once they've completed their planned facelift both inside and out.

So the greed meter is off the charts for me on this one. The applicant is going from having one marketable property to having three plus two rentals, including a legal coach house short-term-rental for the so called "heritage" property and the infill property is likely also to have some sort of secondary suite or be suite ready. Their original Floor Area Ratio (FAR) ask in 2022 was already high at 0.38 but now it's ballooned to .047! There is no danger that they will not be recouping all their costs and then some. They will be sitting pretty (and good for them) but it should not be at the expense of the rest of us taxpayers.

Furthermore, the applicant has already planted a new hedge on DoWV property along Haywood Ave which appears to now impact the proposed small boulevard communal garden plot. Instead, the applicant looks to have syphoned off +12 feet of district land for their own use as they have done with the district's blind lane at the north end, all without any compensation to the DoWV.

**3)** How exactly is this so called relocation/preservation/rehabilitation/restoration of the Clegg House benefiting the WV community? What are we getting in exchange for relinquishing all that revenue potential to the benefit of this applicant? While you're at it, please explain how the finished Clegg House supposedly aligns with the OCP objections i.e. how does it retain, protect and/or revitalize heritage assets within the community?

We get a heritage plaque installed at the front of the property which 'provides pedestrians a brief history and overview of the heritage significance'. Whoop-de-doo! This future house will NOT scream out 'heritage' to any passerby (and in all likelihood what will be a tall hedge by then is going to screen the house from the curious heritage seeker anyway).

Per the provided plans, the finished product for the Clegg House will look nothing like the original house. Per the Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada, it clearly states 'Do not create a false sense of historical development' and 'Use the gentlest means possible for any intervention' and yet this is exactly what is being done and not done here respectively!

But please judge for yourselves with this south view comparison - 1929 Clegg House versus 2021 Clegg House versus future Clegg House. The most obvious 1929 vs future differences - house moved to southern border, raised height of house to allow for 9' basement ceiling (for a stratified basement suite!), previously added bay window is not being removed (applicant is refusing - even though it would improve the authenticity of the front elevation), previously added back deck is being enlarged considerably and now covered, two more dormers are being added (and one much larger than the others), etc. and that's just the outside of the structure.



Clegg House circa 1930



Clegg House 2021



As one writer wrote in the Oct 11th/23 Correspondence (My alterations in *italics* but I couldn't have said it better myself). 'The consensus view of the *WV community* is that what is proposed here has **absolutely nothing to do with preserving heritage** (as the repositioned renovated Clegg House simply ends up appearing as a new build craftsman,

albeit without otherwise required setbacks) and is very obviously *motivated* simply by a desire to profit through subdivision and densification *and its exemption from the associated DoWV fees*'.

This is not a heritage preservation and/or conservation and/or protection application! The intention of this application will NOT restore the 1929 home to its former glory or bear any more than the slightest resemblance to it! It's already questionable integrity, style, quaintness, charm, character, and historic significance will be no more.

If the applicant's proposal is approved to proceed under the heritage banner, I feel it will make a complete mockery out of the Community Heritage Register, Heritage Revitalization Agreement, Heritage Designation Bylaw, and Heritage Advisory Committee.

I look forward to receiving the staff responses to my many questions. As always, I thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,

s. 22(1)

West Vancouver, BC

s. 22(1)

---

**From:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Sunday, October 22, 2023 9:48 PM  
**To:** correspondence  
**Subject:** Re Public Hearing 1591 Haywood Ave. West Vancouver  
**Attachments:** Scan Public Hearing 1591 Haywood, West Vancouver.pdf

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

I would like to submit the attached letter to Mayor and Council regarding the public hearing for 1591 Haywood Ave.

Regards

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

Sent from [Outlook](#)

October 22, 2023

Mayor Sager and Council  
West Vancouver , BC

Re: Public Hearing Notice 1591 Haywood Ave. West Vancouver

Dear Mayor and Council

We are writing to express our support for the above development.

As we understand it there is provision for this type of heritage based development in the West Vancouver Official Community Plan and this particular property qualifies for that.

The project allows for much needed infill housing. A concept that has been discussed by Council and and many West Vancouver residents. The site is a large corner lot, and well located-short walk to Ambleside, transit and schools. It should be noted that project is being proposed by a family firmly embedded in the community.

This project appears less dense than two other heritage style infills located at 12<sup>th</sup> and Jefferson and the 2000 block of Esquimalt, These two developments fit seamlessly into their neighborhood, as would this development.

This is an infill project with a relatively small increase in density in a well located area and should be supported by Council.

Regards

s. 22(1)

West Vancouver

**From:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Sunday, October 22, 2023 11:34 PM  
**To:** correspondence; mayorandcouncil@westvancouver.ca  
**Cc:** esyvojas@westvancouver.ca  
**Subject:** Heritage Revitalization Agreement for 1591 Haywood Ave

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

Dear Mayor Sager and Council:

We request that the subject HRA application be declined.

The proposed application is to the extreme and it appears to be using the HRA for financial gain. Should the objective truly be for heritage preservation, it could be accomplished by restoring the Clegg House alone without destroying its setting.

We appreciate the District's need for densification, but we do not welcome such an extensive and disruptive change in the quiet neighbourhood [REDACTED] s. 22(1). This negative change would be felt not only during the construction but also well after.

Yours truly,

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)





---

**From:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Monday, October 23, 2023 6:21 AM  
**To:** correspondence  
**Cc:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Subject:** Clegg House 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.

Councillors,

My name is [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
I live at [REDACTED] s. 22(1). I've been a West Vancouverite [REDACTED] s. 22(1).

I 100% support this project.

I think you're going find so few projects like this that actually address this district's need for slightly greater density and diversity of housing while still maintaining greater affordability and the neighborhoods characteristics.

Councillors. Please be honest with yourselves and ask the question of what will eventually be built here if we don't allow this?

All over the Cedardale neighbourhood and West Van I am just watching older Ranch style homes being torn down and replaced with a massive multimillion dollar monster home.

Please honestly ask yourself how do monster homes maintain the character of the neighbourhood and make for more affordable homes and more housing options?

Thank You

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

Sent from my iPhone

---

**From:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Monday, October 23, 2023 9:01 AM  
**To:** correspondence  
**Subject:** 1591 Haywood Ave Public Hearing  
**Attachments:** Clegg House Letter.pdf

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

Hello,

I believe there is a hearing at Council this evening around the Heritage Revitalization Project for 1591 Haywood Avenue.

Please find attached my letter [REDACTED] s. 22(1) to this project.

Please confirm receipt.

With thanks,

---

[REDACTED]  
s. 22(1)

s. 22(1)

West Vancouver s. 22(1)

22 October 2023

District of West Vancouver  
Legislative Services  
Municipal Hall  
750 17<sup>th</sup> Street  
West Vancouver BC V7V 3T3

Sent via email: [correspondence@westvancouver.ca](mailto:correspondence@westvancouver.ca)

**Re: 1591 Haywood Avenue Heritage Revitalization Project**

To Whom it May Concern:

As a s. 22(1) I wish to express my support for the heritage revitalization project as proposed by its owners as more fully described in the information website ([www.1591haywood.wordpress.com](http://www.1591haywood.wordpress.com)). The Clegg House is a historic home that deserves to be restored and kept in our community.

It is quite clear that the owners have made considerable efforts in their proposal to protect a home that is not yet designated as a heritage home but that they see potential to revitalize and keep within the community for decades to come. West Vancouver needs to have examples of its original architecture and this proposal enables the Ambleside community to preserve a long-standing home and bring it back to its former glory. I would dare say it will be costlier to enhance this home than to potentially replace it with a “spec home”.

It is my understanding that the owners have also taken many steps to appease local neighbour concerns in their subsequent proposal which I believe are reasonable and still make the project a viable one for the community and the owners. When we hear of densification projects being atop of the District’s Official Community Plan and particularly within blocks of Marine Drive in Ambleside it is quite refreshing and thoughtful to see a plan to improve the density of 1591 Haywood while preserving a home that we can all walk by and continue to appreciate.

I feel strongly that any sustainable housing development plan should blend a mixture of revitalized homes along with new construction. The Clegg House is a representation of how our community can accomplish community goals of gentle densification, preservation of historical architecture and fostering a sense of inclusivity of “old with new”. In fact, much of West Vancouver’s population consists of both senior citizens as well as newer families. This project represents a respectful approach to symbolizing how we embrace both our past but also our necessary future.

I have personally spoken with the owners of this project and I believe their intentions are bona fide and it is clear they have a vision that I believe we can all be proud of. It would be a sure miss to not support homeowners as passionate as these who wish to go above and beyond to preserve historical homes while embracing the needs of the community for sustainable density.

Respectfully,  
s. 22(1)

**From:** s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Monday, October 23, 2023 11:10 AM  
**To:** s. 22(1); correspondence  
**Subject:** Re: 1591 Haywood

**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.

Good morning,

I am s. 22(1) of the above proposed redevelopment project. My thoughts and opinions regarding the site and a prior proposal were stated in a previous email to the owners and District of West Vancouver on Feb. 11, 2022.

Regarding the current proposal and proposed bylaws, I am in full agreement and support of the opinion and comments in the October 22, 2023 email below from s. 22(1).

Again, to be clear, **I disagree with the heritage designation of the proposed moved, raised house at 1591 Haywood AND I am against any tax exemptions for this project.**

Thank you.

s. 22(1)

West Vancouver

----- Original Message -----

**From:** s. 22(1)  
**To:** [correspondence@westvancouver.ca](mailto:correspondence@westvancouver.ca)  
**Sent:** 10/22/2023 5:55:39 PM  
**Subject:** 1591 Haywood

Re Proposed Bylaws 5234, 5235, 2023

We take issue with the following:

**Designation of this project as a heritage revitalization.**

The existing house was occupied by s. 22(1) for more than 40 years and is known to residents as s. 22(1) house, not the Clegg House. This house is set in the middle of the lot among a grove of cedar trees. The project would remove 6 of these trees, move the house forward to the southwest corner of the lot and raise it to provide a garden level suite. Moving it and raising it destroys any heritage value to our way of thinking. The proponent does gain a significant advantage in heritage designation in issues such as Floor Area Ratio (FAR) which can be increased to 0.5 from 0.3. We recommend that this application for heritage revitalization be defeated.

**Application for a tax exemption**

A tax exemption would create a new category of tax exemptions, which we understand are limited to non-profit organizations, housing societies and places of worship. We are not in favour of categories relating to real estate development and recommend that this exemption request be turned down.

In summary, we disagree with the heritage designation of the proposed moved, raised house at 1591 Haywood. And we certainly are against any tax exemptions for this project.

Thank you for considering our opinion.

s. 22(1)

West Vancouver

**From:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Monday, October 23, 2023 11:48 AM  
**To:** correspondence  
**Subject:** Proposed Development—1591 Haywood Ave, 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.

To whom it may concern:

I am writing to support the development proposed for 1591 Haywood Ave in West Vancouver.

