

## COUNCIL CORRESPONDENCE UPDATE TO JULY 7, 2021 (8:30 a.m.)

### Referred for Action

- (1) **June 30, 2021, regarding “Gas Powered Weed Trimmers & Leaf Blowers”**  
(Referred for consideration and response)
- (2) **June 30, 2021, regarding “Contacting West Van Police”** (Referred for consideration and response)
- (3) **July 1, 2021, regarding “4310 Marine Drive” (Preliminary Development Proposal)** (Referred for consideration and response)
- (4) **July 2, 2021, regarding “Excessive motor car and motor cycle noise Taylor Way”** (Referred for consideration and response)
- (5) **July 5, 2021, regarding “Fwd: Amber Rise - 2100 block Union Court etc. WV”**  
(Referred for consideration and response)
- (6) **M. Slater, July 5, 2021, regarding “Respectful Communication Bylaw 5141.”**  
(Referred for consideration and response)

### Referred for Action from Other Governments and Government Agencies

No items.

### Received for Information

- (7) **10 submissions, June 29 - July 5, 2021, regarding Proposed Subdivision of 5826 Eagle Island**
- (8) **9 submissions, June 30 - July 5, 2021, regarding Preliminary Development Proposal for 4310 Marine Drive**
- (9) **7 submissions, July 1 and 5, 2021, regarding Proposed: Zoning Bylaw No. 4662, 2010, Amendment Bylaw No. 5106, 2021; and Development Variance Permit 19-109 (6779 Dufferin Avenue)** (Referred to the July 13, 2021 public hearing)
- (10) **July 1, 2021, regarding “Fw: West Vancouver & Homelessness again ??”**
- (11) **July 1, 2021, regarding “Arts and Culture Centre - Site Selection Project” (Proposed Arts & Culture Facility)**
- (12) **2 submissions, July 1 and 3, 2021, regarding Non-Medical Cannabis Retail**
- (13) **July 2, 2021, regarding “"14th and Marine area" - Skateboarding and Vandalism Complaint - The Desired Ambleside Night Life?”**
- (14) **July 2, 2021, regarding “Singing group at the library”**
- (15) **July 4, 2021, regarding “Street and sidewalk maintenance”**
- (16) **2 submissions, July 5, 2021, regarding Ambleside Pier**
- (17) **A. Latchford, July 5, 2021, regarding “Proposed Development Variance Permit for 8440 Citrus Wynd” (Proposed Development Variance Permit 19-042)**  
(Referred to the July 12, 2021 regular Council meeting)
- (18) **Surrey Board of Trade, July 5, 2021, regarding “SBOT Invitation” (July 14, 15, and 16, 2021)**

(19) Petition with 42 names, July 5, 2021, regarding “Development Proposal for 2204 Bellevue Avenue/177 22nd Street”

(20) July 6, 2021, regarding “Garbage Drop Off Option?”

**Received for Information from Other Governments and Government Agencies**

(21) P. Weiler, M.P. (West Vancouver-Sunshine Coast-Sea to Sky Country), July 5, 2021, regarding “July 2021 Newsletter”

**Responses to Correspondence**

(22) Senior Manager of Cultural Services, June 30, 2021, response regarding “Missing Plaque”

(23) Manager of Bylaw & Licensing Services, July 6, 2021, response regarding “Gas Powered Weed Trimmers & Leaf Blowers”

---

**From:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 30, 2021 10:03 AM  
**To:** MayorandCouncil  
**Subject:** Gas Powered Weed Trimmers & Leaf Blowers

**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.

Date: June 30, 2021

To: Mayor & Council

Re: Gas Powered Weed Trimmers, Hege Trimmers & Leaf Blowers

A couple of days a week our Ambleside neighborhood wakes up to the loud, annoying, unpleasant, ear piercing and deafening sound of gas powered trimmers and leaf blowers.

This noise normally starts between 7:30 and 8:00 AM on Wednesday and usually continues till 11 AM.

With the now available electric trimers and blowers which are far quieter I wonder if it is possible to pass a by-law outlawing the gas powered machines??!

Most of the time rather than sweeping up the debris on the ground, the workers just blow the cuttings and leaves around which accomplishes next to nothing.

I suffer from [REDACTED] s.22(1) . Sometimes I have to leave the building and the neighborhood.

As I write this email there are currently three of these machines running [REDACTED] s.22(1) .

Standing By for your response.

Many Thanks !

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

West Vancouver, BC

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

**From:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 30, 2021 4:35 PM  
**To:** MayorandCouncil  
**Subject:** Contacting West Van Police

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

To Mayor & council... I was involved in in [REDACTED] s.22(1) long-time resident of West Vancouver...We discover a couple of fire arm which we were anxious to get removed from the house . As it vacant & did not want them to fall in the wrong hands & wanted to make sure we followed the proper regulation .. We phone West Van Police Dept. & were told that we had to call E-Com on [REDACTED] s.22(1) .. We tried twice were on line for over 40 minutes. ( this was before the E-com started having long wait times due to the high temperatures We call again on [REDACTED] s. 22(1) 2 times & could not get through. So I went down to the city hall on [REDACTED] s. 22(1) But everything was closed.. Told me again to call 604-925-7300... Again we could not get through. So [REDACTED] s. 22(1) Morning at 9:am I personally went down again. I went to the Police Office & was told by the person behind the counter that she could do nothing & told me to once again to phone E- Com. I tried again on [REDACTED] s. 22(1) after I got back & the same reply. Very frustrating... We ended up having to go to another jurisdiction to finally find a police force that was available which was willing to help & remove the fire arms.

Why would we not have the police force available to the West Vancouver tax payers ? Why would we pass this responsibility TO E- Com when we know they have had difficulty dealing with volumes.? We have always been able (in the past ) been able go to the police station & report problems. ( I understand now why people get fed up & call the 911 number when they should not, because no one answers...By joining E-com it is another bureaucratic night mare ) I see this as another move to keep residence from accessing a vital departments & adding the more frustrating citizens & giving them so many more difficulties rather servicing. Why has the police Dept. allowed this to happen?

I feel that the Mayor & Council should review this & cancel the E-com services. I am appalled that this has happened. We had to go elsewhere to solve this important situation.. I FEEL THE ELECTED MAYOR & COUNCIL SHOULD BE ASHAMED TO HAVE LET THIS HAPPEN IN OUR COMMUNITY .. I reply would be

appreciated

s. 22(1)

s. 22(1)

Vancouver

s. 22(1)

West

**From:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 1, 2021 12:39 PM  
**To:** MayorandCouncil  
**Subject:** 4310 Marine Drive

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

**TO: THE MAYOR AND COUNCIL, WEST VANCOUVER**

**RE: 4310 Marine Drive Proposal**

My name is [REDACTED] s. 22(1) and I have been a resident of West Vancouver for [REDACTED] s. 22(1) years and care deeply about the neighborhood, the environment and the ambiance of West Vancouver, and particularly of the immediate neighborhood in which I live.

**This is a disastrous proposal for several reasons.**

Firstly, I am shocked that council would even consider the proposed re zoning of the Erwin/Ferndale/Evergreen neighborhood for a multi-unit development. This proposed structure and resulting density is alien to our neighborhood and I strongly oppose this massive zoning change. Quite simply put-the approval and even consideration of this re-zoning and multi-family development would be a travesty. The proposed rezoning and related development would forever change the character of our community and would create a dangerous future precedent. **I urge our District planners and Council to preserve our neighborhood and oppose this re-zoning application!**

On a due process point, I question the process whereby only immediate neighbors were notified of this development. This is not the first time the Council and/or Planning Dept have tried through ‘sleight of hand’ to railroad neighborhood altering policies through the system without wanting or requesting input from the local community-we have seen this before and any ‘benefit of the doubt’ on this deliberate policy of exclusion has long since worn out. This rezoning application has been dealt with as if it were a variance application on a house build rather than a major shift in zoning policy that would forever change the character, density and ambiance of a neighborhood. The fact that this is re-zoning is even being considered by Council, and the manner with which the Planning Dept have tried to expedite it, demonstrates a continuing (and very worrying) arrogant and dismissive approach to Community affairs.

One question I have is to whether the DWV stand to profit from this rezoning in any way other than from property taxes? To avoid confusion the direct question is.... *“Has the DWV, or any department within it, entered into any verbal or written agreement with the owner and/or developer of 4310 Marine Drive whereby the DWV would share in the profits from any deemed increase in value of the property as a result of a re-zoning, or from any deemed profits that may accrue upon the sale of the units as a result of a rezoning?”* A clear answer would be appreciated in order to demonstrate absolute transparency in the system and the process. With such an outrageous proposal several people in the neighborhood find it hard to derive a reason as to why and how this application was ever considered by the Planning Dept, other than because of a possible profit motive .

I'm sure it is not lost on the Mayor and Councilors that although some of them treat residents and voters with complete and utter contempt and would obviously favor some sort of autocratic local governance system, those Councilors that even dream of being re-elected will still require residents to vote for them in the next election. As the Mayor recently stated, the voting record of Councilors will indeed be scrutinized and publicized at that time. Accordingly, it is time all Councilors started talking to, and more importantly, listening to the residents of West Vancouver and then start doing what is in their, and the Community's best interests.

Sincerely,

s. 22(1)

West Vancouver.

---

**From:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Friday, July 2, 2021 6:19 PM  
**To:** MayorandCouncil  
**Subject:** Excessive motor car and motor cycle noise Taylor Way

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

Why has council been ineffective in reducing excessive traffic noise - especially motor cycles and hi powered cars on Taylor Way? Do we not have excessive noise bylaws? PLEASE have the police enforce , or beef up the existing bylaws.

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

**From:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Monday, July 5, 2021 1:58 PM  
**To:** MayorandCouncil  
**Subject:** Fwd: Amber Rise - 2100 block Union Court etc. WV

**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.

Attn: Mayor and Council

I sent this email in April as you will note and I never heard back from any one except Marcus Wong who said he would look into it

But I never heard anything back. I am so surprised that they are so busy in the Municipal Hall that no one could even acknowledge my email.

I have since contacted the by law officer Alisha who seems to have take a month to contact the building dept.

I am [REDACTED] s.22(1) and we have [REDACTED] s. 22(1), so a good number of your community members!!

I would appreciate someone looking into the situation [REDACTED] s.22(1) and getting back to me.

Regards,

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

West Vancouver.BC

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Subject: Amber Rise - 2100 block Union Court etc. WV**  
**Date:** April 26, 2021 at 9:26:00 AM PDT  
**To:** [MayorandCouncil@westvancouver.ca](mailto:MayorandCouncil@westvancouver.ca)

Attn: Mayor and Council

[REDACTED] s. 22(1) the development site at the above address.  
It has been a mess of a site for approx 10 years.

I don't know why the municipality allowed the developer to pile up dirt in the first place that has resulted in a huge pile of rocks to enforce it. We are all terrified driving by if there is ever an earthquake!! The east side of the property has had unsightly plastic covering the dirt pile for years to stop rain washing it away. We have frequently called the building dept. and the bylaw dept over the years trying to get them to tell the developer to clean it all up.

It has gone on long enough. We all know it is a hot Real Estate market so why has the owner not reduced the price of the 3 built houses? Do they pay the empty house tax? One of them doesn't have the final occupancy certificate, is that being delayed to avoid paying the tax? Where does the money come from that someone can sit with this unfinished site? There is also supposed to be 9 more houses built is that going to be another 10 to 20 years??

I phoned the building dept. last week and was told the last permit was a couple of years ago, I said it's been going on for years. The lady then just said she hasn't been working there that long!! Then she told me to call the bylaw dept. which I did. Another of my neighbours called the Municipal Hall and was told to call the building dept. So you can see the buck is being passed around.

This has gone on too long we should not have to have this unsightly site next to us. Also who would pay \$6.9m for a property that is all overgrown in front?

I would appreciate this being looked into and dealt with.

Thank you for your attention.

s. 22(1)



---

**From:** M Slater <melroy1058@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 5, 2021 5:14 PM  
**To:** MayorandCouncil  
**Subject:** Respectful Communication Bylaw 5141.

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

Re: Proposed Respectful Communication Bylaw 5141, 2021 appearing on the agenda for the July 12, 2021 Council Meeting.

Dear Mayor & Council,

I am appalled by this proposed bylaw, which says is intended to *promote a safe, healthy, respectful and positive environment for members of the public, staff and Council*, but would more accurately be described as a measure to muzzle public discourse by allowing staff to ignore and suppress inquiries that make them feel uncomfortable!

I am appalled that such a bylaw would even be suggested. While no-one should be subject to abusive behaviour (and to that end, surely the District already has adequate policies and procedures in place), certainly anyone in public service must expect to deal with difficult inquiries or unhappy citizens from time to time. This may be vexing, but it is part of the job.

It is hard to imagine that there are so many instances of seriously disrespectful communications that a bylaw is required to protect District staff. If this is indeed the case, it suggests there is a much larger underlying problem that needs to be addressed.

- **Kindly elaborate on these instances of inappropriate communication (*that staff have experienced in increasing frequency*) and provide some examples so we may have a better understanding of what staff are dealing with and what is deemed inappropriate.**

While some of our public servants (both elected officials and staff) are solicitous, I have been the recipient of disrespectful and offensive communications from District representatives on multiple occasions. For example, I have been falsely accused of misquoting a Councillor and threatened with libel. The correspondence would well be described as intimidating and humiliating, not to mention unfounded. (The correspondence is part of public record and I am happy to provide a copy to anyone who wishes to peruse it and judge for themselves). And I have had so many disrespectful and offensive emails from Councillor Cameron that I have ceased communicating with him, as to continue to do so is akin to perpetuating an abusive relationship. I know of residents who are too intimidated to speak up and will no longer address Mayor and Council because they are fearful of rebuke, including threats of libel.

I also know of residents who are afraid to raise concerns with District staff as they fear repercussions. I initially dismissed such fear as paranoia until I experienced a series of unpleasant incidences, including being the only home on my block that

did not receive a temporary water shut off notice. This happened twice after I raised concerns about lack of consultation on road work in my neighbourhood. Coincidence? Perhaps, but around the same time, someone at the District also spread false rumours that my “uninsured” vehicle had been parked in front of my home, so I now understand why some residents would feel intimidated by District staff.

The guidelines defining what constitutes inappropriate communication are subjective, allowing staff not to respond to or publish future correspondence from anyone deemed to engage in communications that are *vexatious or frivolous* or that may cause the subject and/or recipient to *feel humiliated or intimidated*.

Yet not responding to inquiries is already a common occurrence – so common that it seems to be a deliberate strategy to discourage questions (along with not replying in a timely manner and/or replying with an answer that is not relevant to the question). My most recent correspondence with the District regarding a new Arts Centre is a classic example...

- I never received a reply to an inquiry submitted June 16;
- I sent another inquiry June 24 and received a reply, which raised more questions;
- I sent additional questions June 28 and received the identical reply as had already been provided to my initial inquiry, which did not address the new questions posed;
- I sent a follow-up June 29 and to date I have not heard anything further. I expect I never will.

This is but one example and I can provide others. Now I wonder...

- **Was my recent correspondence about the Arts Centre deemed to be *intimidating, humiliating and/or part of a pattern of communications that are frivolous or vexatious*?**
- **If this bylaw is implemented, will residents be notified when they are deliberately not receiving a reply? Otherwise, how will one know when a “non-reply” is due to the bylaw or because of another reason, such as the query was misplaced or the District is simply late in responding?**
- **If one doesn’t hear back and then follows-up, will this be deemed a *pattern of communication that is frivolous or vexatious*?**

A lot of time and expense has gone into creating policies to protect staff and elected officials from the public, but no thought to protecting citizens from abuse or intimidation from our public servants.

- **How about conducting an annual Local Government Performance review asking citizens about their satisfaction with the overall performance of staff and Council?**
- **How about implementing communication and service standards to ensure citizens receive an appropriate reply in a timely manner?**

I respectfully suggest public servants who do not wish to deal with “*frivolous or vexatious*” communications from the public, or who are not comfortable dealing with pointed questions or disgruntled residents, may be better suited to another line of work.