I am familiar with this lot/house and do not mind at all if additional units are potentially being added to this property. Especially if this means the house will be cared for and be given the upgrades it needs to remain intact.

Regards,  
[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

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

**From:** s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Monday, October 23, 2023 11:48 AM  
**To:** correspondence  
**Subject:** 1591 Haywood Avenue, West Vancouver, BC

**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 Whom it May Concern,

Re: Public Hearing/ Heritage Revitalization Project. No. 5234,2023

I am a resident/owner of s. 22(1), West Vancouver. Please note I share the same views as s. 22(1) West Vancouver.

Thank you,  
s. 22(1)

This Heritage Revitalisation Agreement seeks density and financial benefits through the relaxation of fees, charges and tax incentives to enable the Clegg House be rehabilitated. To do this the proponent wants to,

1. Subdivide their lot, a lot impacted by a major creek not large enough to form two lots under current zoning.
2. Cut down mature trees to accommodate the second house.
3. Move the house very close to both Haywood and Gordon challenging stated Municipal neighbourhood character objectives which have been lauded by the Canadian Institute of Planners, the professional body.
4. Significantly modify and change the Clegg House to accommodate their housing needs incurring cost to raise the building out of the ground, add dormer windows, a larger deck and significantly transforming the interior.
5. Add two apartments for their aging parents, one to be strata titled to enable sale the other over a garage, hardly suitable accommodation to age in place.
6. Waive full building code compliance.
7. Have a 20 year tax holiday.

I know this house well. It is a modest house whose charm is its setting, on the high point of the lot nestled in the trees by the creek. I know that many of neighbours share this view. And it seems that Dewhirst and Lessard Consulting, the heritage consultants retained by the proponent do likewise. On page 28 of their 56 page report they state, "the Clegg House should retain its presence at the corner of 16th Street and Haywood.....it should retain a significant relationship to Vinson Creek. The cluster of trees at the north west corner should be preserved".

The heritage consultant in their report state, “generally the building is in fair condition and well maintained for a building of its age”, page 11 of 56, implying reasonable costs to rehabilitate the building. It would appear the proponent does not share this view and others in the report.

For example, to minimise costs and to retain the heritage integrity of the building the consultants recommend the existing original windows be “refurbished with sash sashes to improve performance”, p 29 of 56. The proponent propose replacing the windows.

The heritage consultant recommends the front bay window installed at a later period be replaced to return the building to its original state . The proponents decline to do so. I could add further examples.

Instead, the scheme proposed by the proponents moves the building to increase density to derive revenue. This will incur significant construction costs, requiring deck and front porch to be replaced and the loss of the brick chimney which the heritage consultant feels is an important heritage feature. Services will need to be upgraded and groundwater mechanisms installed.

The scheme will incur a burden on the neighbourhood by changing the neighbourhood character and other impacts best described by those affected in the immediate vicinity.

It is my understanding that the purpose of a heritage agreement is to provide incentives to encourage the retention of heritage buildings. In this case this would best be achieved by keeping the building in its present location. Instead it would seem that moving the house will incur undue costs and benefits to the proponent with little heritage benefit thus defeating the objectives of a heritage agreement. The charm of the building as we know it would be lost. On balance it would appear that this proposal does little to retain heritage value just benefit to the proponent

I therefore respectfully ask that the Clegg House not be moved and the Heritage Revitalisation Agreement declined.

s. 22(1)

West Vancouver s. 22(1)



**From:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Monday, October 23, 2023 3:35 PM  
**To:** correspondence  
**Subject:** Public hearing October 23, 2023 Clegg house

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

Dear Mayor Sager and Councillors:

I am the proud owner of one of the [REDACTED] s.22(1) heritage homes on the North Shore. As a keen advocate for the preservation of heritage homes, I strongly support the Heritage Revitalization Agreement for the Clegg House.

HRA's are beneficial for our community because they preserve our history and create much-needed housing stock. The Vinson House Cottages on Gordon Ave, and Major Rush Mews on 12th & Jefferson Ave by Michael Gellar are excellent examples of successful HRA's that benefited the community, and I believe the Clegg House HRA will be just as successful.

Too often heritage homes are left to deteriorate and end up demolished due to neglect because there are often little incentives to protect and save them. It's more profitable for a developer to tear them down and build bigger, higher density housing. By supporting HRA's like the one for the Clegg House, you are ensuring that the Clegg House is protected for future generations to enjoy.

As a heritage homeowner [REDACTED] s.22(1), I understand the challenges the homeowners have faced. Given the difficulties and neighbourhood opposition, I find it admirable that [REDACTED] s. 22(1) are embarking on this heritage project. I hope it will serve as an example to other heritage homeowners on how to increase the development potential of their property such that it makes it financially feasible to protect their heritage home.

Finally, whether the neighbors like it or not, increased density is coming to the North Shore as announced by the B.C. government. If this HRA is not approved, then a developer may just buy this property, tear down the Clegg house, subdivide the property, and just build 3-4 units per lot for a total of 6-8 units as allowed by the B.C. government in the future. That would be far more profitable for the developer than just replacing the Clegg house with a single, much larger house like you currently see in the neighborhood. I believe that [REDACTED] s. 22(1) HRA is far better for West Vancouver and the neighborhood as it not only preserves our vanishing heritage, but is also far better than the increased density coming as mandated by the B.C. government.

Thank you.

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

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

Sent from my iPhone

---

**From:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Monday, October 23, 2023 5:30 PM  
**To:** Erika Syvokas; [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Cc:** correspondence  
**Subject:** Re 1591 Haywood Avenue Development Permit  
**Attachments:** Re 1591 Haywood Dev Proposal.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.

Please find attached our comments re the proposals surrounding this project.

We regrettably cannot join tomorrow's meeting in person [REDACTED] s.22(1) but are happy to clarify any points herein as requested.

Regards,

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

s. 22(1)

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

Dear West Vancouver Planning & Development Dept, Mayor and Council,

Similarly to our neighbours, we have been quite surprised by the notice of Recommendations stemming from the applications provided for the redevelopment of 1591 Haywood.

### **On West Vancouver Planning & Development Services Process**

Our last information surrounding this project was a Zoom call of January 25, 2022, on which at least one District Representative was present, where many immediate neighbours took part and outlined reservations about the proposed development.

From my notes, I see the following questions were raised, but not answered, in the meeting:

- What is the proposed total occupancy of the property?
- What is the proposed square footage of each building?
- What is the full plan for on-site parking to preserve emergency corridors and safe intersection navigation in an area which sees high foot traffic from West Van Secondary and neighbourhood walkers as well as heightened vehicle traffic at school start & finish?
- What is the creek covenant / overflow plan (for a creek that has overflowed and caused significant home damage to multiple downstream homes)

We have not heard anything since January 2022 and have returned s.22(1) to learn of these recent developments.

***How was the original feedback from the surrounding community considered during the staff evaluation?***

We are truly quite stunned that in the absence of any of these answers coming forward, that a plan has advanced through staff to council with recommendations that would support the project without following up the first consultation.

***Was Council informed that the neighbours had raised specific questions that had not yet been responded to at the presentation of these Recommendations on September 25<sup>th</sup>?***

Having renovated our home s. 22(1), we have worked through the process both with the District and directly with our immediate neighbours. We have had several other renovations / additions in the neighbourhood in the intervening years. In each and every case we felt fully informed and were very comfortable with density added or character changes to accommodate new owners' tastes.

While I have reviewed your response to [REDACTED] s. 22(1), questioning the process I note the item

*“Prior to submitting a formal application, the applicant submitted a preliminary development proposal and undertook preliminary public consultation to allow for initial staff review and public input. “*

My question would be, and what of the input? And of the dozen or more neighbours who expressed concerns or objections, whose email addresses are in the District’s hands, why were none notified at any point in the interceding 22 months of responses to the questions in that meeting, or notified in advance of the September 25<sup>th</sup> meeting of decisions taken subsequent to that meeting?

***Please explain your process between January 25,2022 and the rationale for the arriving at the Recommendations of September 25<sup>th</sup>.***

s. 22(1) is a quite engaged resident, having worked [REDACTED] s.22(1) with the planning dept, the [REDACTED] s. 22(1) and active with several [REDACTED] s. 22(1), so it is not for lack of attention to civic matters that this process has eluded our notice.

**From the letters noted by other neighbours, we are quite confident a due process of consultation, response and communications has not been followed here, given the prior engagement of the impacted residents and their previous participation in the process.**

## **Ambleside Local Area Plan**

As we understand it, the current Ambleside Local Area Plan is still in process, which would govern potential rezoning of the area to allow for more density and diversity of residents in the transit-accessible, small family-friendly area of West Vancouver.

Per the WV website:

### ***3. Neighbourhood areas:***

*Staff will wait for provincial direction regarding changes to the regulation of single-detached housing, assess any implications, and hold local conversations with residents in five single-detached neighbourhood areas ([see Map 2\(External link\)](#)).*

*Property owners within the five sub areas will be notified directly in 2024. We look forward to having these conversations with you then.*

***We look forward to continuing to work with community members and stakeholders on planning for the future of Ambleside.***

While this particular area can certainly absorb infill housing/single-home modification to support density, I note that it is **not included in the prioritized Five Single-Detached Neighbourhood Sub-Areas for higher-density housing.**

In light of this, and the fact that the LAP is in process, we do not favor a **spot rezoning** ahead of this in an area not even prioritized for it. It is spot rezoning, special developer considerations and other one-off actions that have placed us in such dire need of a Local Area Plan.

## **Contradictory Application for a Heritage Designation Bylaw and a Heritage Revitalization Agreement simultaneously**

Per the WV website *“A municipally designated heritage property is protected by a bylaw so that it cannot be altered or destroyed.”* If designated a Municipal Heritage Asset, the Clegg House ‘cannot be altered or destroyed’. The rest of the discussion is moot if this is to be done.

The application for a Heritage Revitalization Agreement requires that ‘restoration, preservation and protection’ of the property.

While the modifications to the home are certainly appealing appear to retain the original character, the absence of outlined preservation measures does not meet the spirit nor the letter of

## **Uncertainty surrounding the CAC Calculation**

Without the Heritage Revitalization Agreement – which notably requires that the property owner restore, preserve and protect the heritage property – this rezoning would be subject to a CAC calculation.

CAC calculation considers what should be a net addition to the community, however does not consider the negative impact to surroundings which result. In the case of significant alternations to the Clegg House, these are not fully scoped in our view – from the potential disruption to Vinson Creek, the loss of boulevard for runoff retention on a significant downslope, to substantial building and paving contributing to heat absorption to the devaluation of homes in a highly regarded, desirable neighborhood, in large part due to their proximity to the Clegg House.

## **Commentary on the Proposed Plan insofar as it is currently presented**

### ***Absence of Heritage Conservation Plan***

It is wholly unclear at this stage what the actual plans are to preserving the heritage aspects of the home. The Vinson Home’s Heritage Conservation Plan was quite detailed, enabling the community, including the immediate neighbours impacted by the densification proposal, to understand the project in full. We do not have this insight.