Discouraging or hindering residents from communicating with Council and District staff is a form of censorship and an erosion of democracy. It is my sincere wish that Mayor and Council recognize the danger of implementing a policy that would do just that, and register their strong objection to this proposed bylaw.

Sincerely,

Melinda Slater

1058 Keith Road

West Vancouver

Please do not redact any portion of this correspondence.

(Note – **bold** font used to distinguish questions to which a reply is kindly requested).

**From:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 29, 2021 2:50 PM  
**To:** MayorandCouncil; Jim Bailey; Michelle McGuire  
**Subject:** 5826 Eagle Island Application to sub-divide.  
**Attachments:** IMG\_6065 2.HEIC; IMG\_6065.HEIC

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

Hello,

I am writing this to express my strong opposition to this proposal. I feel that the character of our precious and historic neighbourhood is being threatened and must be protected.

The increase in construction traffic and activity will be severe and when this is coupled together with our already increasing parking situation, it is , frankly, intolerable.

Already cars are lined up [REDACTED] s. 22(1), on a daily basis from beachgoers, but more often by workers.

The ambience that made us all want to live in Eagle Harbour is disappearing and needs protection, now.

Please consider the thoughts of myself and my neighbours before deciding on this money grab by the applicants.

Thank You,

[REDACTED]  
s. 22(1)





(7)(b)

---

**From:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 30, 2021 9:25 AM  
**To:** MayorandCouncil  
**Cc:** Michelle McGuire  
**Subject:** Regarding 5826 Eagle Island

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

[REDACTED] s. 22(1) I am against any rezoning on Eagle Island to allow more homes to be built. It is suggested that there is 11 spots available on Eagle Harbour Rd and a few more designated to an islander is not a problem the problem is this [REDACTED] s.22(1) I can't park as there is never any spaces available. So why should more be given to anyone that does not live on this road. Garbage supposed to be solved this would never be accepted in Ambleside or the Properties so why is it allowed on Eagle Harbour Road [REDACTED] s.22(1) latest email is to say all barge problems will be solved because she has a plan. That plan includes extending mainland dock by 6' there is no concern that a boat [REDACTED] s. 22(1) would have difficulty getting into the channel and [REDACTED] s. 22(1) would be affected. Another solution of theirs is putting municipal barge perpendicular to the dock no thought of how that would work as one end has a motor and the other a landing ramp ask the fire chief how that would work. I would appreciate the district understanding that what happens in Eagle Island affects us [REDACTED] s. 22(1). It is time to stop and look at the bigger picture Thank you. [REDACTED] s. 22(1)

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 30, 2021 11:17 AM  
**To:** MayorandCouncil  
**Subject:** Re: Proposal for lot subdivision at 5826 Eagle Island

**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.

On Mon, Jun 14, 2021 at 3:49 PM [REDACTED] s. 22(1) wrote:

On Mon, Jun 14, 2021 at 11:50 AM [REDACTED] s. 22(1) wrote:

Thank you, [REDACTED] s. 22(1) for sharing your proposal with us.

I must first say that I find it egregious that your entire proposal is presented as if you would be doing Islanders a favour by subdividing your current property and using the profits to build yourself a new home.

I also believe that you have presented some inaccurate information and omission of facts to support your proposal.

Firstly, those who resided on Eagle Island prior to 2017 are well aware of your application for a coach house, and how the MAJORITY of Islanders were against it.

We were never against renters, which you have linked in your current proposal to the fact that the majority of Islanders did not want coach houses built on Eagle Island. In fact, there are currently four homes being rented on the island. To my knowledge, no one has a problem with that.

When you applied for a coach house, you offered to pay for a parking spot on the gravel lot. All Eagle Islanders would agree that on a cold, rainy day/night, if you are transporting children/ groceries/heavy materials, you will NOT park at that distance, but would use one of the already oversubscribed spaces across from the EHYC. Those unassigned spots are currently being used by guests of Eagle Island residents, EHYC guests, beach goers, (including an ever increasing number of paddle boarders and kayakers), movie crews, and Eagle Island residents who own more than one car. Currently, there are many Eagle Island residents who have three or four vehicles parked in any spots available close to Eagle Island, yourself included.

As to barge and dinghy parking: you have made a case regarding parking on the mainland dock, but have failed to make any mention of the current congestion on the Eagle Island dock.

Also, as per a letter sent to all Islanders from the Eagle Island Residents Association, it is becoming increasingly difficult to park a barge on the mainland side because of the number of dinghies. Part of the problem is that several Islanders, yourselves included, have more than one dinghy. This situation will only be exacerbated by a new owner owning at least one barge and one dinghy.

No mention was made by you regarding low tides and the fact that several moorage spots become unusable during low tide, PARTICULARLY on the Eagle Island dock.

In other words, your new proposal would have the same impact on Eagle Islanders as your coach house proposal-different name but same old issues.

You state that you wish 'to maintain the charm and character of our beautiful island' by subdividing your lot for a view home, but further state, 'any resident who feels this property should not be developed will have the opportunity to buy it and leave it undeveloped'. Really? I do not see any great demand for a decommissioned half tennis court, but this alternative would still put money in your pocket for the waterfront home you wish to construct.

You also state that your plans for a new waterfront home are that it will not be a monster home. However, your plans are for a much larger home than what currently exists on your property, and this will impact the neighbours [REDACTED] s. 22(1), as well as those who

will endure the noise and movement of materials for the demolition and rebuild, both of which you have failed to mention in your proposal.

Although you state that 'there is no other viable opportunity for a similar subdivision on Eagle Island', I believe that there are other lots, although not quite as large, that could be subdivided on Eagle Island. Should either current or future owners decide to make application, will they also be allowed to build, taking into consideration the aforementioned issues, or will the application from 5826 be the only one allowed? This would seem to be unfair on every level.

I am submitting my comments to your website, which you state will keep comments 'confidential'.

I am more than happy to share my thoughts with not only all Eagle Islanders, but also Mayor and Council of DWV and the planning department of the DWV.

I encourage ALL Eagle Islanders to submit their comments to:

[mayorandcouncil@westvancouver.ca](mailto:mayorandcouncil@westvancouver.ca)

[mmcquire@westvancouver.ca](mailto:mmcquire@westvancouver.ca)

(Michelle McGuire, senior manager of  
current planning and urban design)

[jbailey@westvancouver.ca](mailto:jbailey@westvancouver.ca)

(Jim Bailey, director of planning)

I definitely do not support your application for the subdivision of 5826 Eagle Island.

Respectfully,

s. 22(1)

**From:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 30, 2021 2:20 PM  
**To:** MayorandCouncil  
**Subject:** POV: Proposed Subdivision 5826 Eagle Island

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

Dear Mayor and Council,

I am a concerned home owner in West Vancouver and former long time [REDACTED] s. 22(1) on the North Shore. I have often found it both alarming and curious that some very obvious privileges have been granted to certain home owner's/developers that are so obviously outside of the scope and general character of their neighbourhoods. I am in review of your ongoing council meeting minutes and the numerous letters shared by others who have also brought forward similar concerns. These exemptions certainly raise eyebrows as to the nature by which numerous exceptions to the OCP have been granted. To that end I will make this brief and spare a recap of the obvious examples as you are fully apprised.

I have given great thought to the nature of the request by the homeowner's proposed and well panned potential subdivision of this one acre parcel on Eagle Island. It seems perfectly reasonable to grant the owners approval, based on their comprehensive, proactive and thoughtful rationale and detailed application, I would like to endorse and fully support their efforts to allow for one additional single family dwelling as would be afforded and within the guidelines of a subdivision of this parcel. Their modest request accommodates future needs for parking and water access. I would well prefer to see 2 homes of reasonable size on this parcel rather than one mega home that could only ever be afforded by a very elite and wealthy individual.

I frequent deep cove and am pleased that the density that has been allowed by the DNV to develop and thrive. It allows more for reasonable scale of buildings and greater access to more homeowners. In Horseshoe Bay, density around the seashore is increasing. If your stated objectives via OCP are to cater to all citizens then why continued support of projects that can only be undertaken and financed by the uber wealthy? In my opinion, the very character of West Vancouver's community has come under threat. The transformation, supported by the endorsements of these projects, has rapidly changed and narrowed liveability, affordability and helped foster an elitist community.

I wish to go on record as fully supporting the application noted above for 5826 Eagle Island and a proposed subdivision. I hope this inspires more thought from Council on the precedents it has and continues to set by accord.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

West Vancouver BC

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

Sent with [ProtonMail](#) Secure Email.

(7)(e)

---

**From:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 30, 2021 7:27 PM  
**To:** MayorandCouncil  
**Subject:** 5826 Eagle Island

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

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

Dear Mayor and Council,

I am writing this email in support of the proposed subdivision of 5826 Eagle Island. I am very familiar with this very large waterfront property and its features. I am aware of the proposed lines for division of the lot and believe this can be done tastefully and appropriately. The size of the proposed lots is sufficient to tastefully accommodate a minimum of 2 houses. The subdivided lot is one I would seriously consider living on myself.

I encourage council to seriously consider this viable project.

Yours sincerely,

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

**From:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 1, 2021 11:50 PM  
**To:** MayorandCouncil  
**Cc:** Jim Bailey; Michelle McGuire  
**Subject:** Response to Subdivision Proposal 5826 Eagle Island  
**Attachments:** 20210701 Response to 5826 Eagle Island Subdivision Proposal.pdf

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

Please see Response Enclosed.

Thank you and Happy Canada Day.

[REDACTED]  
s. 22(1)

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

[REDACTED]  
s. 22(1)

**TO:** Mayor and Council

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

**RE:** Application for subdivision of lot with municipal address 5826 Eagle Island

**DATE:** July 1, 2021

---

The Applicants e-mailed me on June 9, 2021 (and I assume others) with their subdivision proposal and stated input **must** be delivered (confidentially?) to them by no later than June 30, 2021. I am not submitting this Response to directly to Council because the Applicants are not able to address my main concern which is one of fairness and equity. Only Council has the ability to ensure fairness and equity are exercised in making decisions that affect the community at large. I would ask that you redact anything in this memo that identifies me or my address before making it public.

In my opinion, the Applicant's subdivision application should be turned down by the District of West Vancouver at the outset for the reasons set out below.

#### **Amendment to Official Community Plan**

Official community plans describe the **long-term vision** of communities. They are a statement of objectives and policies that guide decisions on municipal and regional district planning and land use management.

Note that the OCP is supposed to be a "long term vision".

#### **District of West Vancouver OCP site specific prohibition 2.1.11**

Support the small island character of Eagle Island by continuing to prohibit **subdivision and attached or detached secondary suites (i.e., basement suites or coach houses)**.

In my opinion any subdivision application on a one-off exception basis is inconsistent with the long-term vision that was just established a mere three years ago.

The DWV OCP was passed in June 2018 after much consultation with the Eagle Island community. The community provided input. Council listened and enacted 2.1.11 of the OCP appropriately. The particular provision that the Applicants seek to amend or take exception to was as a result of community input resulting in a large part from the Applicant's previous application for a coach house on their lot. That application (which came in two attempts – the first one was turned down and the second one was withdrawn) is not much different than the current Application except, from a planning perspective, the current Application for Subdivision is of a more elevated and onerous level. In any event, all nature of the objections the community made to the previous applications for the coach house apply to this Application but with even more certainty. Now there will definitely be an additional family added to the Eagle Island Community with need for infrastructure, including services provided by the District, barge moorage and parking, with the resultant additional impact on the broader Eagle Harbour Community and marine habitat.

While OCP's are not "writ in stone" and are supposed to be living documents that may be altered over time with changes in the community (as pointed out by the Applicant's reference to 2.1.18 of the OCP), I would suggest that there have been absolutely no changes to the Eagle Island Community or Eagle Harbour over the last three years which would mandate this specific change to the OCP. The size of all the lots on Eagle Island, the barge and parking configuration, the composition of the community (except

for the wonderful addition of new families with small children) all have not changed. If anything, with Covid, the demand for beach parking outside the Eagle Harbour Yacht Club and along Eagle Harbour Road has increased as West Vancouverites have discovered that beach in their quest for local outdoor recreation.

The Applicants have attempted to address parking by paying for an additional space (now increased to two) on Eagle Harbour Road. However, additional parking was offered in the coach house application. In the summer months all of the available spaces across from the Eagle Harbour Yacht Club and all along Seaview Road and Eagle Harbour Road are regularly taken by beach-goers from the West Vancouver community at large. I've seen many a disappointed swimmer or kayaker desperately driving around looking for that one spot so they can go enjoy the beach. If there is room for creation of an extra spot or two by the gravel lot on Eagle Harbour Road it would be more appropriate for the District to create it for the benefit of the entire West Vancouver community who use the beach rather than for one resident of Eagle Island who wants to subdivide a lot.

After asking for input on this new Application, and hearing the same input from the community, the Applicants finally recognized the lack of barge space and by e-mail offered to pay for an extra six feet on the mainland dock (with the added width of the DWV green service boat added to the end). They have also resurrected the service dock extension which I understand was taken down as a result of DFO's objections and the objections of the neighbour [REDACTED] s.22(1). Both proposals would be problematic given DFO's mandate to protect the marine life on the sea bed and given the private mainland dock immediately adjacent to where the dock extension where the new owner of [REDACTED] s. 22(1) will be docking a [REDACTED] s. 22(1). Navigating barges (and a boat to the dock of [REDACTED] s. 22(1)) through a narrowed passage in possible high winds and tidal currents could prove difficult and possibly dangerous. The suggestion that moving the DWV green service boat creates 4 additional spots is false. Those spots are practically useless to islanders who regularly haul wheel barrels and carts off their barges. There is no room to do so directly into the ramp. And these spots are practically inaccessible in low tide, especially for the longer barges.

The Applicants state that this is a one-time exception and emphasize theirs is the only lot on Eagle Island capable of being subdivided. While I doubt that statement is accurate, it fails to recognize the other uses specifically prohibited on Eagle Island by the OCP, i.e. coach houses and secondary suites. There are several properties that have secondary buildings that could easily and more economically (than a new subdivision house) be converted into coach houses and others that could accommodate a new coach house structure. I would also suggest that practically all the houses on Eagle Island could accommodate a secondary suite. In addition, the District is currently addressing the reduction of threshold requirements for subdivision requirements and Eagle Island is explicitly excepted from this process presumably because subdivisions are not permitted on Eagle Island and Eagle Island was clearly excluded from the Neighbourhood Character Plan Amendments (for good reason).

See links:

<https://westvancouver.ca/sites/default/files/dwv/council-agendas/2021/jun/28/21jun28-5.pdf>  
[https://westvancouver.ca/sites/default/files/dwv/assets/news/2021/DWV-%234265766-v1-Council\\_presentation\\_-\\_NCWG\\_implementation\\_-\\_first\\_reading.pdf](https://westvancouver.ca/sites/default/files/dwv/assets/news/2021/DWV-%234265766-v1-Council_presentation_-_NCWG_implementation_-_first_reading.pdf)

If subdivisions were allowed on Eagle Island, and these proposed reductions applied, further lots could probably qualify for subdivision on Eagle Island. Also, appropriate variances could even expand the number of potential subdivisions. If you combine this with the potential of 30 potential secondary suites the Applicant's suggestion that their situation is somehow unique is not credible. This is where the exercise of fairness and equity is critical. If this opportunity cannot be offered to all, it should not be given to one.

[REDACTED] s.22(1) approached the DWV planning department on a preliminary basis to determine the feasibility of renovating and installing a secondary suite for supplementary income. [REDACTED] told in no uncertain terms that secondary suites on Eagle Island were prohibited due to the extremely limited parking and barge spots.

If one mandate of the DWV is to create affordable housing, should Council not first be opening up Eagle Island to secondary suites as a first initiative and coach houses as a second initiative before allowing subdivisions? Secondary suites and coach houses would be much more affordable than someone buying and building on a subdivided lot. I put this question to Council not because I believe Eagle Island should be opened up to secondary suites or coach houses (because I think that is impractical from an infrastructure standpoint), but to point out the inequity in making an exception to one OCP specifically prohibited use over the others.

I could go into more detail on the merits of the Application and why it doesn't work for barges and parking but we have been down this road before. We should not have to revisit it all again.

While it is laudable that the Applicants have by way of a series of follow-up e-mails in the past week or so appear to be responding to some of the concerns of their neighbours by offering to pay for all sorts of improvements to address infrastructure concerns, to bring those improvements to completion will require the approval of the Federal Department of Fisheries and Oceans and the BC Ministry of Forest, Lands, Natural Resource Operations and Rural Development and consultation/consent of those neighbours having foreshore rights immediately in front of those improvements. Those approvals and consents have not been obtained and are not assured.

## Summary

So, in conclusion, in my opinion, the Applicant's Application should not be entertained at all because:

1. The OCP that was just passed 3 years ago specifically prohibits subdivisions
2. Community consultation just happened; the community was heard; the restrictions passed
3. Nothing has changed since the OCP was passed
4. It would be completely **unfair and inequitable** to all the other residents of Eagle Island to grant these Applicants an exception while ignoring all the other prohibited uses and exceptions that could be asked for by other residents; why should the Applicants be singled out for special treatment?
5. To approve the Applicants' exemption from the general restriction on subdivisions and secondary suites because they have the monetary resources to build or contribute to building the necessary infrastructure to benefit their property is inequitable and elitist. If the same exceptions were available to anyone on Eagle Island who wanted to subdivide or put in a secondary suite, District approval might be acceptable. But due to infrastructure limitations the District cannot open up these OCP use restrictions for every Eagle islander. So, it is only right that the District deny this subdivision Application on the grounds of inequity.
6. Despite my submission and all of the other objections the District will probably receive, should the District decide to entertain the Applicants' subdivision Application, before the District approval is granted, on a preliminary basis the Applicants should be required to obtain the required DFO and Provincial government pre-approvals and the foreshore neighbours' consents. And before the subdivision is registered, the Applicants should be required to implement all the infrastructure improvements they promised in their summary e-mail to Council of June 30, 2021, without any future exceptions. However, to reiterate, on grounds of equity, the Application should be turned down.

(7)(g)

---

**From:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Friday, July 2, 2021 10:35 AM  
**To:** MayorandCouncil; Jim Bailey; Michelle McGuire  
**Subject:** Redevelopment Subdivision Proposal 5826 Eagle Island West Vancouver  
**Attachments:** Submission to WV council July 1, 2021 re DP application to split lot into 2 on Eagle Island-4.pdf

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

Please see our attached submission on this subdivision proposal.

Thanks you

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

s. 22(1)

[REDACTED] West Vancouver

RE: Preliminary Development Proposal -- subdivision of 5826 Eagle Island --site specific variance to the 2018 MWV-OCP,

July 1, 2021

Dear Mayor and Council:

Before we go any further, we would like to make it clear we are deeply appreciative of the efforts of present and past councils and staff in making all areas of West Vancouver superb areas to live in, raise families, and retire (if one wishes) in West Vancouver. Further thank you to current and past councils and staff for creating and funding some of the best public schools in Canada.

We also wish to make clear, that “we respect all Eagle Islanders on a personal basis”. We appreciate the owners of 5826 Eagle Island outreach to all stakeholders. Their proposal is professional, substantive and clear. We also appreciate the responses from other islander stakeholders. We look forward to reviewing correspondence from other stakeholders on island and on the mainland in Eagle Harbour and those who also have permanent docks facing Eagle Island.

With the kindest regards to all, we are opposed to ANY further densification or redevelopment that involves the splitting of any lots on Eagle Island. Thus, we cannot support the subdivision proposal for 5826 Eagle Island. Any redevelopment that creates an additional lot in an area where there are already constraints, peak load congestion, and bottlenecks on key shared municipal resources is a “zero-sum game”, there is no opportunity to make this a “sum-sum game”. In plainer English, the owners of the redevelopment will win, and all others will lose. For those proximate neighbours to any redevelopment proposal, they bear direct costs and the indirect costs borne by all neighbours. Proximate neighbours lose twice.

It is our position, that any redevelopment that creates an additional lot is “pareto-degrading”, the costs to the many outweigh the benefits to the few. Even with the offers to expand docks, reposition the service dock, and add 2 car parking spots. None of which may be possible without extensive consultation. Including federal/provincial regulatory review and approval, and broad residential reviews as per the 2008 Balanced Environmental report.

The costs to the many live on in perpetuity both for residents of Eagle Island/Eagle Harbour but also the municipality in increased capital costs and more importantly ongoing operating costs which are fundamentally more onerous.

By the way, “Thank You” to current and past council and staff for the ongoing substantial sunk investments in municipal docks and ramps on both sides for Eagle Island which flowed from the October 21, 2008 Balanced Environmental Services Report on Eagle Island. A 20-year

operational study. An update to 2021 pricing of the situational analysis and costing of the various options outlined in the 2008 Balanced Report would be appreciated. As anticipated in 2008, the family members per household has increased as younger families have moved onto Eagle Island. Covid has also resulted in many millennials moving back with parents on an episodic basis which may be the new norm post-Covid?

Our reasoning for our inability to support to any subdivision redevelopment is as follows:

**In our opinion, Eagle Island shares the same “public good” characteristics as “strata ownership”:**

- Shared land/limited lobby in this case the West Vancouver Eagle Island mainland dock and the Eagle Island dock – the common municipality docks.
- Shared and limited parking: Firstly, barge parking and rowboat parking on both docks. Secondly there are significant periods of peak demand for car/motorcycle parking (from Eagle Island residents and guests; EHYC members and guests; EH residents and guests and North Shore residents and guests using the public access and Eagle Harbour beach) that vastly overwhelms supply. This is a significant constraint
- Eagle Island resembles a “mixed use” strata – all 34 lots can use the common municipal docks. 25 EI lots “must use” municipal docks. 9 Eagle Island lots have our own private docks tied to WVCYC private barge dock access. As anticipated in 2008, there is increasing pressure from the 9 lots on municipal docks. The scenario of the demand for 1.5 barge spaces/2 rowboats contemplated in 2008 is the reality for many current families on Eagle Island. There is not enough room on current docks for 1 barge for all 34 families and 1 rowboat.
- Offers to expand docks or reposition the service dock (again) is piecemeal, and will run asunder of Federal, Provincial, and Mainland marina and resident’s review. It does not address any of the issues identified in the 2008 Balanced report.
- Other stakeholder correspondence and pictures submitted by EI owners show quite clearly at peak times at both municipal docks there are already bottlenecks on barge parking, rowboat parking and car parking.
- All of these “public good” issues were identified in the 2008 Balanced report on Eagle Island
- If one redevelopment/subdivision is approved, this will be precedent setting and it is our understanding that others are already interested in subdivision of their properties. And why wouldn’t they be, the upside is one can take out millions of dollars (tax free) and still have a lot/house to live in or sell both.

Eagle Island municipal docks and mainland shared parking have a “peak load” constraint that is significant and has increased as families mature. No one foresaw the Covid pandemic, nor how it has affected the return of millennials to their parents’ homes. Young adults with cars need a lot of extra parking.

As well due to the “Public Good” characteristics of waterfront, any expansion of current docks impacts the views, access to mainland docks and potentially negatively the value of several mainland properties. My understanding is that during the recent redevelopment of the service/materials dock, it was originally put in deeper water, but due to concerns and complaints by mainland owners, it was moved back to the original placement which leaves it high and dry for much of the time.

The words affordability next to West Vancouver seem to be an oxymoron. We do agree with those EI residents who have pointed out that one buys on EI and many other areas in West Vancouver because of the larger or secluded nature of the lots and we pay a premium to do so. One of the unforeseen consequences of Covid, is that larger secluded lots have increased significantly in value. This may be a permanent change in ‘relative values’ due to Covid.

We willingly accept the barge/rowboat rides and the “wheel barrow” lifestyle to live on Eagle Island. While this subdivision of 5826 impacts all of us indirectly, the costs to the proximate neighbours of the proposed development is the greatest and the potential decrease in the future value of their properties due to any redevelopment is potentially non-trivial. Whether the offers for mitigation of damages by the owners of 5826 Eagle Island compensates proximate owners to their satisfaction is not for us to decide or comment on.

There are areas in West Vancouver where redevelopment results in a sum-sum game and everyone is better off in aggregate. Eagle Island is not one of these communities. Externalities are common in housing markets. Given the constraints with access and parking for Eagle Island, any further subdivision will create significant negative externalities for all Eagle Island residents.

We are deeply appreciative to staff and council for all the time and consideration given to date on redevelopment/subdivision proposals on Eagle Island. We greatly appreciate that any decision council make’s will be unpopular with someone, hence our arguments have been based on the “public good”, economic and business fundamentals.

Therefore, to recapitulate, we cannot support in general terms any subdivision of any lot on Eagle Island. Thus, with respect, we cannot support this subdivision proposal at 5826 Eagle Island. **Current development/building guidelines allow for the redevelopment of single-family housing stocks which we support fully (even mega homes maxing out FS ratio's).**

Thank you to council, and staff for allowing us to make a submission.

Cheers and regards,

s. 22(1)

**From:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Monday, July 5, 2021 8:40 AM  
**To:** MayorandCouncil; Jim Bailey; Michelle McGuire  
**Subject:** 5826 Eagle Island Application to Sub-divide & Eagle Harbour Area Parking

**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 All,

The purpose of this email is to oppose any subdivision on Eagle Island as well as to point out the increasing issues with parking around the Eagle Harbour beach and on Eagle Harbour Road. We live [REDACTED] s. 22(1), [REDACTED] s. 22(1). Often it is difficult to exit our property due to parked vehicles along [REDACTED] s. 22(1). Often vehicles are left for lengthy periods of time. If you look around the neighbourhood some vehicles have vinyl covers as they are left in place long-term. On Eagle Harbour Road between Telegraph Trail and the beach there are vehicles left long-term, one that has been there as long as I can remember. On Eagle Harbour Road due to the medians parked cars, access is often a challenge for residents trying to get in and out as well as for pedestrians. I can understand it is difficult if you live on Eagle Island; however, the limited parking is not new. Perhaps residents have multiple cars though they may only have one or two spots. Any subdivision would add to the problem.

To summarize:

- Parking is already a problem
- People are leaving vehicles long-term
- Eagle Harbour Road access continues to be an issue
- Beach access for pedestrians, particularly elderly and children, can be treacherous

I have attached two photos taken looking up Seaview Road form the beach. One is one a Sunday and the other on a Tuesday to show the congestion on different days.

Thanks for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

[REDACTED] West Vancouver



**From:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Monday, July 5, 2021 8:41 AM  
**To:** MayorandCouncil  
**Subject:** Subdivision Proposal at 5826 Eagle Island

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

Dear Mayor and Council

Thank you for the time and effort of this and past Councils to consider various rezoning proposals at 5826 Eagle Island and the multiple opinions that have been expressed on the matter. We also appreciate your efforts and success in improving the attractiveness and livability of West Vancouver, and your policies to encourage sensitive subdivision and redevelopment of large lots where appropriate.

Reluctantly, we now feel compelled to respond to the proponent's June 30 letter to you (copied below for ease of reference) [REDACTED] s. 22(1) [REDACTED].

The June 30 letter offers unrequested and quite out of the blue benefits to immediate neighbours in support of the proponent's rezoning proposal. We cannot speak to the offers made [REDACTED] s.22(1) but do want to set the record straight on the [REDACTED] s.22(1)

s.22(1) following the second failed attempt to rezone 5826 for coach house development, which s.22(1) incorporated construction elements, visible below, that were clearly intended to make it unsightly. The proponent now s.22(1)

s.22(1)

The proponent's June 30 letter admits to [REDACTED] s.22(1), and quite evidently, make [REDACTED] s.22(1) as unpleasant as possible.

This offer is entirely self serving. [REDACTED] s.22(1) in both directions. The true purpose of [REDACTED] s.22(1) and reversing the mischief intended by [REDACTED] views from the proposed new lot [REDACTED] s. 22(1). Views that were not available [REDACTED] s.22(1) and therefore expendable until now.

In any event, [REDACTED] s.22(1) partial views [REDACTED] s.22(1) the new house to be built. Meanwhile the new trees planted by the proponent [REDACTED] s.22(1) to eventually [REDACTED] s.22(1) will keep growing.

We quite frankly wish [REDACTED] s.22(1) never been mentioned as we had gotten past that affront.

The other offers in the proponent's June 30 letter are equally flawed and doubtful. The proponent is in no position to deliver on the expansion of the two docks, relocation of the District's barge and relocation of the freight dock for 24 hour use.

Federal and Provincial approvals may be required and, unless the world has turned completely upside down, the District will not consider contributing, if at all, to the relocation of the freight dock until all hurdles have been cleared given the quite recent attempt by the District to relocate this dock to deep water which resulted in an expensive and embarrassing reversal.

In short, numerous third party approvals, consents, and agreements must be obtained before the proponent can establish a clear and actionable path to make good on his offers.

In closing, the proposed rezoning is a repeated and largely unwelcomed imposition that negatively impacts the entire Eagle Island community. While we respect those who are supportive following intense and often uninvited lobbying efforts by the proponent, we do not support this rezoning proposal, more so having been falsely portrayed [REDACTED] s.22(1).

Kind Regards

[REDACTED]  
s. 22(1)

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

## Summary of Applicant Paid Contributions Offered as part of Subdivision

We are prepared to offer the following as part of our subdivision plan. These contributions to the Eagle Island neighbourhood are in addition to any CAC imposed by the District:

1. Creation of two additional vehicle parking spaces in the undeveloped road allowance area of the gravel parking lot in the 5700 block of Eagle Harbour Road.
2. Addition of a 6 ft extension to the south end of the mainland dock (see sketch) to provide:
  - One additional barge moorage on the east side of the dock
  - 6ft. of additional dingy moorage on west side of the dock
  - lateral moorage for the municipal barge at the south end of the dock
  - repositioning of the municipal barge frees up 4 barge spaces on the east side of the dock
3. Addition of a 6 ft extension to the south end of the island dock to provide moorage for two more barges.
4. 50% of the cost, up to a maximum of \$70,000 (see Blue Water quote) to extend the Service Dock to have it afloat and accessible for barges 24/7. This would add 6 barge spaces and provide all island residents with a delivery platform to use anytime. At the time they removed the new service dock back in 2016, the District indicated they would extend it at some future time. Hopefully a 50% contribution for a necessary asset will provide that impetus.
5. For the owner at 5830, we would remove the fence and “window” the trees between our properties substantially improving their view over our property.
6. For the owners at 5822, we would gift them that portion of our property that lies east of the stone wall which runs the length of our common property line.
7. For the owners at 5821, we would significantly improve their ocean view to the south by “windowing” large trees on our property.

In summary these offered contributions add 11 mainland/service dock moorings, 2 island dock moorings, some new dingy docking area, and two new vehicle parking spaces.

s. 22(1)

5826 Eagle Island

**From:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Monday, July 5, 2021 9:16 AM  
**To:** MayorandCouncil; Jim Bailey; Michelle McGuire  
**Subject:** Re: Subdivision Proposal at 5825 Eagle Island

**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.

\*\* CONFIDENTIAL \*\*

Dear All,

Given the intense and unwanted lobbying by the applicants [REDACTED] s. 22(1), I would like to formally notify you that I am very much not in favour of the rezoning application for a number of reasons, including:

1. Rezoning on Eagle Island and impact this would have on the island communities way of life; and
2. The lack of resources in place to support any additional families on the island.

Approval of rezoning would I understand not be treated as a one off for the applicant's in order for them to sell the subdivision to build themselves a new home and pocket the change. A change in the rezoning laws could result in additional rezoning requests by others looking to impact the island's way of life for their own benefit

The parking and dock / barge situation is frankly a disaster [REDACTED] s. 22(1). Parking is restricted to one vehicle and I would guess that at least 70% of the islanders have 2 or more vehicles. Although there is overflow parking located on Eagle Island Road this is generally occupied 24 / 7 by community residents and results in families having to park their vehicles some distance from the island, these are families with kids or elderly people and their associated shopping. Very challenging especially in winter.