Viewing the proposed rendering of the Clegg House post-development, it appears to be a normal craftsman style home. Our own home is in this style – inside and out – but was essentially newly constructed in 2000. We received no considerations or bonussing of space or added buildings or lot division allowance for retaining interior features such as original pine floors, original interior doors and other heritage elements. If the home is to receive allowances, considerations and other release from standard property owner obligations and bylaw enforcements, the rationale for this must be underpinned with appropriate documentation, such as the Vinson Home developers provided.

### ***Home Siting***

In the case of the Vinson House, the large front yard of the home was considered a significant heritage feature of the home and required to be retained. The siting of the Clegg House is similarly a notable feature of the property. We would advocate for minimal disruption to the siting of the home (while not ruling it out entirely) as was done with the Vinson property.

### ***Number of Buildings, Proposed Occupancy***

We are greatly in favor of a thoughtful and considered rezoning that makes this possible, such as infill housing, the addition of suites and subdivision of single family housing.

We fail to understand how Recommendations could advance supporting this number of buildings on this lot – without the answers requested in January 2022 regarding proposed total occupancy and parking arrangements – and in the absence of the forthcoming Local Area Plan guidance that is intended to provide the structure for such decision-making.

### ***Vinson Creek Watercourse Protection Plan***

The plan should be part of the proposal given the potential impact to neighbouring houses of any work around the creek which may shift creekbeds or surrounding banks. With a dry run-off creek on our own property for which needed to provide both the specific plan and sign a creek covenant, and continue to need to negotiate due to its impact on our own home's foundation stability, I feel any consideration by Council must include a full plan, which the potentially impacted neighbours (specifically those along the east side of 16<sup>th</sup> below Haywood Avenue, and potentially above, and along Vinson Creek to the east) should have the opportunity to review with the District's environmental engineer.

In summary, neighbours have expressed support for a level of development here commensurate with adding needed densification, creating a financially feasible home ownership model for a young family in the neighbourhood to support income generation, co-housing with elderly parents and/or aging in place.

Any and all of that can be accomplished with a far more modest proposal than this that greatly adds to their own property value. What is truly difficult to imagine is 5 buildings on the lot, allowances granted for preserving heritage site while substantively altering both the building and the site and pushing forward with recommendations in the absence of answers to many outstanding questions.

We would be present to voice these concerns and engage in what could be a hopefully productive dialogue and consensus solution, however the timing of all of this precludes our in-person presence on October 23<sup>rd</sup> (as it did Oct 10 and Sept 25<sup>th</sup>).

We are confident that our neighbours can speak to these points on our behalf, and certainly are prepared to have an advance scheduled discussion with the proponents and the District to find an amenable solution for all.

---

**From:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Monday, October 23, 2023 7:20 PM  
**To:** correspondence  
**Subject:** Support for proposed development at 1591 Haywood Ave.

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

To Whom it May Concern,

I am writing to express my enthusiastic support for the proposed development at 1591 Haywood Ave, West Van, which includes the preservation and transformation of a heritage house. As a resident of Ambleside, I believe this project will not only enhance the neighborhood but also exemplify a harmonious blend of modernity and heritage preservation.

The idea of revitalizing a historically significant and beautiful house rather than replacing it is a testament to the care and commitment to our community's rich heritage. Furthermore, the addition of smaller units on this property not only complements the local architecture but also offers more affordable housing options for our community members, which is a step towards a more inclusive and diverse neighborhood.

This development is not just about bricks and mortar; it's about creating a more practical and beautiful space that can benefit the entire area. Its proximity to schools, job opportunities, and accessible transit on Marine Drive positions it as an ideal location for families looking for a convenient and vibrant place to call home.

I urge you to consider the broader positive impact this project can have on our community. It's a chance to preserve our heritage, promote affordability, and contribute to the overall aesthetic and practicality of our neighborhood. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

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

**From:** David Sander <david@hollyburn.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 19, 2023 10:37 AM  
**To:** correspondence  
**Subject:** Letter in Support of Ambleside Plan  
**Attachments:** Hollyburn Letter Regarding Ambleside Plan.pdf

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside the organization from email address david@hollyburn.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,

Please find attached a letter from Hollyburn Properties Ltd in support of the Ambleside Plan.

Sincerely,  
David Sander

--



*Building Rental Communities Since 1975.*

David Sander MSc | *Director*

E: [david@hollyburn.com](mailto:david@hollyburn.com) | BLOKEDhollyburn[.]comBLOKED

T: 604.662.7346 ext 1103 | F: 604.662.7355

Vancouver > Calgary > Toronto > Ottawa

[Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#) | [LinkedIn](#) | Instagram





HOLLYBURN  
PROPERTIES LIMITED



October 19, 2023

Sent to Correspondence@westvancouver.ca

Mayor M. Sager and Members of Council  
Corporation of the District of West Vancouver  
750 17th Street  
West Vancouver, BC  
V7V 3T3

Attention: Director of Legislative Services/Corporate Officer

Dear Mayor Sager and Members of Council

**Subject: Content and Adoption of the Ambleside Plan.**

Hollyburn Properties has owned rental and commercial buildings in West Vancouver's Ambleside Neighbourhood since 1974. Hollyburn also completed two new rental infill buildings in the Ambleside Apartment Area in 2021 that successfully added 42 new rental units to an existing rental tower and moved the property's density from 1.75 FSR to 2.5 FSR.

Over the 49 years Hollyburn Properties has been in Ambleside the neighbourhood has seen little change. As a whole, the District's population has grown just 18% over this period compared to 160% for Metro Vancouver. Still Ambleside remains an attractive, well-maintained local area. It is very popular for residential renters and owners, but less so for retailers.

Aside from the new rental at 2100 Bellevue, Hollyburn's three properties in Ambleside are each over 50 years old. Data from the DWV states that 96% of DWV's multiple family housing (strata included) was built 43-63 years ago. Maintaining older buildings is difficult, expensive, and bothersome for existing residents. Over the anticipated life of the Ambleside Plan many buildings will require significant upgrading and some will be demolished. As this renewal takes place, we believe the productivity of the land and nearby municipal infrastructure should be increased by redeveloping at higher than current densities.

» [HOLLYBURN.COM](https://www.hollyburn.com)

**VANCOUVER**

1650 Alberni St, Vancouver, BC  
T: 604.662.7345 | F: 604.662.7355

**CALGARY**

815 4th Ave SW, Calgary, AB  
T: 403.265.0100 | F: 403.234.7281

**TORONTO**

20 Prince Arthur Ave, Toronto, ON  
T: 416.923.5945 | F: 647.346.2754

**OTTAWA**

235 Bay St, Ottawa, ON  
T: 613.235.0342 | F: 613.235.0345



There may be some exceptions to the rule, but a building density of 1.75 times the lot area is usually the maximum allowed in Ambleside. We have not done a comprehensive survey but the CNV has approved densities 4 times as high, and the DNV has approved densities at 3.5 FSR.

In urban centres off the North Shore we found no allowable density lower than 3.5 FSR. Allowing more density on a negotiated basis through the Ambleside Local Area Plan will allow the District to obtain rental and other public benefits. DNV is currently negotiating density increases in its town and village centers to increase the supply of market and non-market rental.

We believe it is important the land use plan does not distinguish between rental residential, non-market rental residential, and condo residential. This balance is a decision that is best left to the rezoning applicant, municipal staff, and the Mayor and Council to determine at the time of rezoning. Designating the type of residential use today can create unnecessary barriers to housing supply five, ten or 15 years from now. This is because key economic variables are always changing (construction costs, interest rates, rent rates, operating costs, land prices, and so on). It is impossible to get the ratios correct today for a project tomorrow. It is not as simple as the “just take some of the value out of the land” approach we have seen in other Metro municipalities. If it were that simple our regional housing crisis would not be trending the direction it is.

We have studied the current OCP developed in 2017 that is looking out to 2041 and affordability is an aspiration in Sections 2.1.15 to 2.1.21 (22 policy statements). These sections have not yet been pursued with policy, programs or projects with few exceptions in the past five years. For example, Hollyburn’s recent Bellevue project did not benefit from any of these potential DWV policies. In fact, the cost of the project was significantly increased by the DWV’s requirements that included off-site servicing, development cost charges and community amenity payments. For these 42 rental units we paid about \$2,050,000 in DWV fee’s.

Of the Ambleside local area plan options presented, we favour Option 1 since it focuses higher density in the Ambleside core where it will create a much more vibrant and successful urban center.

We also like Option 3, since there are properties in Ambleside and elsewhere in the District that are languishing. The larger lots sizes and Ambleside’s south facing slope are very attractive for low rise multiple dwelling housing — still affording views and sunlight access for those uphill.



**HOLLYBURN**  
PROPERTIES LIMITED



Thank you for allowing us to share these thoughts with you as you contemplate the future of Ambleside. Well thought out new development is needed in Ambleside to serve the entire community for generations to come. Commercial rejuvenation requires customers and staff. Mixed use and higher density in and near the traditional core of West Vancouver will flourish with redevelopment underpinned by economically viable plans that serve the community's needs and aspirations.

Sincerely,

s. 22(1)

David Sander  
Director

cc: Jim Bailey  
David Hawkins

» [HOLLYBURN.COM](http://HOLLYBURN.COM)

**VANCOUVER**

1650 Alberni St, Vancouver, BC  
T: 604.662.7345 | F: 604.662.7355

**CALGARY**

815 4th Ave SW, Calgary, AB  
T: 403.265.0100 | F: 403.234.7281

**TORONTO**

20 Prince Arthur Ave, Toronto, ON  
T: 416.923.5945 | F: 647.346.2754

**OTTAWA**

235 Bay St, Ottawa, ON  
T: 613.235.0342 | F: 613.235.0345

---

**From:** Michael G. Armstrong <mga@armlaw.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 19, 2023 1:29 PM  
**To:** Mark Sager; correspondence  
**Subject:** Concerns re Proposed Zoning No. 4662 and Amendment Bylaw No. 5264  
**Attachments:** 2023 10 19 LT Mayor and Council re Proposed Zoning 4662, 2010 and Bylaw Amend. 5264.pdf

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside the organization from email address mga@armlaw.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.

Please see attached letter in opposition to the above-proposed zoning bylaw/zoning changes. Thank you.