As for the barge, the mainland dock is partially unusable at low tide and at least a 1/3 of the dock is occupied with row boats. The island side is generally full in the evening and there have been occasions when islanders have had to revert to mooring at private docks to get back to their homes.

I believe this is the 3rd application by the applicants and I see no change in the views of the islanders or the demands of the applicant. The proposal to effective pay off neighbours to make them happy, whilst generous does not remediate the problems associated with granting this application to those families that call the island home.

Please keep this email in confidence to ensure the relationships on the island are not strained any more than they currently are as a result of the lobbying efforts you will have seen in the emails you have been copied on.

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

Very best regards,

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

On Jun 30, 2021,

wrote:

## Subdivision Proposal at 5825 Eagle Island

### Summary of Applicant Paid Contributions Offered as part of Subdivision

We are prepared to offer the following as part of our subdivision plan. These contributions to the Eagle Island neighbourhood are in addition to any CAC imposed by the District:

1. Creation of two additional vehicle parking spaces in the undeveloped road allowance area of the gravel parking lot in the 5700 block of Eagle Harbour Road.
2. Addition of a 6 ft extension to the south end of the mainland dock (see sketch) to provide:
  - One additional barge moorage on the east side of the dock
  - 6ft. of additional dingy moorage on west side of the dock
  - lateral moorage for the municipal barge at the south end of the dock
  - repositioning of the municipal barge frees up 4 barge spaces on the east side of the dock
3. Addition of a 6 ft extension to the south end of the island dock to provide moorage for two more barges.
4. 50% of the cost, up to a maximum of \$70,000 (see Blue Water quote) to extend the Service Dock to have it afloat and accessible for barges 24/7. This would add 6 barge spaces and provide all island residents with a delivery platform to use anytime. At the time they removed the new service dock back in 2016, the District indicated they would extend it at some future time. Hopefully a 50% contribution for a necessary asset will provide that impetus.
5. For the owner at 5830, we would remove the fence and “window” the trees between our properties substantially improving their view over our property.
6. For the owners at 5822, we would gift them that portion of our property that lies east of the stone wall which runs the length of our common property line.
7. For the owners at 5821, we would significantly improve their ocean view to the south by “windowing” large trees on our property.

In summary these offered contributions add 11 mainland/service dock moorings, 2 island dock moorings, some new dingy docking area, and two new vehicle parking spaces.

**From:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 30, 2021 10:34 AM  
**To:** MayorandCouncil  
**Cc:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Subject:** 4310 Marine Drive

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

To the Mayor and Council,

I became aware this week of the proposal to rezone 4310 Marine Drive to build high density condominiums. As the owner of [REDACTED] s. 22(1), I am very concerned about this project and am opposed to the requested zoning change from single family. I believe that any such change of zoning should require notice to the whole community. The proposed zoning change will significantly effect property values and alter the character of the neighborhood. I recently purchased my home at [REDACTED] s. 22(1) seeking a lower density family neighborhood.

I am aware that higher density and affordability are priorities for council, but it seems that the focus should be Ambleside. It also seems quite clear to me that the developer is attempting to manipulate these priorities for his own profit motives.

Please acknowledge receipt of this email.

Many thanks,

s. 22(1)

[REDACTED]  
s. 22(1)

**From:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 30, 2021 11:03 AM  
**To:** MayorandCouncil  
**Subject:** 4310 Marine Drive.

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

To Mayor and Council.

We have lived on [REDACTED] s. 22(1) for the last [REDACTED] s. 22(1) years, and previously on [REDACTED] s. 22(1) for [REDACTED] s. 22(1). What astounds us, and our neighbours, is that only the most immediate neighbours were notified of this dramatic change to the neighbourhood. If a variance is required, then yes, immediate neighbours may only be effected or interested, but such a significant rezoning as this effects far more. To not seek input from others, reeks of trying to slip this through in the Zoom world of mid summer.

It represents the very worst of political optics. And then when the inevitable push back arrives the politicians and staff resent unwanted input.

This design, especially if elevated to be above the new Flood Control Level under consideration, will never blend in. It will stand out as a long lasting example of seriously bad planning.

The only winner, if this project proceeds, will be the developer and its consultants. It will not fulfill a social void in providing affordable housing. Each unit will be priced well into seven figures and social housing policy should be aimed at meeting a value threshold way below that.

A bad proposal like this should never have seen the light of day, let alone be proposed with such limited exposure to the neighbourhood.

You should expect opposition to this, both now and next year.

[REDACTED]  
s. 22(1)

“Be Safe, Be Wise, Be Patient, Be Strong”.

**From:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 1, 2021 1:05 PM  
**To:** MayorandCouncil  
**Subject:** Re ....Re ZONING 4310 MARINE DRIVE. ....

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

Dear Mayor and council,

It is inconceivable and shocking that you, our elected councilors, the Mayor, planning and community planners, etc, would REMOTELY consider such a proposal/request, to CHANGE the property zoning on 4310 Marine Drive and Ferndale Avenue.

We are completely and wholly apposed to this and the very idea, it is extremely unacceptable. The property 4310 Marine Drive, should only ever be built on as TWO SINGLE FAMILY homes in keeping with the rest of our long established neighborhood.

For your information know this is NOT just a neighborhood of the rich, we and other home owners have a lived here for many many years, us for [REDACTED] s. 22(1), we built our house [REDACTED] s. 22(1) because of the country like area the coves and beaches, nature and distance from built up areas and the town.

I ask that you please listen and hear that there is UNANIMOUS OPPOSITION to this proposal and do what's right for the good of the people AND the land on which we live.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

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

Sent from my iPad

**From:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Friday, July 2, 2021 11:13 AM  
**To:** Mary-Ann Booth; Craig Cameron; Nora Gambioli; Peter Lambur; Bill Soprovich; Sharon Thompson; mwong@westvancouver.ca  
**Cc:** MayorandCouncil: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Subject:** Sent on behalf of [REDACTED] s. 22(1) - Re: 4310 Marine Drive Housing Development  
**Attachments:** Opposition Letter for proposed zoning change - [REDACTED] s. 22(1) .pdf

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

Please see attached a letter from [REDACTED] s. 22(1) and ask that you acknowledge receipt.

KIND REGARDS,

[REDACTED]  
s. 22(1)

2 July 2021

Dear Honorable Mayor and City Council,

I am writing to vehemently oppose the proposed townhouse development to be located at 4310 Marine Drive, West Vancouver, BC. I have owned my home at [REDACTED] s. 22(1) W. Vancouver, BC for over [REDACTED] s. 22(1) and am disappointed that the council did not notify me of the proposed change to zoning.

First and foremost, the proposed zoning changes would result in significant increased traffic and congestion, reduce property values and negatively impact the overall character of the surrounding neighborhood. The contemplated change to zoning will alter the use of a large area in close proximity to [REDACTED] s.22(1). This townhouse development will adversely affect the personality and entire nature of the street and neighborhood.

I purchased this home specifically due to the peaceful environment and I, along with my neighbors, pay large sums of property taxes to help preserve and enjoy the quiet surroundings. The additional density that would result from the townhouse development is nonsensical, as the additional traffic, congestion and noise alone would diminish the charm of the neighborhood and reduce my enjoyment of my property and the neighborhood.

It seems indisputable that this development will negatively impact the ability of current residents to continue to enjoy the neighborhood where they chose to purchase property and will also result in decreased home values for the entire neighborhood.

I have been in contact with several of my neighbors [REDACTED] s. 22(1), having personally known many of them for years, and I can assure you that we understand the long term implications of this zoning change and how it will significantly impact the neighborhood and we will do whatever necessary to stop this project.

Therefore, I respectfully ask that you re-consider and prompt the developer to find a more suitable location for the aforementioned proposed development.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]  
s. 22(1)

**From:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Friday, July 2, 2021 6:49 PM  
**To:** MayorandCouncil  
[REDACTED]  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** 4310 Marine Drive Proposed Development

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

Mayor & Council,

It was recently brought to our attention KMD and F. Adab Architects Inc. are proposing to rezone the single family property at 4310 Marine Drive for 12 townhomes. We are strongly opposed to this re-zoning application.

We have lived in several neighborhoods in West Vancouver over the years. [REDACTED] s. 22(1) we moved our family from [REDACTED] s.22(1) to our current house in the [REDACTED] s.22(1) neighborhood.

When we lived in [REDACTED] s.22(1) several higher density projects of this nature came along and we were generally supportive because it fit with neighborhood, public amenities, surrounding developments and commercial, restaurant and retail infrastructure. These higher density developments also effectively allowed for a bigger, broader community without necessarily necessitating more cars on the road given the close proximity to the village. The same can be said for the thoughtful developments in Ambleside.

The development at 4310 Marine Drive seems the opposite of this thoughtful growth planning. There is little surrounding infrastructure, commercial and retail. Moreover the 4310 development is a total anathema to the DNA of the existing community which is entirely made up of single family homes. The development will put more vehicles on Marine Drive when in fact we should be trying to do the opposite. It is perplexing that this type of development would even be considered in the proposed neighborhood.

Development and growth will happen but it must be done carefully and thoughtfully in the appropriate areas while mindful of the surrounding neighborhoods. The 4310 proposal appears to be more of developer cash grab, driven by other motivations, and does not support the neighborhood and community objectives.

Further progress on this project should be halted as soon as practicable and the developer re-directed to explore higher density developments where existing infrastructure and neighborhoods will support them.

We appreciate your consideration.

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]  
s. 22(1)

**From:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Sunday, July 4, 2021 12:19 PM  
**To:** Mary-Ann Booth; Craig Cameron; mgambiolo@westvancouver.ca; Nora Gambioli; Peter Lambur; bsoporovich@westvancouver.ca; Sharon Thompson; Marcus Wong; MayorandCouncil  
**Subject:** REZONING PROPOSAL 4310 MARINE DRIVE, WEST VANCOUVER

**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 Council,

I am a resident [REDACTED] s. 22(1) in this neighbourhood and I am very unhappy and shocked at the proposed plan to develop a 12 Unit building at 4310, Marine Drive. I do not believe it is at all suitable to the neighbourhood.

In addition, rezoning the area sets a precedent for possible further development of this nature, thus changing forever, the peace and tranquility of this single family area.

I do not think the developer has any altruistic motives and is simply trying to make a very large profit on the lot.

This letter respectfully requests that mayor and council leave the current zoning re single family homes unchanged.

Yours truly,

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

West Vancouver

**From:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Sunday, July 4, 2021 2:39 PM  
**To:** Mary-Ann Booth; Craig Cameron; Nora Gambioli; Peter Lambur; Bill Soprovich; Sharon Thompson; Marcus Wong; MayorandCouncil  
**Subject:** 4310 Marine Drive

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

To Mayor and Council

Our family has lived in West Vancouver for [REDACTED] years and on [REDACTED] s. 22(1) for [REDACTED] s. 22(1) years. The Lower Caulfield Community is a beautiful, quiet "**single family**" neighbourhood that is enjoyed by all and we want to keep it that way. Imagine our concern to find the Developers plans for 12 townhouses and 22 parking spaces stuck in our mailbox. Up until this time there has been no contact from the DWV Planning Dept., Mayor or Council members...so who has been given the authority to put this development through without consultation with all the neighbours on Erwin, Ferndale, Evergreen and other affected areas.

This is totally against what the neighbourhood is all about and it is very strange that only the adjacent properties were notified of this development.

The access and egress from the site is very restrictive and is proposed to come out on Ferndale Ave. - Ferndale is a 2 lane road at best.

Two vehicles can barely pass on the street and if trucks such as fire or garbage are on the street there is no room for passenger vehicles.

Any changes to Ferndale Ave. further erodes the ambience of the area and will only benefit the owner of 4310 Marine Drive.

MLower Caulfield is and has always been a community of single family homes. Such a development is inappropriate and as proposed would ruin the neighbourhood. It could set a precedent for future development. Homeowners purchase in this area because of the location and ambience. The property should remain for **Single Family** home development in line with the rest of the community.

You the elected Mayor and Council members should rethink this plan as it will impact everybody who lives on Erwin, Ferndale, Evergreen and surrounding streets as well as lower everybody's property.

[REDACTED]  
s. 22(1)

**From:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Sunday, July 4, 2021 9:21 PM  
**To:** MayorandCouncil  
**Subject:** 4310 Marine Drive. West Vancouver.BC

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 have been a resident of [REDACTED] s. 22(1) for [REDACTED] s. 22(1) and I am writing to register my opposition to the proposed townhouse development of the above lands.

My objection to the proposal is that the public should be able to rely on the OCP and any change to the OCP should have full consultation with the immediate community and the public at large. This land was purchased for and is zoned single family in keeping with all the surrounding land and to propose a density of 3 to 4 times what it is zoned for is totally unacceptable. It is out of character with the neighbourhood and will have a devastating affect on those single family homes surrounding this property. If approved it will set a precedent that will have a long lasting effect on this neighbourhood, with other developers applying to rezoning other lands along Marine Drive. It will be difficult to refuse them if you allow this application to be approved.

I do not understand how this application has gone this far as someone at City Hall must have encouraged this developer to draw up plans and make this application. This concerns me as it should have been made clear from day one that the land was zoned for single family and no encouragement should have been given to this applicant to proceed to make this application.

I am hoping this council will understand the concerns of the community and preserve and not destroy this single family area.

Your truly,

[REDACTED]  
s. 22(1)

Sent from my iPad

**From:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Monday, July 5, 2021 8:40 AM  
**To:** MayorandCouncil  
**Cc:** Jim Bailey; Eric Villeneuve  
**Subject:** 4310 Marine Drive - Public Trust

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

Dear Mayor and Council,

The West Vancouver Community Plan is an excellent piece of work; the product of broad collaboration and the collective imagination of West Vancouver's residents. Finding opportunities for gentle densification in neighbourhoods of predominantly single-detached houses is a bold and laudable strategy in helping to fill the "missing middle" - medium density housing.

For gentle densification or sensitive infill to work, the planning and architecture of projects must be pleasing enough to existing neighbours that they could visualize living there themselves. Especially in the early stages of introducing multi-family housing where it has never existed, projects must be of exemplary quality. I think "Hollyburn Mews" on Esquimalt Ave, between 20th and 21st Streets meets that standard for its neighbourhood.

So I was shocked to learn that a clumsy attempt to overcrowd a lot in my neighbourhood with 12 units in an ugly lump of a building, where one small house had formerly stood, had reached the stage of a rezoning application. If Hollyburn Mews is sensitive infill, the building proposed for 4310 Marine Drive is "callous infill".

I am not opposed to the introduction of pocket neighbourhoods in my area, consisting of well designed clusterings of two or three units, asymmetrical duplexes and the like. The project must harmonize with its surroundings. The proposed project does violence to that concept.

My wife and I have lived [REDACTED] s. 22(1) since [REDACTED] s. 22(1). Prior [REDACTED] s.22(1) numerous multi-family and resort projects in the Lower Mainland and elsewhere. I can confidently say that I have never seen a proposed project less well suited to its surroundings. It should not be built, for the sake of this neighbourhood and for the sake of maintaining public trust in the policy of gentle densification in West Vancouver.

Yours truly,

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

**From:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 1, 2021 12:23 PM  
**To:** MayorandCouncil; Erika Syvokas  
**Subject:** Proposed rezoning of 6779 Dufferin Ave.

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

Dear Mayor, Council and Community Planner,

I have concerns about the Proposed rezoning of 6779 Dufferin Ave.

1. Dufferin Ave, historically, has been a summer beach community with small cottages and yards that are reasonably sized. There has been new building and renovations and they have been in keeping with our neighbourhood. The proposed rezoning will change the look and feel of our "hood" as we call it. It is near the top of the street and will "stick out like a sore thumb."
2. The drawings the contractor has provided are not realistic. The houses will be very CLOSE TO THE ROAD. Hence the "stick out like a sore thumb."
3. PARKING - it seems they will have little room for parking putting more cars on the street which is already a problem especially in summer.
4. WHY NOW - The blue house across the street was not allowed to build a garage because it would have been too close to the road. The proposal has the house much closer to the road.  
- The house next to the proposed rezoning at the top of the street was not allowed to have a driveway on Marine Drive because of the DANGER. People drive fast on Marine Drive. Again PARKING ON MARINE DRIVE will increase.
5. You denied the rezoning of property on the top of Nelson where St. Monica's church is. This is an ideal place for higher density building.
6. I would rather see a large house rather than 2 houses crammed onto a VERY small lot.
7. I understand the developer will be paying West Vancouver \$182,000.00 if he is granted the rezoning. DONE DEAL? I hope this is not the case.

Please ensure our neighbourhood does not lose it's charm.

Thank you for listening to my concerns.

Sincerely  
[REDACTED]  
s. 22(1)

(9)(b)

**From:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Monday, July 5, 2021 1:56 PM  
**To:** MayorandCouncil  
**Subject:** Rezoning of 6779 Dufferin 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 Madam Mayor and Council

We live at [REDACTED] s. 22(1) and are fully in support of the proposed rezoning of 6779 Dufferin Ave – [REDACTED] s. 22(1) [REDACTED]. This is a wonderful family-oriented neighbourhood and 2 new family homes will be a great addition. We were lucky enough to raise our family here and there has been a wonderful influx of young families over the last decade. This is exactly what West Van needs!!

Yours truly

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

**From:** Brodie Gunn [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Monday, July 5, 2021 4:32 PM  
**To:** MayorandCouncil  
**Cc:** Erika Svakas; Carmen Gunn  
**Subject:** 6779 Dufferin avenue Subdivision 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.

Dear Honourable Mayor and Council,

By now I am sure you are familiar with the subdivision proposal at 6779 Dufferin Avenue. The public hearing is scheduled for July 13th, 2021. I would like to extend the invitation to those who have not yet visited the site to come by and get a feel for the project in person. We are happy to work within your busy schedules to accommodate a viewing. Please let us know if you would like to come by and see the site and neighbourhood.

Thank you,

Brodie and Carmen Gunn  
6779 Dufferin Avenue, West Vancouver, BC

[REDACTED]  
s. 22(1)

**From:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Monday, July 5, 2021 4:59 PM  
**To:** MayorandCouncil  
**Subject:** Fwd: Gallery homes Dufferin Ave. Subdivisions

**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.

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Date:** July 5, 2021 at 4:25:24 PM PDT  
**To:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Subject:** Gallery homes Dufferin Ave. Subdivisions

Dear Mayor and Council,  
My name is [REDACTED] s. 22(1) and I reside at [REDACTED] s. 22(1). For [REDACTED] years my family has enjoyed the neighborhood of [REDACTED] and surrounding Dufferin Ave. As residents we can say with conviction and confidence that Dufferin is the kind of neighbourhood community that West Vancouver is seeking to create in other areas. This lovely green neighborhood has the old, the young, the middle. We know our neighbors and share beach time, Easter Egg hunts and New Years dips. We are a community. We revel in the lush greenery and sometimes feel swamped by it but that is why we are here. The vast majority of Dufferin Ave. has large lots with single family dwellings. I have never ever heard anyone murmur that we need to revitalize our neighborhood. Nor have I ever heard neighbours express the desire to have smaller lots and more density. So my question is why now do I find myself in a position of trying to defend and retain the very best kind of neighbourhood and one that the municipality would do well to emulate!

6779 Dufferin Ave recently sold [REDACTED] s. 22(1). Wonderful! It was not advertised by the realtor as a tear down. It sold for a price point over lot value. In fact over the years on many occasions, [REDACTED] s. 22(1) the home requesting to be demolished. Not once did it occur to us that it was substandard and unsuitable. Quite the contrary, the house was a good example of mid century housing and had clean lines and minimal outlook. It was well kept. My own family would be thrilled to live in such a fine house. So why are we discussing tearing down a mid century home to build a flat roofed self declared mid century knockoff. I am confused. And why all this discussion about two homes being created? Surely the occupied existing family home counts as one, so in fact there is only one additional home being created. We have two recent superb examples of renovation of older homes on Dufferin. In my opinion this is the most appropriate option for our street.

The next confusion for me is about rules. When is a rule really a rule? If you don't like a rule, it seems you go the way of a variance. How many variance(s) is too many? How many feet in variance front, back and sides is too much? When is a lot size too small for 2 homes? It would seem to mean that all these things are arbitrary when they should not be. For example, The proposed Lot A is requesting a variance of a)359.5 sq. Ft. b)5.6 metres and Lot B is requiring a) 417.6 sq.ft and b) 5.03metres. Too many variances required.

Trees are important in our neighborhood. The current home at 6779 Dufferin has no basement. Tree roots will be disturbed with the excavation of the entire lot AandB combined. 10-12 trees are to be removed completely and the remainder of 36 will be disturbed. What is it we are trying to achieve here? And why?

Traffic has increased in our neighborhood in a huge way in recent years. People from far and wide are using and enjoying Bachelor Bay at the foot of Dufferin and Whytecliff Park is being used for weddings, movies, family gatherings, cyclists, pedestrians and sightseeing. To this end we have had traffic calming installed, parking signage posted and 'local traffic' only monitoring on weekends. There is no case for increasing density in our neighbourhood. Recently with road repairs ongoing and five minute light waits, it was shocking how quickly traffic builds. We have a one way in, one way out neighbourhood and I would caution any density increase.

One thing I am not confused about is that [REDACTED] s. 22(1) frontage currently exists in line with 6779 frontage. If this proposal is approved [REDACTED] s.22(1) will have a huge loss of greenery and be viewing [REDACTED] s.22(1) the side of a house. Both at the front and back [REDACTED] s.22(1). We currently enjoy the greenery. This in my opinion is unnecessary, unfortunate and devastating.

I trust mayor and council will see fit to preserve the existing neighborhood and existing home. There is nothing to be gained for the greater good in this project. My husband and myself oppose this rezoning.

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

Sent from my iPad

**From:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Monday, July 5, 2021 2:10 PM  
**To:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Cc:** MayorandCouncil  
**Subject:** Rezoning 6779 Dufferin

**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.

<https://westvancouver.ca/home-building-property/planning/major-applications/6779-dufferin-avenue>

Can you send a quick note to Mayor and council in support of this project

[MayorandCouncil@westvancouver.ca](mailto:MayorandCouncil@westvancouver.ca)

This what [REDACTED] s.22(1) sent

Dear Madam Mayor and Council

We live at [REDACTED] s. 22(1) and are fully in support of the proposed rezoning of 6779 Dufferin Ave – [REDACTED] s. 22(1). This is a wonderful family-oriented neighbourhood and 2 new family homes will be a great addition. We were lucky enough to raise our family here and there has been a wonderful influx of young families over the last decade.

This is exactly what West Van needs!!

Yours truly

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

**From:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Monday, July 5, 2021 2:29 PM  
**To:** MayorandCouncil  
**Subject:** Fwd: Residential development proposal for 6779 Dufferin 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.

Sent from my iPhone

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Date:** April 9, 2020 at 8:45:29 AM PDT  
**To:** [esyvokas@westvancouver.ca](mailto:esyvokas@westvancouver.ca)  
**Subject:** Residential development proposal for 6779 Dufferin Ave

I am writing to you to state my opposition to this proposal. Although densification seems to be the byword these days, I can't think of a less appropriate location. I understand that there is always a desire to realize a profit with regard to house and land and this is the only motivation I can see for this particular proposal. This will not provide affordable housing that people want so much and would come at great cost to our neighbourhood. We are so lucky to have relatively good sized lots with lots of greenery and beauty. To have areas like this so close to a large city is something to be preserved. We are a stable, family oriented, cohesive neighbourhood and are grateful to live here. We chose to live here because of what the neighbourhood has to offer. For many years there was little turnover, but in the last few years there has been some. This is the inevitable result of people aging and life style changes. As houses come on the market, young couples wanting to start a family and families with children have taken their places and settled in well to the community. Believe me, the really aged do not want to live here as there are no supports for them. Some move to areas closer in, that are better serviced. Some move closer to their children, sometimes in other parts of Canada. Some of our new neighbours came from crowded areas of the city, quite a few are people who grew up in the nearby area and are delighted to return. This is a family neighbourhood. Children and grandchildren all play together, so definitely multigenerational. So far we have not been plagued with developers. We aren't an area with huge mansions sitting empty. Our housing stock tends to be older, but instead of ripping it down, most are updating and renovating, which maintains the character and feel of our community.

This is a car dependent neighbourhood. It is poorly serviced by transit and this will not change. I can think of only one person who regularly commutes to work from this area, everyone else drives. Our walk score is something like 19/100 and is described as being car dependent. Our

closest supermarket is 5km away, certainly not walking distance.

The proposal for sub dividing 6779 Dufferin will create two small lots, requiring multiple variances. We will lose a lot of tree cover even though West Vancouver has set a high value on our trees and has brought in bylaws to prevent cutting mature trees. Interestingly enough it's ok to cut them if they are within a building footprint, in this case two footprints. Occasionally people will move in and find after a while that it's not the lifestyle they want and have moved on. They haven't tried to change it to what they see as desirable. One of the concerns is West Vancouver's decreasing population, not so here. We have growing families with lots of children. It's a safe, stable environment. Neighbourhoods such as these should be preserved as they are now.

From my perspective, allowing lots to be split up willy nilly for the purpose of redevelopment is not conducive to your stated goal of preserving established neighbourhoods. What we have is worth preserving.

Sent from my iPad

s.22(1)



(9)(g)

---

**From:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Monday, July 5, 2021 4:19 PM  
**To:** MayorandCouncil  
**Cc:** Erika Syvokas  
**Subject:** 6779 Dufferin Ave sub-division proposal  
**Attachments:** Virtual Public Engagement for 6779 Dufferin Ave sub.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.

A copy of feedback for the virtual public engagement is attached

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

## **Virtual Public Engagement for 6779 Dufferin Ave sub-division proposal**

**Dear Mayor and Council**

I write again to oppose, quote, “*The subdivision of 6779 Dufferin Avenue...*” that “... will bring two new modest single family homes to West Vancouver.”

In reality, the proposed subdivision a) will demolish an older home to add two new ones that will have a larger building footprint, in part by removing or impacting a large number of trees. I will get to the safety concerns this sub-division will after making two important comments about the reporting process and content. Unfortunately, both comments are negative.

First, a public engagement process whereby a proponent controls the feedback does not protect confidentiality (i.e., potentially reducing feedback) and it introduces the potential for feedback being edited. For this reason, our message is being copied directly to you as well as being posted on the website.

Second, the Report to Council (by Erika Syvokas, Community Planner) is disingenuous with regard to earlier feedback on the proposed sub-division.

To quote the Report (my emphasis): “*Concerns raised regarding the proposal were related to loss of privacy through altering existing site lines, tree removal, and concerns regarding the uncertainty of the size/design of the homes to be built on the subdivided properties. More generally, concerns were identified related to the impacts of densification including change to the existing neighbourhood character, safety with respect to adding density in an area with only one access route into and out of the neighbourhood (Marine Drive), increase in vehicle traffic due to lack of transit service in the neighbourhood, lack of street parking and the potential of a precedent being set in terms of subdivision.*”

However, the Report wrongly claims that all of these issues were resolved. Quote: “*The proposal responds to(sic) these concerns by proposing relatively smaller sized homes with the design secured through the proposed Development Variance Permit No.19-109, the proposed tree replacement and the provision of on-site parking.*”

In contrast, two relatively smaller homes will have a larger ecological footprint than the older home being demolished. Also, the requested variances represent unacceptable encroachments on roadway allowances and neighbouring properties. Therefore, sadly, only the issue of on-street parking was adequately addressed.

I hope that you will do a much better job considering the previously expressed issues. In addition, below I focus your attention on the single, unresolved question of safety, one that needs serious consideration.

**Is it safe to subdivide 6779 Dufferin Avenue and build two homes, one (referred to as Bdg A) with an existing access to Dufferin Ave and the other (referred to as Bdg B) requiring a new access to Marine Drive?**

I believe significant safety concerns exist, two obvious ones and one to be discovered if excavation starts. These safety concerns speak directly against applying OCP Policy Policy 2.1.1 to property in the peninsula west of Wellington Ave (which allows consideration of site-specific applications to enable the development of smaller houses on smaller lots in existing detached residential areas).

1) Driveway access to the busy Marine Drive is an on-going safety concern in West Vancouver, yet Bdg B requires a new driveway access to Marine Dr.

Some years ago Council rejected a variance request for a new driveway about 20 meters north of the one proposed for Bdg B, in part, because of safety concerns over the speed and the volume of vehicular traffic traveling to Whytecliff Park. Since that decision, traffic density has increased considerably, especially weekend traffic destined for Whytecliff Park and Bachelor Bay beach, as well for filming and weddings (West Vancouver allows four weddings a day in the park). Indeed, the discovery of these two ‘destinations’ has forced West Vancouver to monitor and restrict weekend access (it pays for four people to this - two for traffic control and two for monitoring). This expense follows costly installations of new signage (restricting on-street parking) and of new traffic calming speed bumps (which do nothing to deal with traffic density).

Clearly, traffic volume on a single-road access to two popular public beaches is a safety issue that cannot be ignored contrary to the blithe dismissal in the Report to Council, quote (my emphasis) “*the creation of a new home fronting onto Marine Drive will improve the residential feel of Marine Drive, potentially helping to slow traffic and make it safer for residents*”. Beyond resident safety is the greatly increased pedestrian traffic, who do not have a dedicated sidewalk. Any housing densification west of Wellington Ave, such as the present proposal, simply adds to an existing safety problem. Who will be liable for injuries?

2) The building proposal states that 36 trees will be impacted, 12 of which will be removed. This will create a serious safety concern for the remain trees and is out of character with OCP Policy 2.1.8 “*Ensure that new single family dwellings respect neighbourhood character ..... in regards to neighbourhood context and character, streetscape and natural features*”.

The peninsula west of Wellington Ave has a high tree density, with many large, mature conifers and deciduous trees. Indeed, some of these tress have been growing largely untouched on the existing 6779 Dufferin Ave site, its road allowance and its immediate surroundings for the [s.22(1)] years I have lived in the neighbourhood. Another undisputable fact is that this peninsula is subjected to intense Squamish outflow gales during winter months (witness trees being uprooted on Marine Drive just 0.5 km from 6779 Dufferin Ave – power was lost for over 24 h to the peninsula - and on another occasion the sinking of a huge barge in Horseshoe Bay).

For trees stability, safety exists in numbers. Thus, tree removal exposes remaining trees to wind shear during the next Squamish gale, something that may become more severe given the predictions of global warming. However, the arborist's report does consider the safety issue of removing 12 trees from this wind corridor (is this what the arborist's report means by 'impacted'?).

While the arborist's report did consider the potential for root damage to existing trees, it did not consider that some of the buffer zones extend very close to the walls of the proposed buildings (and under new driveways). Missing, therefore, is a consideration for future tree and root growth of the drain tile that will extend beyond these walls. Unlike the existing building, which is built on a concrete pad, the new buildings will require deep excavation to accommodate the full basements. Deep excavation and drain tile will damage roots during construction and lead to asymmetric root growth in the future, both of which can destabilize trees. Therefore, I cannot support the conclusion: "*6. All trees proposed for retention on public boulevard adjacent to the property and trees on neighbouring properties which have their critical root zone located on or within the building site as indicated in Schedule C shall be protected during construction and site works.*"

In fact, the four variances increase the tree safety concerns expressed above because of the encroachments on roadways and neighbouring properties. As such, the variances are unacceptable, and necessary only for larger homes.

Furthermore, I do not see how a 2:1, or even a 1:1, tree replacement remediation strategy will be practicable given the proposed building coverage and the existing root structures. I have no idea where they will be placed.