Michael G. Armstrong

View Mont Estates Ltd  
2080 – 777 Hornby Street  
Vancouver, B.C.  
V6Z 1S4

# VIEW MONT ESTATES LTD.

---

2080 - 777 HORNBY STREET  
VANCOUVER, B.C.  
CANADA  
V6Z 1S4

MICHAEL G. ARMSTRONG

DIRECT: (604) 633 - 4282  
ASSISTANT: (604) 633 - 4284  
FAX: (604) 662 - 3231  
[mga@armlaw.com](mailto:mga@armlaw.com)

October 19, 2023

Via email to [correspondence@westvancouver.ca](mailto:correspondence@westvancouver.ca) and  
[mark@westvancouver.ca](mailto:mark@westvancouver.ca)

**Mayor Sager and members of Council  
District of West Vancouver**

Dear Mayor and Council:

Subject: The View Mont Tower, 2180 Argyle Avenue, Ambleside LAP, and  
Proposed Zoning No. 4662, 2010, Amendment Bylaw No. 5264, 023

We write to express our concerns about the above-noted Bylaw amendment proposal currently before Council. The proposal, if adopted, will result in a down-zoning of our property on Argyle Avenue and an additional 20 other properties in the Ambleside area, from the current zoning, which permits mixed strata and rental redevelopment, to new rental-only zoning.

We believe that the proposed downzoning of our properties will not have the desired effect of improving or preserving rental housing in West Vancouver and is also inconsistent with the goal of increasing non-rental housing through densification.

View Mont Estates Ltd ("View Mont") is a family-owned company. It was the original developer in the early 1970s of the View Mont Tower, a 12-story building with 50 rental homes on Argyle Avenue. View Mont continues to own and manage this property. The fifty homes have housed hundreds of households during their lifetime.

However, the View Mont Tower, like many of the other 20 properties identified in the proposed Bylaw amendment, is now over 50 years old. Our building is well-maintained but does not have the features and amenities one would currently expect, particularly for property in a prime location adjacent to the waterfront. As was typical in 1970, our ceiling heights are lower than the current standard and our renters still have access only to a common laundry facility. The kitchens and washrooms are small. Upgrading some building systems, while desirable, is impossible if the building is to remain continuously occupied.

Therefore, in recent years we began to consider the timeframe and the economics of redevelopment of our property. Although the current RM1 zoning permits strata development,

we have generally assumed that any redevelopment would not likely be 100% strata-owned units but would instead preserve modern rental units as part of a mixed strata/rental facility. Our plans for the future envision an attractive new development with all the new amenities that both tenants and owners desire and expect.

Council now has before it proposed Bylaw amendments that target 21 specific rental properties in the Ambleside area, including View Mont's property. No similar legislation is proposed for the many other properties that are strata-titled, commercial and/or institutional buildings now being slated for housing development. The rest of Ambleside, in fact, appears to have no limitation on the tenure of future development.

The stated goal of governments at all levels in Canada is to increase available housing overall and to preserve rental spaces. Preserving the ability of the owners of the 21 properties to economically redevelop their aging buildings with mixed strata and rental units would serve both of these policy objectives.

Restricting any redevelopment to rental housing, especially for properties in waterfront locations with high land values, will have the unintended consequence of making any redevelopment uneconomic from a business perspective. We fear that the result will be that redevelopment does not take place or is severely delayed, that the current rental stock at many of the 21 identified properties will continue to age, and that the additional density that strata-owned housing would offer will not materialize.

In summary, our building is soon reaching the end of its economic life and we cannot be expected to help West Vancouver revitalize and make Ambleside more vibrant if the proposed constraints are implemented. Prohibiting tenure choice and suppressing the density of development will not make our building or the current aging rental stock easy to replace.

Policies like density bonusing for rental replacement and providing for both strata and rental tenures in a single development will both enable a wider range of households to live in safer, up-to-date accommodation in Ambleside.

We appreciate Mayor and Council understanding our concern about this pending Bylaw change. We ask that you seriously consider whether the proposed amendments impede rather than advance the goals of increased density and rental preservation. We hope and expect that after appropriate consideration the proposed change will not be approved.

Yours truly,

View Mont Estates Ltd.

s. 22(1)

Michael G. Armstrong, Director

**From:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Monday, October 23, 2023 11:08 AM  
**To:** correspondence; Mark Sager; Nora Gambioli; Sharon Thompson; Christine Cassidy; Linda Watt; Peter Lambur; Scott Snider  
**Subject:** Re: Ambleside Local Area Plan (LAP): Apartment Area Proposed Zoning and OCP Bylaw Amendments – Agenda Item #4 – Regular Council Meeting, Oct. 23, 2023

**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 Councillors, the following presents this resident's views on the D. Hawkins's proposed zoning and OCP bylaw amendments to presented to Council this evening.

Take-away: Aggressive re-zoning intended to drive existing land uses away to be replaced by higher density.

Land-use contracts on 1300-blk Clyde and Duchess to force the strata-unit owners to sell under pressure to be exerted by BC Assessment increased land tax assessment values resulting from hypothetical unbuilt residential units in the air-space over the land parcels currently occupied by up to 4 storey strata-units on these two sites. Increased tax assessment values have had a highly negative impact on mixed commercial-residential zoned sites in the City of Vancouver as reported by the Vancouver Sun. This is an example of the uncompensated negative externalities that local government re-zoning actions have on current residents.

Fire Hall No. 1 has recently undergone a multi-million dollar renovation and seismic up-grade. The planner is proposing that the fire hall site be rezoned to high-density residential rental housing units. The planner states in section 4.0 Financial Implications that there are no negative financial implications. Rezoning the fire hall site at 16<sup>th</sup> and Fulton to high-density residential housing use will require the demolition of the Fire Hall No. 1 at significant cost to the District property owners (long-term capital assets) and will require the District to find another suitable site for the replacement Fire Hall No. 1 when the fire hall site is alienated by sale/purchase by a private property speculator seeking to construct high-density multi-family housing on the site. The planner does not address this financial implication nor suggest an alternative site for a replacement of Fire Hall No. 1. Does he think that the District can do without a fire hall in the Ambleside area? Does he expect the District of West Vancouver to rely on the City of North Vancouver Fire Department and the District of North Vancouver Fire Department to come to West Van's rescue in the event of an apartment fire in the Ambleside Apartment Zone? If so, think again.

1800-block Marine Drive is a mix of residential and commercial land uses, but the planner is proposing to turn this retail section of Marine Drive into exclusively residential use only. He envisions another "Guinness" will spring up on the lots on the north and south sides of the 1800-blk. Marine Drive. Is he prepared for the fight that this will entail? Once more, think again.

Surprising things seem to happen in the planning department. The Cenotaph at Memorial Park, right across from the West Vancouver Memorial Library, is going to be replaced by a multi-family apartment building in the planner's proposed revisions to the OCP and Zoning bylaws. This will be news to most residents of West Vancouver, but it is being slipped in as part of the package presented by the planner. Will Council speak up and save the Cenotaph from the tender mercies of the real estate speculator?

Rezoning a property from fee-simple to fee-simple rental only is tantamount to a soft expropriation of the land, if the rezoning is not undertaken at the behest of the current property owners of record. The re-zoning should not proceed without an in-depth consultation of the affected property owners. I know that the planner will respond that Council does not need to consult with the affected owners because the planner has consulted

with 640 individuals (unidentified) who may or may not have a connexion to the lots in question or even to West Vancouver, but that does not preclude Council from taking the extra step against the planner's druthers. Planners invariably believe that they have a mission to convert all land to higher density or restrictive use under the political direction of the provincial government in Victoria. But that need not concern us when it comes to determining how we proceed with land use changes of the type that the planner is advancing. Where a soft expropriation is anticipated from an unilateral rezoning change, it behooves Council to go the extra distance and consult specifically with the affected property owners of record before proceeding to rezone the land.

West Vancouver is purported to have a population of 42,000 individuals, yet the planner asserts that his consultation with 640 individuals is to be considered adequate consultation for the purposes of the Local Government Act. Let's put that number in context – divide 640 by 42,000 to obtain the ratio 0.0152:1 or 1.52% of West Vancouver's usual residents. In a proposed plan this aggressive and with the minimal number of objections that I have space to raise in this communication, I think that Council has to be wary of proceeding precipitously at this juncture on the planner's proposed zoning and OCP changes.

The planner asserts that the financial implications of the proposed land use changes will all be positive, that there will be no negative externalities, and no negative financial implications arising from his proposed rezoning and OCP bylaw amendments. His assertion is clearly wrong. He has not taken the time nor effort to comply with the Council procedure to determine the full extent of the financial implications of the changes he proposes. Council must require the Municipal Manager to take measures that will fully inform Council of the financial implications of proposed land use changes, rezoning bylaw amendments, and OCP amendments that could result in higher taxation to fund capital and operating expenditures, reduce general revenues, or entail increased expenses for the District that raise property taxes or could be foreseen to raise property taxes to maintain service levels, arising from the planner's proposed changes to zoning and/or OCP.

This review is not a comprehensive nor a complete review of the proposed zoning and OCP amendments and their anticipated effect on the District and its residents. Council should obtain a second opinion from a qualified arms-length review before proceeding with the proposed zoning and OCP amendments.

Regards,

s. 22(1)

s. 22(1)

, West Vancouver, BC

s. 22(1)

s. 22(1)



**From:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Monday, October 23, 2023 11:00 PM  
**To:** correspondence  
**Cc:** Mark Sager; Christine Cassidy; Nora Gambioli; Scott Snider; Linda Watt; Peter Lambur; Sharon Thompson  
**Subject:** Provincial Ministry Approval Required for Environmentally Protected Area Developments

**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

As indicated in my correspondence of Oct 18, 2023 according to correspondence to me from the Ministry of Water, Land, and Resource Stewardship, and the January 2022 Provincial Ombudsperson reports:

*“As West Vancouver is regulated under the RAPR, there is a requirement for any proposed development within the 30m riparian assessment area (RAA), to have a RAPR assessment completed by a Qualified Environmental Professional (QEP) and submitted to the province for review and approval before any development occurring. As this development is proposed within the 30m RAA a QEP **must** complete and submit a RAPR assessment to the Province through the Riparian Areas Protection Notification System (RARNS). Once it comes through, the RAPR Biologists review the assessments and will reject it if it does not meet RAPR standards. If it is rejected the QEP needs to rectify the issues and re-submit the assessment until it meets RAPR standards and can be approved.”*  
*(emphasis in original)*

This review and approval by the Ministry would also apply to the Ambleside LAP because developing the riparian areas by cutting down riparian trees/vegetation (which would scorch the creeks and kill the fish) by “daylighting” them would of course be exactly contrary to the *Riparian Area Protection Act*.

This review and approval by the Ministry also means that independent riparian biologists will be making assessments solely in the best interests of the environmentally protected riparian areas, instead of solely the interests of (often external) Developers’ Consultants/QEPs/Staff represented. This is apparently a well known problem.

As the Ombudsperson put it in January 2022:

*“Regulatory changes have removed the ability of QEPs to provide opinions on development that are contrary to the [RAPR] Regulation, and the ministry’s new ability to reject assessment reports, discussed below, is instrumental in addressing QEP [Qualified Environmental Professional] non-compliance.<sup>28</sup> ...*

*We described in *Striking a Balance* how local governments were notified as soon as the ministry received an assessment report – meaning local governments could proceed with the development approval process regardless of the content of the report.*

*The ministry now has regulatory authority to reject QEP assessment reports [as found in the Haywood application] if it considers in its review that the assessment or assessment report does not comply with the requirements (Recommendation 12). This is a key mechanism for addressing QEP non-compliance.<sup>29</sup>*

*QEPs no longer have the ability to ignore review corrections, but must implement them and resubmit their report for further review by the ministry. In addition, local government notification may be postponed until the*

*ministry's review is complete.<sup>30</sup> As a result of this process, local governments can more confidently proceed with approving development knowing that the ministry has considered the report's quality and accuracy. ...*

*While the ministry is responsible for monitoring regulatory compliance, responsibility for enforcing compliance lies with local governments and the DFO. It is therefore crucial to the efficacy of the ministry's compliance efforts that the compliance information it collects is systemically organized to inform enforcement action" (**emphasis added**)*

Could you please ensure that Staff is aware of these regulatory requirements? I would also like to request that any presentations or proposals presented by District staff inform the tax paying public whether they have sought and obtained the required Ministry approvals. This will save time in checking on the status through provincial requests for information.

s. 22(1)

WV

---

**From:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 24, 2023 1:42 PM  
**To:** correspondence  
**Subject:** Fireworks Ban - Boo!

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 just read the news today that you have banned Halloween fireworks. Boo...! I am so disappointed and actually sad. Our neighbourhood has celebrated Halloween night together with fireworks for the last [REDACTED] s. 22(1) with fireworks. It the one time of year that we actually all get together - the elderly, the children, the parents - we all get together and have a fun, safe, exciting evening (with our permit). We even have a number of people contribute to the fireworks fund. And I hear of other West Vancouver neighbourhoods doing the same. It gives me joy to think that families, cut-de-sac's and communities around West Vancouver are getting together likewise. It is a lively evening and there is always a sense of excitement in the air.

And now, because of a few kill joys that have forgotten what it means to be young, we have to bury a much loved and much anticipated tradition. I think this is so sad.

No more fun for you!

And for all of you that already planned your celebration and bought your fireworks, we are going to ban it just a week and half before the event. Really?!

How sad that a few people have the right to ruin the celebration for the whole. I am not surprised that nobody wrote in in support of fireworks. The people that support them are too busy raising their families, going to work, and living their lives to even know that a few fuddy duddy's are complaining about their dog's anxiety one night a week. And what else does the fire department have to do? I thought they enjoyed the activity of having people come in and get their permits. I always have a great conversation with the officer on duty - this happens only once a year!

Surely our society isn't becoming so sophisticated and responsible that we forget what makes up a fun time. How many of you on council also enjoyed fireworks around Halloween when you were a kid. Do you really want to be the council that kills the fun for hundreds of West Van kids and families?

Please reconsider this ruling. Let's be a community that embraces family and fun and celebration. Not squash it for some grey joyless sense of self important responsibility,

Disappointed and sad,

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

West Vancouver

**THE CORPORATION OF THE DISTRICT OF WEST VANCOUVER  
CODE OF CONDUCT COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES  
RAVEN ROOM, MUNICIPAL HALL  
MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 18, 2023**

---

Committee Members: D. Moss, D. Thomas; and Councillors S. Snider (Chair), N. Gambioli, and P. Lambur (Acting Chair) attended the meeting in the Raven Room, Municipal Hall.

Staff: E. Glickman, Director, Human Resources & Payroll Services; P. Cuk, Manager, Legislative Operations/Deputy Corporate Officer (Staff Representative); and T. Azuma, Committee & Policy Coordinator (Committee Clerk) attended the meeting in the Raven Room, Municipal Hall.

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 3:01 p.m.

**2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the September 18, 2023 Code of Conduct Committee meeting agenda be approved as circulated.

CARRIED

**3. ADOPTION OF MINUTES**

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the July 24, 2023 Code of Conduct Committee meeting minutes be adopted as circulated.

CARRIED

**REPORTS / ITEMS**

**4. Review of Proposed Code of Conduct**

Committee members commented, and staff responded to the committee's questions regarding: the focus of the discussion; scope of the proposed bylaw; external legislation that would affect the proposed bylaw; process and timeline to file a complaint; types of interactions between Council and staff, volunteers and advisory body members; and implicit authority.

Councillor S. Snider left the meeting at 3:33 p.m. Councillor P. Lambur assumed the Chair.

Committee members commented regarding the different types of interactions between Council and staff, volunteers and advisory body members.

Councillor S. Snider returned to the meeting at 3:34 p.m. and assumed the Chair.

Member Thomas offered to continue revising the proposed bylaw and update the committee at its next meeting.

Committee members commented, and staff responded to the committee's questions regarding: input from other members of Council; complaint process; appointment and role of an integrity commissioner; precedence set by other municipalities; role of the Municipal Manager; confidentiality of the complaint process; enforcement of resolutions; and scenario testing the proposed bylaw.

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the discussion regarding Review of Proposed Code of Conduct be received for information.

CARRIED

**5. PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

E. McHarg commented regarding: the progress made by the committee; inclusion of mental health in the Code of Conduct; expected conduct of electoral candidates; formal and informal power of Mayor & Council; and discussion on scenario testing.

**6. NEXT MEETING**

Staff proposed dates, times and locations for the next two committee meetings. Committee members commented regarding availability.

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the Code of Conduct Committee Meeting Schedule for 2023 be adopted as follows:

- October 23, 2023 at 3 p.m.; and
- November 20, 2023 at 3 p.m.

AND THAT all remaining Code of Conduct Committee meetings for 2023 be held in the Main Floor Conference Room at Municipal Hall.

CARRIED

**7. ADJOURNMENT**

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the September 18, 2023 Code of Conduct Committee meeting be adjourned.

CARRIED

The meeting adjourned at 4:41 p.m.

Certified Correct:

s. 22(1)  
[Redacted Signature]

Chair

s. 22(1)  
[Redacted Signature]

Committee Clerk



**WEST VANCOUVER MEMORIAL LIBRARY BOARD**

**MINUTES**

**September 20, 2022, 7:00 p.m.**

**Welsh Hall**

**Present:** T. Wachmann [Chair], C. Garton, B. Hafizi, A. Krawczyk, S. Sanajou, S. Thompson, L. Yu

**Absent:** P. Cottier, D. Diedericks, A. Nimmons, R. Shimoda

**Staff:** S. Hall, S. Gill, S. Felkar, S. Barton-Bridges, T. Matsuzaki, S. Dale

**1. Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m.

**2. Approval of Agenda**

Moved by: T. Wachmann

Seconded by: S. Thompson

THAT the Agenda be approved.

CARRIED

**3. Approval of Consent Agenda**

Moved by: A. Krawczyk

Seconded by: S. Thompson

THAT the Consent Agenda be approved.

CARRIED

**4. Business Arising from Minutes**

None.

**5. Director**

**a) Update**

S. Hall provided an update on the Director's report. Please see report attached.

S. Hall thanked T. Wachmann for attending the All Staff meeting on September 14, 2023. T. Wachmann brought treats to celebrate the IFLA Green Library Project award with staff and her generosity was very much appreciated.

S. Hall mentioned that she will present at the September 25, 2023 Council meeting and will highlight the following:

- IFLA Green Library Project Award, BCLA Eureka! Award, American Library Association PRXchange awards
- 2022 Impact report
- Increase in usership
- Youth space consultation
- Brain Health collection

b) Stats

S. Felkar provide an update on recent stats and noted that visits, enquiries, circulation, and program attendance has increased significantly since the pandemic.

c) Staff Recognition, IFLA

S. Hall spoke to the International Federation of Library Associations (IFLA) Green Library Project Award for our Climate Writer in Residence program and ongoing environmental work, which stretches back nearly 20 years. She thanked S. Barton-Bridges and K. Sakamoto for their leading work on the Climate Writer program, the Green Team and past boards and directors for their vision and achievements, and the whole library team for all their ongoing care and innovation on climate issues.

S. Barton-Bridges reflected on this achievement noting it was a career highlight.

S. Hall sincerely thanked the Board for all their support through the process.

d) CCTV

S. Hall advised that after a walkthrough with the WVPD as part of the Violence Risk Assessment, it was recommended to install cameras at entrances and exists.

S. Hall spoke to the importance of protecting personal privacy. The Ad Hoc Policy Sub-committee will meet to review the Privacy Policy and it will be brought forward at an upcoming Board meeting.

In response to a question from the Board, S. Gill advised that the cameras will be installed by the end of the year.

In response to a question from the Board, S. Gill advised that video footage will be deleted after thirty days. He further advised that the network video recorder on which the footage is located is in a locked room with access only available to the Privacy Officer, Director, Business Manager, and Facility Services Coordinator and the computer itself also has IT access controls.

Moved by: B. Hafizi

Seconded by: L. Yu

To direct WVML staff to:

- 1) Install cameras at the front of the library entrance and inside the back staff entrance and
- 2) Implement processes and procedures to comply with FOIPPA.

CARRIED

## 6. Governance

### a) Board Recruitment

T. Wachmann spoke to the Board recruitment process this fall and advised that C. Garton and R. Shimoda will be leaving in December. She noted that the Board currently has 11 Trustees, but can have a maximum of 13 and asked the Board their preference. She highlighted some of the attributes the Board HR Committee is looking for and the needs for skills, connections, personal qualities, and diverse perspectives.

Discussion ensued regarding diversity, and the recruitment of a member of youth or a member of the Squamish Nation was explored.

S. Dale is working with Legislative Services and will provide dates, deadlines, and any other details once finalized.

## 7. Strategy

### a) Strategic Framework

S. Hall provided an update on the process of the strategic framework review. The strategic framework will be presented to the Board at the November workshop for their feedback and S. Hall will return with a revised version at January's meeting. She mentioned that at last year's meeting, the Board asked to make minor revisions to the Framework to include more reference to the support and development of staff.



The Board spoke in support of this process as it provides flexibility.

8. Finance

a) Annual Budget & Financial Reporting Cycle

L. Yu advised that the Library's budget process is driven by the process and timeline established by the District of West Vancouver.

The Annual Budget & Financial Reporting Cycle Report is provided to the Library Board for information.

The Board expressed their thanks to S. Gill for his efforts.

b) 2023 Q2 Report

L. Yu advised that the Finance Committee reviewed the 2023 Q2 report and no concerns were noted.

The Board expressed concerns regarding staffing capacity acknowledging that it is going to be a busy Q4. It was requested that this be brought forward at the October meeting for discussion as staffing levels need to be addressed.

Moved by: S. Thompson  
Seconded by: S. Sanajou

To accept the 2023 Q2 operating and capital results as presented.

CARRIED

c) Proposed 2024 Operating and Capital Budget Submission

L. Yu highlighted the one-time operating initiatives of \$45,000 for a librarian on a short-term contract to perform project and change management for the transition from the current electronic records management system (EDOCS) to a new Sharepoint system.