For good or for bad, the peninsula west of Wellington Ave is a region with a high tree density and the high level of tree removal, as proposed, creates safety (and esthetic) concerns. Council needs to think beyond tree protection during construction **and** beyond the building sites and road allowances. Who will be liable for the future safety issues when tree die or are blown down? Council, the developers, the new owners, or all three?

3) My last safety concern will be exposed by the proposed excavations for full basements.

When the uphill neighbouring property ( s. 22(1) ) was built the local soil substrata was exposed: a thin topsoil overlying sand and pebbles, which quickly gives way to large beach boulders and then an impressive layer of clay. This water-impermeable clay layer will have to be breached to a considerable extent for the proposed basements which are below grade to a greater extent than those for s. 22(1) . As a result, water drainage around the proposed sub-division will change substantially and add an additional burden to existing tree root systems because they grow towards water. We know nothing of the engineering concerns of building a foundation on clay.

Respectfully,

s. 22(1)

**From:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 1, 2021 1:06 PM  
**To:** Mahssa Beattie; MayorandCouncil  
**Subject:** Fw: West Vancouver & Homelessness again ??

**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.

**From:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**To:** "info@morethanaroot.org" <info@morethanaroot.org>  
**Cc:** "justin.trudeau@parl.gc.ca" <justin.trudeau@parl.gc.ca>, "Prime Minister/Premier Ministre" <pm@pm.gc.ca>  
**Sent:** Mon, 28 Jun 2021 at 15:09  
**Subject:** Homelessness again ??

To : More than A roof (Organizations) !!!

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

Hi ;

I am NOT interested on your waiting list and OLD building's that you have to KILL mentally disabled patients slowly but shorly....

>>>

Just like the first nation kids :(

With all the money that more than A roof Organization gets from the Government and charity's ;

I need them to pay part of my RENT as it is now or find me Permanent Apt in West Vancouver( \$ Independent Subsidy ) ??

I am a Senior with Mental Disability's ; NOT a fool .....Δ

Re- Guards

s. 22(1)

On Mon, 28 Jun 2021 at 14:46, More Than a Roof Housing Society <info@morethanaroot.org> wrote:

Good afternoon,

Thank you for contacting More Than a Roof, we value your inquiry. We are aware that you have had difficulty accessing housing while being on the BC Housing Registry.

If you could please fill out the attached application including your BCHousing file number , and send back via-email.

We do have a waitlist, but will hold your application for 6 months.

Thank you,

More Than a Roof



**More Than A Roof Housing Society**

**O** 604 215 4648 | **F** 604 215 4678

[info@morethanaroof.org](mailto:info@morethanaroof.org)

*Opening Doors, Changing Lives, Bringing People Home*

***Celebrating 35 Years of Service***

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

**Sent:** June-25-21 8:34 AM

**To:** [info@morethanaroof.org](mailto:info@morethanaroof.org)

**Subject:** Homelessness again ??

Hi ;

I am in risk of Homelessness because of high rent that I can not pay with my ministry (PWD) income just beacue :

I am a senior Lady with the lifetime Mental Disability's ???

Also in the BC housing top list for 13 years and still NO roof ???

Systematic Racism !!!

**From:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 1, 2021 1:23 PM  
**To:** MayorandCouncil  
**Subject:** Arts and Culture Centre - Site Selection 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.

Please incorporate my input for your engagement summary report to be presented at the July 26 Council Meeting.

The survey questions (for information) are:

1. Which location do you prefer for a future Arts & Culture Centre? = D

- a) Option 1: Ambleside Park - Tennis Courts
- b) Option 2: Ambleside Park - South Parking Lot
- c) I like both Option 1 and Option 2
- d) I do not like either option**

2. Please briefly explain why you chose this response for question 1.

I oppose taking park land for an Arts & Culture Centre. Ambleside Park is extremely well used – including the existing Tennis Courts and Parking Lot.

3. Do you have any comments related to site selection for West Vancouver's Arts & Culture Centre?

The Community Centre and land area could have this added into its purpose. The District seems to have accumulated a lot of property along with waterfront – starting from a house just east of 19<sup>th</sup> Street as well as the properties currently housing the Silk Purse and Jewel Box (not sure of this name) as well as the Ferry Building – all of which are used for Arts purposes.

I'm not convinced that an Arts & Culture Centre is needed with all these other properties – as well as Klee Wyck – but certainly no part of Ambleside Park should be confiscated for it.

s.22(1)  
[REDACTED], West Vancouver BC s. 22(1)  
Sent from my iPad

(12)(a)

---

**From:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 1, 2021 5:00 PM  
**To:** MayorandCouncil

**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.

s. 22(1) (Avenue Co) deserves the right to open West Vancouver's first legal cannabis store. I trust [REDACTED] s. 22(1) to take into consideration the unique needs of the community and build a space that works for everybody. Other operators are more likely to simply be concerned with their bottom line because they don't actually live in the community. Give [REDACTED] s. 22(1) a chance!

[REDACTED]  
s. 22(1)

West Vancouver

s. 22(1)

(12)(b)

**From:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Saturday, July 3, 2021 7:47 AM  
**To:** MayorandCouncil  
**Subject:** [Possible Scam Fraud]Retail Cannabis in West Vancouver

**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.

---

**WARNING:** Your email security system has determined the message below may be a potential threat.

The sender may trick victims into passing bad checks on their behalf.

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.

---

Re Avenue Cannabis Application for Ambleside.

Dear Mayor and Councillors

Thank you the diligence with which you have approached the very new business opportunities of Cannabis stores in the community.

I feel very strongly that a Cannabis store in this neighbourhood should be locally owned and managed. Being conscious of the businesses reputation within the local community and closest neighbours in this brand new and once controversial industry is of upmost importance.

The principals behind Avenue Cannabis are highly respected successful business people with an good reputation in the local community over many years. In my own professional dealings with them I have found this to be true.

I have found them to be generous pragmatic [REDACTED] s.22(1), being supportive, reassuring and of high integrity during an exceptionally difficult business climate.

Having a non local chain/franchise dispensing weed, making no effort with regards to the appearance of their store front, with no conscious awareness of the smell, reputation or behaviour of its clients would be highly detrimental to neighbouring businesses.

The principles behind Avenue Cannabis have put together a well thought out, high end and tasteful business proposal. They have spent the time and money to recruit expert designers and consultants.

Most importantly they are incumbents that know their audience in the local community, this is crucial.

Thank you

[REDACTED]  
s. 22(1)

**From:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Friday, July 2, 2021 1:21 AM  
**To:** MayorandCouncil  
**Cc:** Mary-Ann Booth; Bill Soprovich; Craig Cameron; Nora Gambioli; Lambur Peter; Marcus Wong; Sharon Thompson; Christie Rosta; Johnlo@wvpd.ca; Sheryl LeBlanc  
**Subject:** "14th and Marine area" - Skateboarding and Vandalism Complaint - The Desired Ambleside Night Life?

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

Hello Mayor and Council,

Re:- 30th June, 2021, Correspondence to Mayor and Council "14th and Marine area" - letter #14.

<https://westvancouver.ca/sites/default/files/dwv/council-correspndence/2021/June/21jun30.pdf>

I was shocked to see the front entrance to [REDACTED] s. 22(1) building pictured. This vandalism is totally unacceptable. Is this what living here is coming to?

I too have been hearing the constant racket of skateboarders in the evenings from my residence [REDACTED] s. 22(1). I thought the skateboarders were outside of our building on our front steps? Didn't West Vancouver Municipality provide the little 'darlings' with an expensive skateboard park in Ambleside Park?

The new white concrete sidewalk outside of the "7-Eleven" is sprayed painted with red graffiti marks and has food and drink stains all over it - it is now visually very unpleasant to walk over. Take-out fast food containers are very often strewn all over the sidewalk, grass boulevard and in our gardens in front of our building for us to clean up.

The Canada Day music was loud enough to blast one out of their chair. It hit and echoed around the concrete walls around here, so one could not tell exactly where the 'noise' was coming from? (Another email complaint to Christie Rosta?) No one in this area was on a balcony 'enjoying' it, nor did they have to! I had to turn the volume up to hear the news on my T.V. - I was more concerned for the poor people of Lytton with their village on fire.

Finally, don't get me started on all the vehicles with souped-up exhaust systems - one blasted me out of my bed at 7.45 a.m. this morning - Canada Day! However, they really start their racing games between 11 p.m. and 1 a.m. Where are the Police?

This area is becoming very noisy and unpleasant to live in. But, Mayor and Council wanted a 'night life' in Ambleside, well, we seem to have it now - is the above what was desired?

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]  
s. 22(1)

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

**From:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Friday, July 2, 2021 3:27 PM  
**To:** Mary-Ann Booth; MayorandCouncil  
**Subject:** Singing group at the library

**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 Mary- Anne and Council.. Many thanks to the Municipality for the excellent entertainment at the library roof yesterday. THERE WAS AN EXCELLENT GROUP OF 3 LADIES CALLED 'THE AGENCY' WHO WERE FABULOUS, AND WITH MUSIC FROM THE 40s AND 50s, WERE IDEAL FOR SENIORS IN WEST VAN. HOWEVER THERE WERE VERY FEW PEOPLE THERE, AND EVERYONE AGREED THERE HAD BEEN NO PUBLICITY, AND WHAT A SHAME THAT SO FEW PEOPLE WERE IN THE AUDIENCE.

I tried phoning the Municipal hall 3 times before Canada Day, to ask what were the plans for entertainment, etc. and my calls were never returned. Why not advertise who will be where, instead of all this secrecy?. All we were told was to listen for music between 6 and 7 around West Van. The timing was bad too, as we usually have dinner then.

So another time please tell us in advance with plenty of publicity so many people can hear such a fabulous group. I knew most of their songs and was joining in! It was better than many we've heard at the Harmony Arts Festival.

Best wishes from [REDACTED]

*West Van.*

s. 22(1)

---

**From:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Sunday, July 4, 2021 1:02 PM  
**To:** MayorandCouncil  
**Subject:** Street and sidewalk maintenance

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,

Why are parts of Skilift Road and Chairlift Road being allowed to resemble an abandoned Mexican housing development?





s. 22(1)

West Vancouver

**From:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Monday, July 5, 2021 8:40 AM  
**To:** MayorandCouncil  
**Subject:** User Conflict At Ambleside Pier

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

Dear Mayor and Council,

We been going to Ambleside pier fishing and crabbing [REDACTED] s. 22(1). Now is my turn to take [REDACTED] s. 22(1) fishing. We have met a lot of nice people and became friends. It's our gathering place place [REDACTED] s. 22(1) where we just show up.

In the beginning of summer ( before starting stage 3), there is user conflict at the pier. We noticed groups of teenagers a total around 70 or so is showing up at the pier and disrespecting spaces. They dropped their bags off in front of our crabbing gear to the point where we cannot attend to it. They been smoking and drinking making the pier not enjoyable for other people. We tried calling the non emergency line on multiple occasions but cannot get through and are frustrated by it. [REDACTED] s. 22(1) got emotionally hurt and traumatized by it and they took some time off to recover and will be changing their timing to come out. I don't think it's fair.

On another I know [REDACTED] s. 22(1) who was crabbing that has been bullied by these kids where the cut the rope.of his trap and got.punched.in the face. [REDACTED] s. 22(1) now.decided.to relocate [REDACTED] s. 22(1). These kids also threw the garbage cans into the ocean and now.we.have no where to throw.our garbage.and the pier now vandalized by graffiti making not enjoyable.i am asking for.patols.to be stepped at the.pier during the afternoon hours so these kids can't hurt. Any other family especially yours

Thanks

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

Vancouver BC [REDACTED] s. 22(1)

Sent from my Galaxy

**From:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Monday, July 5, 2021 11:12 AM  
**To:** MayorandCouncil  
**Subject:** Ambleside pier - not safe to use anymore

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. I have been a West Van resident for many years and have enjoyed the use of the Ambleside pier with no issue until recently. (The last month or so).

Lately there is a large group of young kids ( in groups of 20-70) coming down to jump off the pier and forcing everyone that is using the pier off by crowding the people who are already there and putting all their bags and garbage on top of other peoples belongings. They sit on other peoples belongings and swear and are belligerent towards the people who are enjoying the pier. They have spat on, poured drinks on, and threaten people, who have politely asked them to move off of their belongings and give them personal space.

They are drunk and smoking weed on the pier and totally belligerent with excessively loud music.

They leave piles of garbage and clothing and are getting changed in the open where everyone can see them. And now they threw the last remaining garbage can in to the ocean.

[REDACTED] s.22(1) been affected by this as has all the people who use the pier regularly.

They bully other kids that go to school with them that are there enjoying the pier fishing and crabbing and have cut the trap lines of people who are crabbing, [REDACTED] s.22(1) has been punched and pushed around multiple times. The police were called and the assault was reported.

There are a lot of older people there that don't stand up for themselves and get pushed around by these delinquents.

We call non-emergency every time to be on hold for a long time and no one comes by when we call.

Now [REDACTED] s. 22(1) does not want to go back for fear of the groups of drunk kids harassing everyone.

I understand the police are very busy. But we see them patrolling the beach everyday and they concentrate on the skate park and the rest of the parks at the beach. However they rarely come on to the pier. It is between the hours of 3-9pm the groups show up daily.

It would be greatly appreciated by all who use the pier if they could make more frequent rounds of coming on to the pier when they see large groups jumping off it.

Not all kids who come down and jump off the pier are like this. It is just this same group who is making the pier unsafe to come down to for fear of harassment.

Regards

s. 22(1)

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

---

**From:** Andrew Latchford [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Monday, July 5, 2021 9:53 AM  
**To:** MayorandCouncil; Erik Wilhelm; Christie Mills  
**Cc:** Andrew Latchford  
**Subject:** Proposed Development Variance Permit for 8440 Citrus Wynd  
**Attachments:** HPSCAN\_20210705164228523\_2021-07-05\_164347240.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 Mayor and Council,  
I have attached 4 letters of support from [REDACTED] s.22(1) supporting the proposed Development Variance Permit for 8440 Citrus Wynd at the upcoming council meeting on July 12th. Feel free to contact me if you have any questions or concerns leading up to the hearing. Thank you so much for your time and consideration.

Andrew

--

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

June 16th, 2022

Dear Mayor Booth and Council,

s. 22(1) My name is [REDACTED] and I am the owner of [REDACTED]  
s. 22(1)  
I am writing this letter in regards to the proposed development variance permit for 8440 Citrus Wynd. I have been in consultation with the applicant Andrew Latchford and have reviewed the council report that has been submitted. These variances will have no impact on my property and I am in support of these variances being approved.

Best regards,

s. 22(1)  
[REDACTED]

June 16th, 2022

Dear Mayor Booth and Council,

s. 22(1) [REDACTED]  
My name is [REDACTED] s. 22(1) and I am the owner of [REDACTED]  
I am writing this letter in regards to the proposed development variance permit for 8440 Citrus Wynd. I have been in consultation with the applicant Andrew Latchford and have reviewed the council report that has been submitted. These variances will have no impact on my property and I am in support of these variances being approved.

[REDACTED]  
s. 22(1)

Best regards,  


June 16th, 2022

Dear Mayor Booth and Council,

s. 22(1)

s. 22(1)

My name is [REDACTED] and I am the owner of [REDACTED]  
I am writing this letter in regards to the proposed development variance permit for 8440 Citrus Wynd. I have been in consultation with the applicant Andrew Latchford and have reviewed the council report that has been submitted. These variances will have no impact on my property and I am in support of these variances being approved.

WEST  
VAN.

Best regards,

[REDACTED]  
s. 22(1)

June 16th, 2022

Dear Mayor Booth and Council,

My name is [REDACTED] s. 22(1) and I am the owner of [REDACTED] s. 22(1). I am writing this letter in regards to the proposed development variance permit for 8440 Citrus Wynd. I have been in consultation with the applicant Andrew Latchford and have reviewed the council report that has been submitted. These variances will have no impact on my property and I am in support of these variances being approved.