L. Yu spoke to circulation trends and the increasing demand for e-collections.

L. Yu also commented on the importance of staff personal development and training opportunities.

In response to a question from the Board, S. Hall advised that the Rick Hansen Foundation conducted an accessibility review in 2015 and some recommendations that have been completed include:

- Creation of a ramp from the accessible parking area to the Library entrance.
- Installation of an accessible book return.
- Painting of a high contrast white nose strip on the interior stairs.
- Availability of screen reading software in the Library.
- Installation of an accessible computer.

Moved by: L. Yu

Seconded by: B. Hafizi

To approve the proposed 2024 Operating Budget in principle, 2024 One-Time Initiatives, 2024 Capital Budget along with rankings, and the 2025-2034 Capital Forecast for submission to the District.

CARRIED

## 9. Infrastructure Committee

B. Hafizi reported on the following projects:

- Library staff are working with the District Facilities and Purchasing departments on the tendering process for the heating upgrades in the Library. An engineering consultant has been hired by the District to act as an advisor in reviewing the tender and in evaluating the bids. The plan is to issue the tender by the end of October.
- The Library end of life hot water tanks have been replaced – one in Welsh Hall and two in the staff area. The two tanks in the staff area have been replaced with one energy efficient heat pump water heater. Heat pump water heaters pull heat from the surrounding air and transfer it at a higher temperature to heat water in a storage tank. This change will result in energy and cost savings.
- A contractor has been hired for the Help Desk renovation. DVD's have been moved to the West Wing and construction related work, including abatement, is expected to commence the week of September 25th. Protective hoarding will be erected in the construction area prior to construction and abatement work.
- An updated architectural design for the Elevator to the Rooftop parking project has been completed and engineers recommend a straight through elevator design located by the stairs leading up to the rooftop parking. We are awaiting the electrical design before discussing with Purchasing on whether or not a tender or direct award process will be initiated to hire a contractor.
- Urban Arts Architecture has done a walkthrough of the Mezzanine area and will be advising on a schematic design for that area, taking into account the seismic upgrades and renovations that are necessary in that area. Urban Arts will also be assisting in providing an updated cost estimate for the Mezzanine area and for the future Youth floor renovations.

A. Krawczyk suggested notifying the neighbours of the 4 a.m. construction and spoke to the importance of communication.

#### 10. Engagement Committee

C. Garton advised that the Engagement Committee will be meeting on October 4, 2023, to review the draft non-user report and discuss advocacy opportunities.

C. Garton encouraged Trustees to sign up for events that they are interested in attending in the Community Relations Opportunity calendar. She highlighted the following events:

- Annual Civic Reception to honor volunteer contributions to the citizens of West Vancouver on Thursday, October 12.
- NewToBC - A Presentation on Current Immigrant Settlement Facts, Figures and Issues on Wednesday, October 18.
- Joint North Shore & Bowen Island Library Boards workshop: Inclusive Governance on Wednesday, November 1.
- Special programming will be offered on September 30 to honour the National Day for Truth and Reconciliation.

S. Hall advised that the Library will be open on Remembrance Day to the public opening at 1 p.m.

#### 11. Council Update

S. Thompson provided an update highlighting the following:

- Her attendance at UBCM (Union of BC Municipalities) 2023 convention (September 18-22).
- West Vancouver's Mayor and Council and Senior Management attended a strategic planning day led by their Municipal Manager commenting that climate change is becoming a massive challenge.
- Mayor Sager passed on his congratulations on the success of the Summer Reading Club medal ceremony.
- Mentioned that her term as a Council liaison on the Library Board will be coming to an end in December and a new Council representative will be appointed for 2024.

#### 12. New Business

None.

#### 13. Date of Next Meeting

Wednesday, October 18, 2023, 7 p.m.

14. Adjournment

Moved by: S. Thompson

Seconded by: L. Yu

THAT the meeting be adjourned.

CARRIED

The meeting was adjourned at 8:32 p.m.

All documents distributed at the meeting are available for perusal upon request.

s. 22(1)

Tracy Wachmann  
Chair, West Vancouver Memorial Library Board

---

**From:** Weiler, Patrick - M.P. <Patrick.Weiler@parl.gc.ca>  
**Sent:** Friday, October 20, 2023 4:21 PM  
**To:** Weiler, Patrick - M.P.  
**Subject:** [Possible Scam Fraud]Letter from MP Patrick Weiler - Call for Proposals for the Youth Employment and Skills Strategy (YESS) Program  
**Attachments:** Letter from MP Patrick Weiler - 2023 YESS Program Funding Application Open.pdf

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside the organization from email address Patrick.Weiler@parl.gc.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.

---

**WARNING:** Your email security system has determined the message below may be a potential threat. The sender may propose a business relationship and submit a request for quotation or proposal. Do not disclose any sensitive information in response. If you do not know the sender or cannot verify the integrity of the message, please do not respond or click on links in the message. Depending on the security settings, clickable URLs may have been modified to provide additional security.

---

Good afternoon,

Please see the attached letter from MP Patrick Weiler detailing a call for proposals for the Youth Employment and Skills Strategy (YESS) Program.

Sincerely,  
Kevin Hemmat



Kevin Hemmat  
Office of Patrick Weiler MP  
Director of Communications  
West Vancouver-Sunshine Coast-Sea to Sky Country  
Office: 604-913-2660  
Cell: 604-353-2550  
Kevin.Hemmat.842@parl.gc.ca



Before printing this e-mail, think about the Environment



HOUSE OF COMMONS  
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES  
CANADA

*Patrick Weiler*

Member of Parliament  
West Vancouver-Sunshine Coast-Sea to Sky Country

October 20, 2023

Dear Friends & Neighbours,

Earlier this month, the Government of Canada **launched a call for proposals under the Youth Employment and Skills Strategy (YESS) Program of Employment and Social Development Canada (ESDC).**

Projects funded through this call for proposals will help improve labour market outcomes for up to 20,000 youth facing barriers to employment. ESDC will provide eligible organizations with up to \$5 million per year for up to four years (starting in 2024–25). The YESS Program will fund organizations to deliver a broad range of activities that help young people (aged 15 to 30). For example, funded projects might include activities aimed at providing mentoring, skills development and training, paid work experiences, or wraparound supports such as dependent care support or mental health counselling.

New to this funding cycle is an emphasis on supporting projects that target youth with disabilities and youth furthest from employment, such as those facing multiple and compounding barriers. Other priority groups include Indigenous youth, 2SLGBTQI+ youth, Black and other racialized youth, and youth in official language minority communities.

**Organizations are invited to apply for funding from now until 12:59 p.m. PST on November 22, 2023.**  
[Click here for details on how to apply for funding.](#)

Additional funding opportunities will be available this fall for organizations that provide volunteer and summer job opportunities for youth through the Canada Service Corps and Canada Summer Jobs.

If you have any questions, please reach out to our office. We are happy to support your application in any way that we can.

Sincerely,

Patrick Weiler, MP  
*West Vancouver-Sunshine Coast-Sea to Sky Country*

<i>Constituency</i>	<i>Ottawa</i>
6367 Bruce Street West Vancouver British Columbia V7W 2G5	Suite 282, Confederation Building 229 Wellington Street, Ottawa Ontario K1A 0A6
Tel.: 604-913-2660   Fax.: 604-913-2664	Tel.: 613-947-4617   Fax.: 613-847-4620

**From:** Weiler, Patrick - M.P. <Patrick.Weiler@parl.gc.ca>  
**Sent:** Friday, October 20, 2023 4:51 PM  
**To:** Weiler, Patrick - M.P.  
**Subject:** [Possible Scam Fraud]Letter from MP Patrick Weiler - Call for Proposals for Enabling Accessibility Fund's (EAF) Mid-Sized Projects Component  
**Attachments:** Letter from MP Patrick Weiler - 2023 Enabling Accessibility Fund's (EAF) mid-sized projects component.pdf

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside the organization from email address Patrick.Weiler@parl.gc.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.

**WARNING:** Your email security system has determined the message below may be a potential threat. The sender may propose a business relationship and submit a request for quotation or proposal. Do not disclose any sensitive information in response. If you do not know the sender or cannot verify the integrity of the message, please do not respond or click on links in the message. Depending on the security settings, clickable URLs may have been modified to provide additional security.

Good afternoon,

Please see the attached letter from MP Patrick Weiler detailing the launch of a new call for proposals under the Enabling Accessibility Fund's (EAF) mid-sized projects component.

Sincerely,  
Kevin Hemmat



Kevin Hemmat  
Office of Patrick Weiler MP  
Director of Communications  
West Vancouver-Sunshine Coast-Sea to Sky Country  
Office: 604-913-2660  
Cell: 604-353-2550  
Kevin.Hemmat.842@parl.gc.ca



Before printing this e-mail, think about the Environment



HOUSE OF COMMONS  
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES  
CANADA

*Patrick Weiler*

Member of Parliament  
West Vancouver-Sunshine Coast-Sea to Sky Country

October 20, 2023

Dear Friends & Neighbours,

All Canadians should have equal access to programs, services and supports. That is why the Government of Canada continues to invest in programs that help remove barriers to accessibility, increase inclusion, and empower persons with disabilities to fully engage in their communities.

This week, the Government of Canada **launched a new call for proposals (CFP) under the Enabling Accessibility Fund's (EAF) mid-sized projects component**. Up to \$3 million per project is available under this CFP to support larger new construction, renovation and/or retrofit projects. Proposed projects can take place in workplaces, respite centers, sport centers, and community centers, and aimed at increasing access to programs and services targeted to persons with disabilities who are on active waitlists.

To be eligible for this funding, the facility must be used by an organization that either exclusively serves persons with disabilities or offers more than one program, service and/or support targeted to persons with disabilities. An example would be the expansion of a respite center to help accommodate more participants in day programs and thereby reduce an existing waitlist of persons with disabilities seeking access to these programs.

**Eligible organizations are invited to submit their funding application(s) by December 13, 2023 (TBC) at 2:00 p.m. PST online.** Online information sessions will be offered to support organizations through the application process. More information on the application and on those information sessions are [available on the Enabling Accessibility Fund funding page link](#).

This funding supports the development of accessible and inclusive communities, aligning with the Government's Disability Inclusion Action Plan, which strive to build a truly inclusive Canada, free of physical, societal, and attitudinal barriers.

If you have any questions, please reach out to our office. We are happy to support your application in any way that we can.