Best regards,

[REDACTED]  
s. 22(1)

---

**From:** Rhona Doria <rhona@businessinsurrey.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 5, 2021 3:37 PM  
**To:** MayorandCouncil  
**Subject:** SBOT Invitation

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

Dear Mayor Booth and Council Members:

On behalf of the Surrey Board of Trade, I invite you to important events in July.

**Event:** A Conversation with Canada's Finance Critic Ed Fast - Canada's Economic Success

**Date:** Wednesday, July 14

**Time:** 11 am - 12 pm

**Access:** Free/Pay What You Can. Your access link will be emailed on July 13

To register, visit [businessinsurrey.com](http://businessinsurrey.com)

**Event:** A Conversation with BC's Green Party Leader Sonia Furstenau - BC's Economic Recovery

**Date:** Thursday, July 15

**Time:** 12 pm - 1 pm

**Access:** Free/Pay What You Can. Your access link will be emailed on July 14

To register, visit [businessinsurrey.com](http://businessinsurrey.com)

**Event:** Surrey and BC's Agriculture Industry: Dialogue with BC Agriculture Minister Lana Popham

**Date:** Friday, July 16

**Time:** 10 am - 11 am

**Access:** Free/Pay What You Can. Your access link will be emailed on July 15

To register, visit [businessinsurrey.com](http://businessinsurrey.com)

I hope you can attend.

Kind regards,

Rhona

■■■ALSO, PLEASE CHECK OUT THE FOLLOWING:

[Surrey Board of Trade Releases First COVID-19 Playbook for Business in Canada](http://Surrey Board of Trade Releases First COVID-19 Playbook for Business in Canada)



## WORKFORCE RESET

**1** NEW! Playbook to navigate employers through the pandemic

**2** Pandemic Rapid Response Business Centre to answer your questions

**3** Labour Market Intelligence so you can make informed decisions



 [businessinsurrey.com/workforce-support](http://businessinsurrey.com/workforce-support)



### RHONA DORIA EVENTS & SPONSORSHIP COORDINATOR

101 - 14439 104 Avenue, Surrey BC Canada, V3R 1M1

P | [604.634.0344](tel:604.634.0344) O | [604.581.7130](tel:604.581.7130) E | [events@businessinsurrey.com](mailto:events@businessinsurrey.com)

*On the Territory of the Coast Salish Peoples*

**From:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Monday, July 5, 2021 9:23 PM  
**To:** MayorandCouncil  
**Subject:** Development Proposal for 2204 Bellevue Avenue/177 22nd Street  
**Attachments:** Signed Petition 21 06 15.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 & Council:

Please find attached a petition regarding this proposal which has been signed by 42 owners at [REDACTED] s. 22(1)

Regards

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

West Vancouver

s. 22(1)

West Vancouver, BC  
June 2021

**Mayor & Council**  
West Vancouver Municipal Hall  
#750 17<sup>th</sup> Street  
West Vancouver, BC V7V 3T3

Dear Mayor & Council:

Re: Development Proposal for 2204 Bellevue Avenue/177 22nd Street

Dear Mayor & Council:

We are writing to express our grave concerns regarding the proposed development for the above noted property. We have recently been very disappointed to hear that the proposal has now in fact be approved by the Design and Review Committee at a time when redevelopment of both the Villa Maris and Shoreland has, correctly, been suspended pending approval of a thoughtful and comprehensive Ambleside Town Centre Local Area Plan.

We really would appreciate your careful consideration of our concerns regarding a building that significantly violates the Bylaws for the current property – it is zoned duplex for a reason. The view from the top of 22nd leaves a water view; it was designed that way in the past so as to not block views and transfer view value s.22(1). If this building goes up and Villa Maris & Shoreland redevelopments go ahead, there will virtually be a wall across the planned-for view corridor – this will effectively impact all residents along 22<sup>nd</sup> Street.

Many of us s.22(1) are going into our “golden years” and are either slower or less mobile - natural light coming into our apartments is very important to quality of life. If this rushed and ill-thought-out development goes forward, residents s.22(1) will lose a large percentage of their natural light for the majority of the day.

It is disingenuous to state that this 103 ft. building fits with the others around it. There are six 2-storey townhouses and several 3-storey apartment complexes in the immediate vicinity - a much better and more thoughtful fit would be a townhouse development. The proposed redevelopment of Villa Maris & Shoreland was, correctly, suspended until the official OCP - why is this high-rise going forward with no thought given to current owners.

Mayor and Council have stated many times - particularly during election campaigns - that you wish "to promote a vibrant, inclusive, livable community"; you have also stated that you wish to attract a younger demographic. Do you really believe that a "younger demographic" will be able to afford the condos you are proposing in this development of seven units?

This development smacks of environmental jargon, approved by Mayor & Council to project (for political reasons) a "forward thinking, sustainable, green" direction - at a huge cost to locals.

Just stop for one moment and consider us - long-standing residents who have helped develop, supported, and voted to keep West Vancouver the beautiful place it is.

All we are asking is that you stop for a moment and consider US.

Sincerely,

Residents of

s. 22(1)

Name: *Signature*

Unit Number:

s. 22(1)

Petition with 42 names

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### **Signature Sheet**

## **Development Proposal for 2204 Bellevue Avenue/177 22<sup>nd</sup> Street**

Name	Unit Number s. 22(1)	Signature
------	-------------------------	-----------

---

**From:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 6, 2021 9:00 AM  
**To:** MayorandCouncil  
**Subject:** Garbage Drop Off Option?

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

We recently missed the bi-weekly garbage pick-up for our address.

Not having room to store the two 'black bags' for another 14 days, we called the number provided (604) 925-7176 but were informed that there is no' drop-off' option for residents of West Vancouver.

We were instead directed to the transfer station by the Ironworkers Memorial Bridge in North Vancouver where we could deposit our two bags - for a fee!

We feel that the District can do better than this, for its rate-paying residents.

To avoid the temptation to find an open industrial sized garbage bin in a laneway, which would be an illegal act, could we ask that you direct staff to make available such a facility. Locating it within the DWV's works yard should reduce the opportunity for mis-use.

Thank you for your attention to this.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

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

**From:** Patrick Weiler <patrick.weiler@parl.gc.ca>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 5, 2021 3:50 PM  
**To:** MayorandCouncil  
**Subject:** July 2021 Newsletter

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside the organization from email address bounce-mc.us19\_135683582.6277010-42c380ea8e@mail125.atl31.mcdlv.net. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. If you believe this e-mail is suspicious, please report it to IT by marking it as SPAM.



Dear Mayor and Council,

As summer ramps up and as public health orders lift, we can look forward to post-pandemic life. With over 75% of Canadians with the first dose, and over a third with the second dose, Canada's vaccination rates are among the highest in the world. The COVID-19 case and vaccination thresholds are allowing us to begin easing our own travel and quarantine restrictions for those who are fully vaccinated in a gradual way that is informed by science and our public health experts. Recent announcements on travel restrictions can be found [here](#), and recent guidance from the Public Health Agency of Canada can be found [here](#). Please follow my social media profiles @PatrickBWeiler for the latest up to date information.

Last month, the provincial government released its re-opening plan, which outlines a four-stage return to normal by September 2021. The federal government will continue to support the provinces and territories in their efforts and will coordinate any international travel restrictions to ensure that we move forward with re-opening in a responsible way.

In marking Canada Day this year, Canadians across the country are taking a close look in the mirror at some painful parts of our past and present. The recent discoveries of the remains of 215 children on the grounds of the former Kamloops Indian Residential School,

the 750 children of the Cowessess First Nation, and other discoveries is a national tragedy that has put a spotlight on the shameful acts that were perpetrated against First Nations children, families, culture and way of life. The federal government has made resources available to further uncover the truth as well as to help with the process of healing.

Important work remains to finish implementing many of [the Truth and Reconciliation's Calls to Action](#). You can read my statement on the Kamloops discovery later in this newsletter, and an update on the recently completed TRC Calls to Action below. [As well, I encourage you to watch my video on Canada Day 2021 here.](#)

Another tragedy hit Canada last month with the senseless murder of a Muslim family in London, Ontario. This was a horrific attack that was perpetrated based on religious hatred. Islamophobia has no place in our communities – and attacks like this strike at the core of what it is to be Canadian. It is incumbent upon all of us to confront racism and violence anywhere so we can create a country safe and welcoming for everyone. We grieve with our Muslim communities across Canada and stand with them in solidarity. Federal agencies, including the RCMP, are assisting the London Police Service as they continue their investigation into this tragedy. The Government of Canada is continuing to move ahead with our [Anti-Racism Strategy](#) and we have tabled legislation to combat hate propaganda, hate crime and hate speech to tackle some of the root causes we are increasingly bearing witness to in our country.

The House of Commons has now risen for the summer, but not before we passed some important new legislation such as historic [Budget 2021 \(Bill C-30\)](#), [implementing UNDRIP into federal law \(Bill C-15\)](#), [climate accountability legislation \(Bill C-12\)](#), [a ban on conversion therapy \(Bill C-6\)](#), and [support for Canada's creative industry \(Bill C-10\)](#). On June 29<sup>th</sup>, Bill C-30 and Bill C-12 received Royal Assent paving the way for them to become law immediately alongside Bill C-15 that became law last week.

In this newsletter, I will detail some of this legislative work and provide updates on federal announcements and constituency events in our community:

- Virtual Townhall with Minister Bill Blair
- Legislation in the House of Commons
- Statement on Kamloops Discovery
- Tackling Islamophobia
- Celebrating Pride Month
- Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure Announcement
- Shop Local Announcement

- Roberts Creek Community School Society Local Food Infrastructure Fund Announcement
- Roundtable with Minister Joly
- Launching the Canada Greener Homes Grant
- Investing in the Pacific Salmon Foundation
- Cody and Megan's "Climb for Climate Change."
- Celebrating World Oceans Day



  
**VIRTUAL TOWN HALL**  
 WITH THE HON. BILL BLAIR, MINISTER OF  
 PUBLIC SAFETY AND EMERGENCY  
 PREPAREDNESS

---

**FRIDAY, JULY 9**  
**12:00PM PT**  
**JOIN US LIVE ON FACEBOOK**

  
  


@PatrickBWeiler



Minister Bill Blair



MP Patrick Weiler

## **Virtual Townhall with Minister Bill Blair**

Join me for a conversation with the Honourable Bill Blair, Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness on Zoom or Facebook Live on **Friday, July 9 at 12:00 pm PST.**

We look forward to discussing issues related to the Minister's portfolio, including responsible and compassionate management of the border with the United States, action to address systemic inequities in the criminal justice system, First Nations policing, reducing the impact of climate-related disasters, implementing our firearms commitments, the opioid epidemic, and anti-money laundering.

Please feel free to share this event with your friends and networks, and submit any questions you would like to have answered to [Patrick.Weiler@parl.gc.ca](mailto:Patrick.Weiler@parl.gc.ca).

### **Event Details**

**Topic:** Town Hall with Bill Blair, Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness

**Time:** Friday, July 9, 2021 12:00 PM

**Facebook Live:** <https://www.facebook.com/PatrickBWeiler/>

**Zoom link:** You are also welcome to [join via Zoom by clicking this link](#).

**Zoom Passcode:** 610057

**Webinar ID:** 832 6600 9297

---

### **Legislation in the House of Commons**

June 23<sup>rd</sup> marked the end of the parliamentary calendar before we rose for summer to return on September 20<sup>th</sup>. The past month has seen several important pieces of legislation passed.

#### **C-12: An Act respecting transparency and accountability in Canada's efforts to achieve net-zero greenhouse gas emissions by the year 2050**

Bill C-12 is the most important piece of climate legislation in our country's history. It will ensure that Canada, among other things, must:

- Legislate emissions targets every five years until 2050;
- Have plans to meet each milestone;
- Embed our new 2030 emissions reduction target of a 40-45% reduction below 2005 levels into legislation; and
- Create an advisory body of diverse experts to provide the government with the best independent advice to achieve net-zero by 2050.

Bill C-12 will bolster our [new Healthy Environment, Healthy Economy climate plan](#) and ensure we are on course to achieve our new target, announced in April 2021, of [reducing our emissions to 40%-45% below 2005 levels by 2030](#). If you are interested in learning more, please see the speech I made in the House of Commons on this legislation at [second reading](#).

Bill C-12 officially became law on June 29<sup>th</sup>.

#### **C-15: Bill C-15, An Act respecting the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples**

Bill C-15 affirms that the *United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples* (UNDRIP) has application in Canadian law and provides a framework for the federal government to ensure that its laws are consistent with it. This relatively short piece of legislation

will have a larger impact on advancing reconciliation with Indigenous peoples than any legislation passed to date. It notably will require the development of an action plan that will be a whole of government approach to reforming existing law and policy where necessary, as well as forever changing the way we develop and implement future policy and legislation. I had the opportunity to join the debate on this piece of legislation on April 15<sup>th</sup>. You can watch my remarks here.

#### **C-30: An Act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on April 19, 2021 and other measures**

Bill C-30 implements Budget 2021, a historic investment that will help Canadians recover from COVID-19 and lay the foundation for a stronger, more resilient and more equitable future. To find more information on Budget 2021, you can read our recently mailed newsletter on our website or visit budget.gc.ca.

#### **C-6 - An Act to amend the Criminal Code (conversion therapy)**

Bill C-6 passed through the House of Commons on June 22<sup>nd</sup> and is currently being studied by the Senate. Bill C-6 bans the harmful and discredited practice of conversion therapy by making it a criminal offence.

Conversion therapy efforts are rooted in the premise that one's sexual orientation, gender identity, and gender expression can and should be changed to a narrow ideal of what is considered 'natural' or 'normal'. There is no place for this destructive, harmful, and deadly practice of conversion therapy in Canada. The measures contained in C-6 are among the most progressive and comprehensive legislative responses to conversion therapy in the world.

While this legislation is an important step that will protect LGBTQ2 persons and promote human rights, we also recognize that more remains to be done. To ensure that no one is subjected to this practice, we will continue to work with provinces and territories to end conversion therapy in Canada.

#### **C-10 - An Act to amend the Broadcasting Act and to make consequential amendments to other Acts**

Bill C-10 passed through the House of Commons on June 21<sup>st</sup> and is currently being studied by the Senate.

I know there has been a lot of debate and controversy with Bill C-10, and I want to provide clarity on the objectives of the bill and address some of the concerns constituents have raised with me.

The objective of Bill C-10 is to modernize the Broadcasting Act, which has not been updated since 1991, before the dominance of online broadcasters and great changes to the way that music and media is consumed.

By working to modernize the Broadcasting Act with Bill C-10, we are levelling the playing field to ensure that internet giants contribute financially to our Canadian media landscape the way traditional broadcasters (radio and television) already do. These contributions will support Canadian storytelling, artists, and creators, so that Canada can continue to enjoy high-quality made-in-Canada content.

I have heard concerns about Bill C-10 leading to the regulation of free speech of individual people online. It is important to make clear that such claims that are being circulated are categorically false. The changes being proposed will not affect user generated content; Canadians who post to social media are specifically excluded from being considered broadcasters under section 2.1.

Rather than regulating content from individuals, what Bill C-10 will do is ensure that large social media companies, when they act as broadcasters, abide by the standards set forth in the Broadcasting Act that apply to other broadcasting media outlets. Our changes, which were supported by the Bloc Quebecois, the NDP, and numerous organizations in the Canadian media arts and culture sector, are about ensuring that web giants invest in Canadian content and celebrate Canadian creators.

---

### **Statement on Kamloops Discovery**

*The following statement was made on June 1, 2021:*

The horrific discovery of the remains of 215 children on the grounds of the former Kamloops Indian Residential School is a national tragedy. This atrocity is a reminder of Canada's shameful history in how it treated Indigenous peoples and highlights the continuing impacts of those abhorrent actions and policies. This example is one of countless other unreported, or as of yet undiscovered, events that cause unspeakable trauma to entire Indigenous peoples and communities that they continue to bear today.