Sincerely,

Patrick Weiler, MP  
West Vancouver-Sunshine Coast-Sea to Sky Country

*Constituency* *Ottawa*

6367 Bruce Street Suite 282, Confederation Building

West Vancouver 229 Wellington Street, Ottawa

British Columbia V7W 2G5 Ontario K1A 0A6

Tel.: 604-913-2660 | Fax.: 604-913-2664 Tel.: 613-947-4617 | Fax.: 613-847-4620



---

**From:** Cindy L. Mayne  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 18, 2023 2:49 PM  
**To:** s. 22(1)  
**Cc:** correspondence  
**Subject:** Council correspondence - The RAPR and Possible Precedent of 1591 Haywood Application

Dear s. 22(1),

Thank you for your letter to Mayor & Council, it has been forwarded to the Planning & Development Services Department for a response. The development proposal for 1591 Haywood Avenue does not set a precedent for development within riparian areas in the District of West Vancouver. Staff reviewed and are processing the application consistent with the OCP Guidelines NE13 for Watercourse Protection and Enhancement Areas in Existing Neighbourhoods, and the project was found to meet these guidelines. Specifically, there will be no net loss of riparian habitat within 15 m of the top of watercourse bank. Lot B will have new development within 15 m of the top of the watercourse bank, but consistent with the guidelines, new development will be as far from the watercourse (in fact farther) than any existing development and will encompass a smaller footprint than existing. Also, the area within 5 m of the top of the watercourse bank will be kept free of new development. Existing development will be removed from this area and the areas will be revegetated.

Invasive plant removal and re-planting are not proposed in exchange of habitat loss (since there will be no net loss of riparian habitat) but rather, are proposed to enhance the riparian area and watercourse, consistent with OCP Guidelines NE13.

Regards,

**Cindy Mayne**

Executive Assistant to the Director of Planning & Development Services | District of West Vancouver  
t: 604-925-7178 | [westvancouver.ca](https://www.westvancouver.ca)



**From:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 18, 2023 1:39 AM  
**To:** correspondence  
**Subject:** The RAPR and Possible Precedent of 1591 Haywood Application

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

Good afternoon, Mayor and Council,

I wanted to add the following to the public dialogue regarding the environmental protection of riparian areas under the *Riparian Area (Trees/Vegetation 5+15m either side of the Creek Banks) Protection Act* which, as you are all very familiar, applies to WV's riparian areas and is delegated by the BC government to the municipalities to enforce. It of course is at issue in the 1591 Haywood application. My concern is precedents broadly damaging to riparian areas if full and focused attention is not given to this aspect of this lengthy and multifaceted application

**The Provincial Riparian Area Protection Regulation and WV's Environmental Development Permit versus the text of the WV brochure referenced in the application (and presumably other applications)**

Staff confirmed in its Oct 2, 2023, email that it is the WV Environmental Development Permit that applies (versus the text of the WV "brochure" from wherever it originated). As it was stated by Staff, development applications "must" comply that there be "*No net loss of riparian habitat with the 15 m setback of the watercourse bank.*"

Combined with Staff's other stated position that Lot A and Lot B are treated separately (so Lot B cannot take habitat credits from Lot A), does this not then put the issue to rest that there can be no development in the Lot B riparian area because to do so would cause a -37m<sup>2</sup> habitat loss when there "must" be "no" net habitat loss?

This does not prevent development in Lot B, just prevents in the environmentally protected area of Lot B per the RAPR and EDP. Experts in development applications like yourselves would best sort it out, but for what's worth, can't the optional deck off the coach house at the back in the riparian area be removed or relocated to the front; and instead of a large garage have two parking stalls situated close to the street, like the ones in Lot A?

Also, the EDP says, as quoted from Staff's correspondence succinctly and clearly states applications "must" comply that there be "No development closer to a watercourse than existing development." The application (and presumably others) wrongly uses the language of the brochure (from whatever it originated) with regards to "harden surfaces" instead of using the above clear and succinct legislated statement above. As you know the WV Creek Bylaw prohibits "harden surfaces" (pavement, gravel, stones) etc. in the riparian areas so then the question becomes how did this hardened surface, on which the application relies to offset new development in the riparian, get there? These "hard surfaces" have also been documented as appearing in at least two other riparian adjacent properties in recent reports to Staff. It is the EDP that applies per Staff which does not identify an allowance for "hard surfaces" to count in relation to Point 2 of the EDP.

**RAPR Biologist Approvals**

Thankfully, the above types of issues are reviewed in applications for approval by expert biologists in the Aquatic Ecosystems Branch, Ministry of Water, Land, and Resource Stewardship of the BC government.

**Why Do We have a Practice of EDP Permits in riparian areas in Exchange for Developers Agreeing to relatively minor Invasive Species Removal and replanting small trees/shrubs...Isn't that Staff or Volunteer Work, especially on the public land of the riparian areas?**

This may be of interest to the new Climate and Environment Committee. In multiple instances (documented), permits are issued, for example, to cut down healthy protected riparian area trees in exchange for the developer removing some invasive plants and re-planting some small trees/shrubs. This application likewise is offering to do riparian revitalization – a very good thing – but it is in exchange for developing in the riparian area. (Also, see my previous question regarding the enforceability of these agreements in the EDP)

Especially on our public land, should we be trading off our environmental habitat in this manner when apparently it is common for volunteers and/or staff in other communities to do the removal of invasive species, replanting, and revitalization of the riparian areas as community projects without having to trade off habitat loss?

Thank you and sincerely,

s. 22(1)

WV

**From:** Erika Syvokas  
**Sent:** Monday, October 23, 2023 9:08 AM  
**To:** s. 22(1)  
**Cc:** 1591 Haywood; correspondence  
**Subject:** RE: Clegg Home Development Plans

Hello s. 22(1)

Thank you for your email regarding 1591 Haywood Avenue. I have added your email to the file and copied [correspondence@westvancouver.ca](mailto:correspondence@westvancouver.ca) so that your email is provided to Mayor and Council.

For more information about public correspondence: [Correspondence | District of West Vancouver](#)

Sincerely,

**Erika Syvokas**  
Community Planner | Planning and Development Services | District of West Vancouver  
t: 604-921-2914 | [westvancouver.ca](http://westvancouver.ca)

---

**From:** s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Sunday, October 22, 2023 2:05 PM  
**To:** 1591 Haywood <1591haywood@gmail.com>; Erika Syvokas <esyvokas@westvancouver.ca>  
**Subject:** Clegg Home Development Plans

**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 s. 22(1)

As you know I am not against redevelopment on your property as I certainly believe we need more tastefully done infill housing/coach houses etc throughout West Van & your current lot is well suited to accomplish this.

The corner of 12th & Jefferson is a good example of a professionally done Heritage development. It fits very well into the neighborhood & existing homes & is beautifully landscaped. It was also constructed in a timely manner and did not appear to cause too much disruption to the neighbours during the construction phase. Hopefully the project you are proposing will achieve the same result if & when approved by council.

However I do have concerns primarily on the execution of your plan if approved:

1. Timeframe for completion of project- Whatever is finally approved needs to be completed in an acceptable timeframe to obviously minimize the construction disruption to neighbours. The project timeline cannot be left open ended & stretched out over several years. The current proposal is for a new built home or to relocate an "existing heritage home". Whatever is finally approved needs to be determined quickly with the new home or relocation happening concurrently with the renovations to the Clegg home. This cannot drag on indefinitely.
2. While there is reference in your application about some of this additional housing being used for family needs and that you have a long term vision for this development, there is obviously no guarantee preventing you from simply flipping the property(s) once approved to cash in on the increased property value or on the other hand if you get into financial difficulties while under construction either pausing the work indefinitely or being forced to sell. If either of these were to occur then there is the strong possibility of this high profile lot becoming a partially constructed White Elephant.

3. As a longtime resident & taxpayer in West Van, I believe your request for a 20 year tax break on the Clegg home is an overreach & should not be granted by council. When & if your development is approved to subdivide your lot there will be an immediate & significant increase in the value of the land in addition to new streams of income by both stratifying & rental. The cost to develop this project is simply your investment in this new business venture you are establishing on your property. This would be a very ill advised precedent to set by council if granted, particularly due the increasing financial pressure on the Municipality with the spiralling costs of infrastructure upgrades including the pricey North Shore Waste Water project. This would also set the precedent for all future Heritage/infill properties to ask for the same consideration.

4. While I understand that the Heritage designation has been approved I still feel that the current development plan is a hodgepodge of too much density crammed into this current lot & the the experience of living on this site may not be of the best quality for some of the residents. Who would want to live in a stratified unit above a garage? Thankfully short term rentals such as AirBnB are not permitted.

While I share the above concerns I also appreciate your time in mitigating some of my other concerns Re impacting [REDACTED] s.22(1) [REDACTED] should indeed the Clegg home be moved. As you know many of your neighbours [REDACTED] s. 22(1) [REDACTED] have lived here for decades and your beautiful high profile lot is in the centre of the action visible to all. While the heritage designation is the Clegg House, we always referred to it as [REDACTED] s. 22(1) [REDACTED] house in the neighborhood due to her long time tenure there - I believe about 50 years.

Hopefully these concerns are not realized and this project ultimately proves to have the same value & quality as those achieved at 12th & Jefferson which I am very familiar with.

I have also copied Erika Syvokas in the WV planning department on this note and ask her to share with council. Erika - you and I had a good discussion back in Jan 2022 during the initial stages of this development & I appreciated your time & advice. I am planning on attending the Public Hearing & Council meeting tomorrow night.

Respectfully submitted

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

West Vancouver

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

**From:** Erika Syvokas  
**Sent:** Monday, October 23, 2023 10:04 AM  
**To:** s. 22(1)  
**Cc:** correspondence  
**Subject:** FW: Heritage Revitalization Agreement Bylaw No. 5234, 2023; Heritage Designation Bylaw No. 5235, 2023; and Development Permit 22-074 (1591 Haywood Avenue)

Hello s. 22(1)

Thank you for your email regarding 1591 Haywood Avenue. I have added your email to the file and copied [correspondence@westvancouver.ca](mailto:correspondence@westvancouver.ca) to be published on the correspondence webpage.

For more information about public correspondence: [Correspondence | District of West Vancouver](#)

Sincerely,

**Erika Syvokas**  
Community Planner | Planning and Development Services | District of West Vancouver  
t: 604-921-2914 | [westvancouver.ca](http://westvancouver.ca)

---

**From:** s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Sunday, October 22, 2023 4:17 PM  
**To:** Mark Sager <[mark@westvancouver.ca](mailto:mark@westvancouver.ca)>; Christine Cassidy <[ccassidy@westvancouver.ca](mailto:ccassidy@westvancouver.ca)>; Nora Gambioli <[ngambioli@westvancouver.ca](mailto:ngambioli@westvancouver.ca)>; Peter Lambur <[plambur@westvancouver.ca](mailto:plambur@westvancouver.ca)>; Scott Snider <[ssnider@westvancouver.ca](mailto:ssnider@westvancouver.ca)>; Sharon Thompson <[sthompson@westvancouver.ca](mailto:sthompson@westvancouver.ca)>; Linda Watt <[lwatt@westvancouver.ca](mailto:lwatt@westvancouver.ca)>  
**Cc:** Planning Department <[planning@westvancouver.ca](mailto:planning@westvancouver.ca)>; Michelle McGuire <[mmcguire@westvancouver.ca](mailto:mmcguire@westvancouver.ca)>  
**Subject:** Heritage Revitalization Agreement Bylaw No. 5234, 2023; Heritage Designation Bylaw No. 5235, 2023; and Development Permit 22-074 (1591 Haywood Avenue)

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

Dear Mayor and Councillors,

My name is s. 22(1). I am a long term resident of West Vancouver. Our family home is s. 22(1), West Vancouver, BC. My phone number is s. 22(1). Please redact my personal information from any online publication.