These reprehensible acts did not occur in far away places or in the distant past. Residential Schools operated in BC into the 1980s and indeed on the Sunshine Coast until 1975, with the last Residential School in Canada closing in 1996. I invite all non-Indigenous members of our communities to take some time to learn about our shared history and to participate in the

powerful work that the Syiyaya Reconciliation Movement and the Squamish Lil'wat Cultural Centre in Whistler provides to become more informed.

The Truth and Reconciliation Commission brought to light the truth about what took place at residential schools, and last week's discovery is only affirmation of these findings. We are working with Tk'emlúps te Secwépemc First Nation and our partners, such as the BC First Nations Health Authority, to provide resources and the support needed as determined by the community. We will continue to engage with communities to help identify the deceased children, locating burial sites and commemorating or memorializing those who died or went missing while attending residential schools.

For immediate assistance to those who may need it, the National Indian Residential School Crisis Line is available 24 hours a day at 1-866-925-4419.

The Prime Minister made clear that concrete actions would be taken to support those impacted by this tragedy and all survivors of residential schools.

Our hearts break for the families and communities impacted by the discovery in Kamloops. As we celebrate National Indigenous Peoples Day on June 21, this year more than ever, we celebrate the extraordinary contributions Indigenous peoples make in our communities.

---

## Tackling Islamophobia

The senseless attack in London, Ontario shows us that Islamophobia continues to rear its ugly head in Canada. I have heard from Muslim members of our communities that the worrying increase in hatred has led them to fear for their safety. No Canadian, regardless of their ethnicity or religion, should ever feel this way in our society, and it is our collective responsibility to combat hatred and condemn it in the strongest possible terms. Left unchecked, it can and has led to horrific outcomes across our country.

That is why our government declared January 29 as the National Day of Remembrance of the Quebec City Mosque Attack and Action against Islamophobia as a way to remember the tragedy and the continued impacts on Muslim communities across Canada.

To combat religious hatred and protect religious groups, the federal government has committed an additional \$50 million to anti-racism initiatives through the 2020 Fall Economic Statement, and Budget 2021 proposes to provide \$2 million to not-for-profit organizations such as places of worship, schools, and community centres to enhance their security infrastructure. All of us must step up, be allies, and do what we can to make our workplaces, communities, and public spaces safer.

As part of our wider efforts to combat racism and hatred in Canada, our government has also created Canada's Anti-Racism Strategy 2019-2022 and established the Federal Anti-Racism Secretariat which looks into systemic racism in Canada and helps advance the Government of Canada's vision of fostering and promoting a more inclusive and equitable country for all Canadians.

---

## Celebrating Pride Month

June marked Pride Month and the start of Pride season, which takes place from June to

September with local events across the country celebrating the resilience and spirit of LGBTQ people in Canada.

Although this year's celebrations continue to look different due to the ongoing pandemic, Pride Month is an important time to celebrate diversity and honour the contributions of Canada's LGBTQ communities. It is also a time to reflect on the history of Pride as a protest against violence on LGBTQ people and come together to advance LGBTQ rights here in Canada and around the world.

This Pride Month, we are proud to have passed Bill C-6 through the House of Commons to ban the harmful and discriminatory act of conversion therapy, which will go a long way to protecting and supporting young Canadians struggling with their sexual and/or gender identity.

[Click here to watch my video on Pride Month 2021.](#)

Happy Pride, everyone!

---

## **Community Updates**

### **Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure Announcement**

This week, I had the opportunity to announce a \$2.35 million investment to install 47 electric vehicle (EV) fast chargers across the province to put British Columbians in the driver's seat on the road to a net-zero future.

From Pemberton to Sechelt, from Surrey to Prince Rupert, this project will provide residents in our region and across British Columbia with the electric charging infrastructure they need to get around.

Canada has now invested over \$1 billion to make EVs more affordable and charging infrastructure more accessible, further supporting our new accelerated target of 100 percent zero-emission light-duty vehicle sales by 2035.

With investments like these, our government is making clean transportation choices more affordable and accessible, and setting the course for a prosperous zero-emissions future.

### **Supporting Small Businesses: Shop Local Announcement**

On June 24, I was joined by Minister Joyce Murray and the President and CEO of the BC Chamber of Commerce, Fiona Famulak, to announce that an investment of up to \$5.5 million will be going to BC to encourage people to shop locally and support businesses. This is part of a national investment of \$33 million to support Shop Local campaigns across the country announced by Minister Mary Ng on June 21.

Small businesses are the pillars of our communities and our economy. They were among the hardest hit sectors, and their success is key to recovering from the COVID-19 recession. Shop Local will be a great boon for businesses and communities across our region. This investment will encourage residents to shop and eat locally and provide the capital that will help small businesses recover and thrive in the post-pandemic economy.

[You can watch the announcement here.](#)

### **Roberts Creek Community School Society Local Food Infrastructure Fund Announcement**

On May 21, I participated in a video call with members of the Roberts Creek Community School Society where I highlighted an investment of up to \$25,919 under the Local Food Infrastructure Fund (LFIF), a five-year, \$50-million program under the Food Policy for Canada that provides funding for community-based, not-for-profit organizations.

This funding supports the Roberts Creek Legacy Garden to make some significant improvements to their gardens.

This will allow food production to increase more than fourfold. As public health orders ease, elementary school students will be able to plant, maintain and harvest healthy produce, and learn how to prepare healthy food from garden produce. As production ramps up, these young gardeners will be at local farmers markets where excess produce will be sold. A portion of the bounty will also be donated to community members in need.

### **Roundtable with Minister Joly**

For this year's National Tourism Week, I had the opportunity to host a roundtable with the Hon. Mélanie Joly, Minister of Economic Development and Official Languages.

Tourism is one of the most important economic drivers across our riding, and one of the sectors most impacted by COVID-19. Minister Joly and I discussed with a variety of regional partners and organizations the important work we are doing to support this industry through Budget 2021, including through the \$500 Tourism Relief Fund. Thank you to the following participants for a very productive and informative discussion: Resort Municipality of Whistler, Tourism Squamish, Sunshine Coast Tourism, Tourism Bowen Island, Tourism Pemberton, Indigenous Tourism BC, Crankworx, Sea To Sky Gondola, and Squamish Lil'wat Cultural Centre.

[Check out the video here to watch our full roundtable discussion.](#)

### **Launching the Canada Greener Homes Grant**

On May 27, we announced the launch of the new Canada Greener Homes Grant, which will provide homeowners with grants of up to \$5,000 to make retrofits to their homes. Up to \$600 is available to help with the cost of home energy evaluations. Eligible home improvements and upgrades include replacing windows and doors, adding insulation, sealing air leaks, improving heating and cooling systems – such as with heat pumps – and purchasing renewable energy systems like solar panels.

The Canada Greener Homes Grant will create more than 110,000 direct and indirect jobs across Canada over the next seven years. To facilitate this, we announced our commitment to recruit and train up to 2,000 new energy advisors to help provide EnerGuide evaluations, advice, and guidance to Canadians from coast to coast to coast. This recruitment is focused on advancing diversity and inclusion and will create new jobs and drive economic growth that benefits everyone.

Undertaking energy-efficient retrofits is a win-win for Canadian homeowners. It improves home comfort, lowers utility bills, and reduces the household carbon footprint, all the while creating good green jobs in our communities that will support a low carbon emissions future.

[For information on how to apply for the grant, please visit this webpage.](#)

Through Budget 2021, a new program will be launched through the Canada Housing and Mortgage Corporation to provide \$40,000 no-interest loans to do deeper retrofits. Stay tuned to more details to come this summer.

### **Investing in Community-Based Climate Action Projects**

On June 7, I highlighted Canada's investment of \$1,904,715 for the Pacific Salmon Foundation's community-based climate action project with PSF President and CEO Michael Meneer. With this funding the Foundation will move forward with its project, called Green Shores for Salmon, Nature-Based Solutions for Climate Change, to strengthen the adoption of nature-based solutions for climate adaptation and shoreline resilience across British Columbia.

This project will provide education and training on practical strategies that use nature-based, green infrastructure to reduce flood risk due to climate change. These techniques will also promote healthy shoreline ecosystems on high-value salmon habitat on the east coast of Vancouver Island and Strait of Georgia island communities.

Community-driven, nature-based climate solutions like this are key to improving climate resiliency and creating a cleaner, more sustainable environment. By engaging with local communities and First Nations, the PSF's project will use local resources and knowledge to protect our shorelines and ecosystems, while preserving the crucial salmon habitats that we all treasure. Our government is proud to work with partners like the PSF to deliver local projects like this, as we work towards net-zero emissions and build the resilient and sustainable future we all envision.

### **Cody and Megan's "Climb for Climate Change."**

In the past year there have been some remarkable young leaders who stepped up to support our communities when we needed it most. Among these young leaders is Cody Kelso from Gibsons, British Columbia who walked 115 kilometres from Gibsons to Powell River with his mother, Megan on a "Climb for Climate Change" campaign.

Through this, Cody and Megan raised \$33,500 for the BC SPCA (BCSPCA) to enable it to install the solar panels needed for the local branch to reach net-zero emissions. This initiative also brought the BC Sustainable Energy Association's 'Cool It' climate leadership training program to the Sunshine Coast.

You can watch my Members Statement in the House of Commons to learn more about Cody and Megan's "Climb for Climate Change" here.

### **Celebrating World Oceans Day**

On June 8<sup>th</sup>, we celebrated World Oceans Day, and I had the opportunity to present a statement to the House of Commons to highlight the outstanding work that organizations across our riding have accomplished to protect our oceans. Among many organizations, I was proud to highlight the work of the West Vancouver Streamkeeper Society, Nicholas Sonntag Marine Education Centre, Pacific Science Enterprise Centre, the Squamish Nation and the many contributors to the newly launched Howe Sound/Átl'ka7tsem Marine Reference Guide. These local organizations are critical to creating a more sustainable future, and our government will continue to work with them to support their important projects and initiatives.

You can watch my statement in the House of Commons here, which I delivered en français.

OFFICE OF MP PATRICK WEILER  
CONSTITUENCY OFFICE: 6367 BRUCE ST., WEST VANCOUVER

OFFICE HOURS: WEEKDAYS  
9AM - 5PM



[View this email in your browser](#)

---

This email was sent to [MayorandCouncil@westvancouver.ca](mailto:MayorandCouncil@westvancouver.ca)

[why did I get this?](#) [unsubscribe from this list](#) [update subscription preferences](#)

House of Commons · 6367 Bruce Street · West Vancouver, BC V7W 2G5 · Canada

---

**From:** Doti Niedermayer  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 30, 2021 6:56 PM  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** MayorandCouncil  
**Subject:** Missing Plaque

Dear [REDACTED] s. 22(1),

Thank you for your email to Mayor and Council dated June 29, 2021 regarding your inquiry about the plaque at the entrance to Ambleside Park that was removed. Your letter has been referred to me for a response.

The plaque that was installed in 1941 with the support of the Lions Club was removed by the District last fall as it contained language considered outdated and not inclusive of First Nations. One of Council's Strategic Goals is to "strengthen relationships with First Nations based on respect, equality and meaningful engagement".

The District is planning to replace this sign and is working with First Nations to update signage containing outdated language with new signage that acknowledges the presence of Indigenous peoples in West Vancouver since time immemorial, and provides information about Indigenous cultural practices and landmarks of significance.

We will be including the Lions Club regarding this plaque as we engage with First Nations.

If you have any questions or concerns, please feel to contact me at 604-921-2938 or [dniedermayer@westvancouver.ca](mailto:dniedermayer@westvancouver.ca).

Sincerely,

Doti

**Doti Niedermayer**  
Senior Manager, Cultural Services | District of West Vancouver  
t: 604-921-2938 | c: 604-250-0476 | [westvancouver.ca](http://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:** Tuesday, June 29, 2021 3:21 PM  
**To:** MayorandCouncil  
**Subject:** Missing Plaque

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

Hello All,

A non-contentious issue, I hope. There was a plaque at the entrance to Ambleside Park next to the sailing club that was installed in 1941 with the support of the Lion's Club. The stonework is still there but the plaque has been removed. I am interested if it was stolen or removed by the district. The plaque: The inscription reads: "Erected by Lions Club of West Vancouver in commemoration of 150th anniversary of the arrival July 1st 1791 of Pilot Commander Don Jose Maria Narvaez the first white man to visit the mainland of Western Canada."

I would like to work to replace the plaque if the district has no issue with this.

Many thanks,

[REDACTED] s.22(1)

I would like a reply.

Link: <https://archives.westvancouver.ca/permalink/5295/default.aspx>

<https://searcharchives.vancouver.ca/j-edward-sears-reeve-of-west-vancouver-dedicating-the-narvaez-cairn-at-ambleside-park>

[https://www.google.com/search?q=narvaez+cairn+ambleside+beach+west+vancouver+bc&tbm=isch&s\\_ource=iu&ictx=1&fir=OE0heRegFz2YpM%252CVfqsm9b6wgPsmM%252C &vet=1&usg=AI4 - kQLfySDkomhXUz00qbc5ovTO9pfTA&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwj4zLH2473xAhWmFzQIHZL9DaQQ9QF6BAgOEAE#imgrc=c-3XvFI37jkSHM](https://www.google.com/search?q=narvaez+cairn+ambleside+beach+west+vancouver+bc&tbm=isch&s_ource=iu&ictx=1&fir=OE0heRegFz2YpM%252CVfqsm9b6wgPsmM%252C &vet=1&usg=AI4 - kQLfySDkomhXUz00qbc5ovTO9pfTA&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwj4zLH2473xAhWmFzQIHZL9DaQQ9QF6BAgOEAE#imgrc=c-3XvFI37jkSHM)

[REDACTED] s.22(1)

West Vancouver, BC

[REDACTED] s.22(1)

---

**From:** Sheryl LeBlanc  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 6, 2021 11:03 AM  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** MayorandCouncil  
**Subject:** Gas Powered Weed Trimmers & Leaf Blowers

Good Afternoon [REDACTED] s. 22(1),

I am in receipt of your email to Mayor and Council dated June 30, 2021 regarding gas powered trimmers and leaf blowers.

District staff may be reviewing alternatives to gas powered equipment in the future however, at this time, the noise created by the use of this equipment is not in contravention of the Noise Control Bylaw No. 4404, 2005 which restricts operation of power equipment, including gas powered leaf blowers, to 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday. There is no limitation on how long the equipment can be continuously operated within this period. Power equipment noise from gas powered leaf blowers is not permitted on a Sunday or a holiday. These hours of operation are more restrictive than several other Lower Mainland municipalities, including our immediate neighbouring municipalities.

If you witness any contraventions to the Noise Control Bylaw, please don't hesitate to contact the Bylaw and Licensing Services Department at 604-925-7152. Our Officers are available to respond from 8:00am to 8:00pm seven days a week.

Sincerely,

**Sheryl LeBlanc**  
Manager, Bylaw & Licensing Services | District of West Vancouver  
d: 604-925-7459 | westvancouver.ca

---

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

---

**From:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 30, 2021 10:03 AM  
**To:** MayorandCouncil  
**Subject:** Gas Powered Weed Trimmers & Leaf Blowers

**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.

Date: June 30, 2021

To: Mayor & Council

Re: Gas Powered Weed Trimmers, Hege Trimmers & Leaf Blowers

A couple of days a week our Ambleside neighborhood wakes up to the loud, annoying, unpleasant, ear piercing and deafening sound of gas powered trimmers and leaf blowers.

This noise normally starts between 7:30 and 8:00 AM on Wednesday and usually continues till 11 AM.

With the now available electric trimers and blowers which are far quieter I wonder if it is possible to pass a by-law outlawing the gas powered machines??!

Most of the time rather than sweeping up the debris on the ground, the workers just blow the cuttings and leaves around which accomplishes next to nothing.

I suffer from [REDACTED] s.22(1) . Sometimes I have to leave the building and the neighborhood.

As I write this email there are currently three of these machines running [REDACTED] s.22(1) .

Standing By for your response.

Many Thanks !

[REDACTED]  
s. 22(1)

West Vancouver, BC

[REDACTED]  
s. 22(1)