I am writing to provide my support for the Clegg House revitalization, a project at 1591 Haywood Ave, West Vancouver, BC V7V 1W4.

This project should be supported for many reasons:

1) The Project preserves a beautiful Heritage house in West Vancouver. Many West Vancouver residents, including my family and I, walk and drive by this house and enjoy thinking about the house, its former occupants and its history. Many beautiful houses are being torn down to maximize the square footage of the house. I recognize land values are very high and the pressure to redevelop is immense, however, when a homeowner with a beautiful heritage house such as this seeks to protect it, the community can and should support it in every way possible.

2) The project is consistent with the character of the neighborhood. The plan as presented is very appealing and the infill buildings are compatible and complementary without detracting from the Heritage structure.

3) The project creates gentle density on a large and appealing lot. At nearly twice the size of neighboring lots with a fantastic location close to schools and district amenities, the infill residences created by this redevelopment will have much to offer its current and future residents.

4) The project is consistent with both the Official Community Plan as well as the Housing for People Action Plan proposed by the Provincial Government. We can and must look for infill opportunities like this one that allow us to meet our obligations to increase housing for all.

5) The project creates diverse housing opportunities for the owners and their family as well as others. Currently, our children have to leave our community to seek affordable residences when they look to start their own families. The next generation is our greatest asset - why would we not do everything to keep them close?

I expect that the owners will face some opposition from a few vocal neighbours. They will say there's too much density, that there are different and better locations for this type of development, that the infrastructure can't support more people in the community, that future traffic will become unbearable. I believe that this is all untrue. The location offers the best of West Vancouver all in walking distance. If not this project, then what project would be ideal? It literally checks all the boxes we should be checking. Regardless of what the vocal minority say, I encourage you to ignore these voices and support in every way possible, this project and projects similar to it.

Warm Regards,

s. 22(1)

---

**From:** Jill Lawlor <jlawlor@westvancouver.ca>

**Sent:** Friday, October 20, 2023 9:07 AM

**To:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)

**Cc:** correspondence <correspondence@westvancouver.ca>; Sue Ketler <sketler@westvancouver.ca>; Liezl de Jesus <ldejesus@westvancouver.ca>; Jennifer Notte <jnotte@westvancouver.ca>

**Subject:** Place for Sport engagement

Dear [REDACTED] s. 22(1),

Thank you for your email to Mayor and Council regarding Place for Sport engagement. Your correspondence has been referred to me for response.

The West Vancouver Place for Sport project completed multiple community consultations between 2014-2017.

Before the construction begins, we will host an information meeting to let the community know further details about this project. Details for this information meeting are not confirmed at this time. We will keep everyone up to date with information on the project webpage <https://westvancouver.ca/government-administration/major-projects/west-vancouver-place-sport> and through our social media. You may also subscribe to receive email updates; a subscription box is on the project webpage.

Thank you for your interest in the West Vancouver Place for Sport project.

Best wishes,

Jill

**Jill Lawlor** (she, her, hers)  
Acting Senior Manager of Parks | District of West Vancouver  
d: 604-921-3467 | c: 604-418-3657 | [westvancouver.ca](https://westvancouver.ca)



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



---

**From:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Monday, October 16, 2023 10:03 AM  
**To:** correspondence; Mark Sager; Christine Cassidy; Nora Gambioli; Peter Lambur; Scott Snider; Sharon Thompson; Linda Watt  
**Subject:** Place for Sport engagement  
**Attachments:** Place for Sport engagement.pdf

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

Dear Mayor and Council,  
Please see the attached letter regarding the West Vancouver Place for Sport request for community engagement.

Regards,  
[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

To: Mayor and Council

CC: Correspondence

Subject : West Vancouver Place for Sport – Community engagement.

Dear Mayor Sager and councilors

I and other homeowners [REDACTED] s. 22(1) are in support of the planned Place for Sport. The Place for Sport facility will be a change to the current use of the West Vancouver Secondary School track and field. This change may have an impact on our neighbourhood, so we want it to be a positive one.

We are asking if there will be a community engagement process for the project and if so when?

Regards,

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

[REDACTED] s. 22(1) West Vancouver

---

**From:** Engineering Department  
**Sent:** Friday, October 20, 2023 4:02 PM  
**To:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Cc:** correspondence  
**Subject:** District of West Vancouver Engineering Public Enquiry Call [REDACTED] s. 22(1) and [REDACTED] s. 22(1) - Traffic Calming and Signage at Kings Ave

Hello [REDACTED] s. 22(1)

In 2022, the District of West Vancouver Engineering & Transportation Department began work on a new operational policy and procedures for traffic calming. We understand that this is an important issue for our community, and we are committed to finding the appropriate measures to address concerns about speeding and traffic safety.

This email confirms your traffic calming request is in our system, has been assigned call [REDACTED] s. 22(1) is being tracked, and will be considered once the new policy is in place.

Next steps:

- finalize the policy and develop operational procedures
- create a priority ranking system
- develop a budget
- report to council for endorsement of the policy in Q2 2023

In 2022, the District received 58 requests for traffic calming. It is not uncommon for a municipality to receive contradictory concerns about a single road. One resident may request speed bumps to slow drivers down, while another finds speed humps problematic. The District aims to create a fair and consistent Traffic Calming Policy regarding how traffic calming measures will be considered.

If all the current traffic calming requests were implemented, it could cost as much as \$800,000. Currently the District does not have a dedicated budget for traffic calming. However, if Council endorses the Traffic Calming Policy, staff will evaluate and rank the requests and reallocate funds from existing budgets to address several of the top ranked requests. The remaining requests will be forwarded for future year consideration.

Please see the District of West Vancouver website for updates on the development of the Traffic Calming Policy and procedures and resulting action plans. Updates can be expected by Fall 2023.

Additionally, we have created call number [REDACTED] s. 22(1) for your enquiry about signage at 15th and 17th Kings Ave.

Best regards,

Engineering & Transportation Services | District of West Vancouver  
[engineeringdept@westvancouver.ca](mailto:engineeringdept@westvancouver.ca) | 604-925-7020

---

**From:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 18, 2023 4:05 PM  
**To:** correspondence; Mark Sager; Christine Cassidy; Nora Gambioli; Peter Lambur; Scott Snider; Sharon Thompson; Linda Watt  
**Subject:** Traffic concerns 1500 Block of Kings  
**Attachments:** Kings Ave.pdf

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

Dear Mayor and Council,  
Please see the attached letter regarding traffic concerns in the 1500 Block of Kings.  
Regards,  
[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

To: Mayor and Council

Cc: 1500 Block Kings Ave s.22(1)

Subject: Traffic concern – 1500 block of Kings Avenue – West Vancouver

Dear Mayor Sager and Councilors,

I am writing to express my concerns about the 1500 Block of Kings Avenue. As you may know, s. 22(1) is open to 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue. 17<sup>th</sup> (North of Inglewood) is the main entrance to West Vancouver Secondary School, and the large parking lots for the school, the fields, and Kay Meek Arts Center.

I would describe s. 22(1) as a side road – it is narrow (under 20 feet wide), with cars parked on the south side (and sometimes on the north side). Taking into account parked cars, Kings Ave has about 12 to 13 feet of width for cars to travel on. It's a one-lane street and certainly not designed for significant street traffic or as a main roadway to the school. There are obvious safety issues for neighbors, their children and pets.

During before and after school hours, s. 22(1) is used by parents, students, and staff to access the school drop-off and parking lots. It's a shortcut to using the main entrance to 17<sup>th</sup> off Inglewood. It is used as an access and egress to 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue (even though there is a no-entry sign on 17<sup>th</sup>). During these school hours, it makes trying to get out s. 22(1) difficult; furthermore, many of the cars drive fast down the street (likely as they are late for drop off).

We believe this issue is only going to get worse with the construction of the West Vancouver Place for Sport. Our fear is that dump trucks and other heavy equipment will find a way to use Kings Avenue to get to the job site. Once complete, users of the Place For Sport could use s. 22(1) to access the facility and/or use our street for parking (which is already tight).

#### Common Sense Recommendation

1. Block off Kings at 17<sup>th</sup> (even with removable bollards if you want to retain access for emergency vehicles)
2. Signage at 15<sup>th</sup> and Kings that road has no exit and for local traffic only
3. Move the No Parking Sign on the north-west side of Kings (near 17<sup>th</sup>) further east to allow residents a way to turn their cars around.

As mentioned, this is currently an issue and one that will only get worse with the construction of the Place for Sports.

I understand that you may need to study the issue; so as an interim step, for safety reasons, I would suggest the following happen ASAP:

- Move the school zone signage and speed zone back to the 15<sup>th</sup> and Kings. It was recently moved to 17<sup>th</sup>.
- Add speed bumps to Kings to force people to slow down
- Move the No Parking Sign on the north side of Kings (near 17<sup>th</sup>) further east to allow residents a way to turn their cars around.

I am happy to discuss this further with you.

Regards,

s. 22(1)

West Vancouver

---

**From:** Ian Haras  
**Sent:** Monday, October 23, 2023 10:57 AM  
**To:** s. 22(1)  
**Cc:** correspondence  
**Subject:** Eagle Harbour Creek Bridge - Repairs Needed!

Hi s. 22(1),

Thank you for your email to Mayor and Council regarding the bridge over Eagle Creek in the Eagle Harbour neighbourhood. Your correspondence has been referred to me for response.

We empathize with the community's desire to see this bridge replaced quickly, and we recognize its importance to the local residents. The District is currently conducting the necessary investigation and analysis required to design and construct a new bridge that can be safely used by the community.

Please visit the project page at <https://westvancouver.ca/government-administration/major-projects/eagle-creek-bridge> for the latest updates and timelines.

Staff will review the closures restricting access to the damaged bridge to determine if it needs to be augmented to further deter unauthorized use of the bridge.

Thanks,

**Ian Haras**, BCSLA, CSLA  
Park Planning & Development Manager | District of West Vancouver  
t: 604-925-7143 | [westvancouver.ca](https://westvancouver.ca)

---

**From:** s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Monday, October 16, 2023 9:44 AM  
**To:** correspondence  
**Subject:** Eagle Harbour Creek Bridge - Repairs Needed!

**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 Council,

Please consider repairing this bridge as s.22(1) still use it to cross over to Keith Road to more easily access Park Verdun. I tell him not to do it but still does as it is a long way around. Even if he does stop, others won't and it is an accident waiting to happen.

Sincerely,

s. 22(1)

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

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