

COUNCIL CORRESPONDENCE UPDATE TO JUNE 4, 2025 (8:30 a.m.)

Correspondence

- (1) Quest Outreach Society, May 23, 2025, regarding Community Grants Program Thank You Letter**
- (2) May 24, 2025, regarding High Rises, the Sea Walk, and Pay Parking**
- (3) Lighthouse Park Preservation Society, May 30, 2025, regarding “Fwd: Use of Net Proceeds from Pay Parking in Lighthouse Park”**
- (4) May 29, 2025, regarding “Tragedy at Keith Rd and Bay Street intersection in Horseshoe Bay Village May 28th”**
- (5) 7 submissions, May 28 – June 4, 2025, regarding Proposed Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 4985, 2018, Amendment Bylaw No. 5386, 2025 (Ambleside Centre Local Area Plan)**
- (6) 3 submissions, May 28 and June 3, 2025, regarding Proposed Zoning Bylaw No. 4662, 2010, Amendment Bylaw No. 5379, 2025 (2550 Queens Avenue)**
- (7) May 30, 2025, regarding “Concerns and proposed solutions - Urban Forest”**
- (8) M. Slater, June 2, 2025, regarding “May 26 Council Agenda item #4 – Preliminary Development Regarding Proposal for 1552 Esquimalt Avenue.”**
- (9) June 2, 2025, regarding “Request for a 4-way stop at 23rd and Jefferson”**

Correspondence from Other Governments and Government Agencies

No items.

Responses to Correspondence

No items.



May 23, 2025

Doti Niedermeyer, Senior Manager, Cultural Services
Lenna Nakamura, Aquatics and Youth Services
District of West Vancouver Council
750 17th Street, West Vancouver, BC V7V 3T3

Dear Doti, Lenna, and members of the District of West Vancouver Council,

Thank you so much for the District's generous \$5,000 grant to Quest in support of our Food Recovery & Redistribution Program on the North Shore! Quest is committed to bridging the gap between the Food Bank and retail grocery stores by providing individuals struggling with financial barriers access to healthy, affordable food that is obtained sustainably. Your funding is instrumental to improving the physical, social, and mental health of our vulnerable neighbours!

"Quest is a lifesaver for a low-income senior like me. Food is a big expense!! I wish there more services like this." – T. Power

"Quest is a fabulous store for the low-income people. There is always a good selection, and the staff are wonderful and friendly. "Bless Quest." Thank you." – Ruth

"When I first started coming here, I felt some shame because I was being offered something- a gift per say- and this felt out of my comfort zone. Very quickly I relaxed and realized that Quest is an amazing resource that has helped me eat healthy every day! The staff are so open, kind, and welcoming here." –Lana.



Quest harnesses the power of community by bringing together businesses looking to redirect surplus food destined to be wasted and individuals in our communities who depend on having access to an affordable grocery shopping experience.

People who shop at Quest may identify as a family, student, senior, refugee, survivor, single parent or guardian, caregiver, person with a disability; they may be un- or under employed or experiencing a traumatic event in their life that impacts their work and financial stability such as a death in their family, the loss of a job, the loss of a home, separation or divorce, a new or changing health prognosis, or



significant grief event. More often than not, they are hardworking people whose income creates barriers to shopping in a retail grocery store.

According to the Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives report, released last November, the living wage continues to climb in B.C., meaning hundreds of families are struggling to make ends meet because their wages are below the actual cost it takes to live in BC.

The report found that one-third of two-parent families in Metro Vancouver do not make the current living wage of \$25.68 per hour, which is up 6.6% from \$24.08 in 2022. Also, Statistics Canada's latest Labour Force Survey found that one in three Canadian households are experiencing financial hardship, while Food Banks Canada's Annual Hunger Count Report indicates that food bank use is up 57% compared to 2019, adding that more and more working individuals are turning to food banks to feed their families.

These statistics are shocking – but are significantly under-represented, as organizations like Quest are not included in Food Bank statistics. At Quest, about half of our clients are working; most are on some sort of income assistance. 79% of our clients make less than \$34,000 per year; of that, 59% make less than \$25,000.

Thank you, again! Your support is changing the quality of life for thousands of vulnerable individuals and families on the North Shore every year.

Kind regards,

s.22(1)

Sarah Abbott, Grants Administrator
CRA#: 137109807RR0001

West Vancouver, BC (2)
 May 24, 2025

The Mayor + Council,
 750 - 17th Street
 West Vancouver, BC

Dear Mayor + Council,
 My husband + I have lived in
 West Vancouver for [REDACTED] happy
 years. I am writing you to thank
 you for three things:

1. I appreciate so much that you have
 not allowed tall intimidating high
 rises such as they have in North
 Vancouver, Downtown, Coal Harbour
 Burnaby and elsewhere. You have
 managed to keep our much-loved
 ambleside by the sea and Dundarar
 charming, beautiful small seaside
 towns which we love!

Thank you so much!

2. Thank you also for letting us
 walk our small dog from 25th to
 Park Royal along the water. We
 enjoy this so much. Ninety percent
 of the time we walk in the dog
 park at ambleside but it is nice to
 have options. Dog owners appreciate
 you!

3. Thank you also for NOT charging us to park in West Vancouver! We appreciate this very much, we often brag about this to our downtown friends. Free parking helps our budget but it also creates a friendly small town homey feeling! Thanks again!

Keep up the good work, we appreciate you.

Sincerely,

From: Lighthouse Park Preservation Society <lighthouseparkps@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, May 30, 2025 5:26 AM
To: correspondence
Subject: Fwd: Use of Net Proceeds from Pay Parking in Lighthouse Park
Attachments: LPPS letter May 29_2025.pdf

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

I am resending this to correspondence, instead of as a cc. My name is Alexandra Mancini, s.22(1) 5371 Kew Cliff Road, West Vancouver, BC V7W 1M3. These details are in the footer of the letter too.
Thank you,
Alexandra

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Lighthouse Park Preservation Society <lighthouseparkps@gmail.com>
Date: Thu, May 29, 2025, 8:24 a.m.
Subject: Use of Net Proceeds from Pay Parking in Lighthouse Park
To: Mark Sager <mark@westvancouver.ca>, Christine Cassidy <ccassidy@westvancouver.ca>, Nora Gambioli <ngambioli@westvancouver.ca>, <plambur@westvancouver.ca>, Scott Snider <ssnider@westvancouver.ca>, Sharon Thompson <sthompson@westvancouver.ca>, Linda Watt <lwatt@westvancouver.ca>
Cc: correspondence <correspondence@westvancouver.ca>

Dear Mayor and Council,

Please see attached letter.

Alexandra Mancini, President
Lighthouse Park Preservation Society



May 29, 2025

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

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

On behalf of the Lighthouse Park Preservation Society, I am writing to request clarification about the intention for the use of funds generated by pay parking in Lighthouse Park and to raise your awareness about the high need for additional Park Rangers to oversee the safe enjoyment of Lighthouse Park and protect the park.

When pay parking was introduced in Lighthouse Park as a pilot project, it was stated publicly that the profit generated from such parking fees would be reinvested in maintaining the park. Although many of us were not supportive of the way the program was implemented (no way to pay by machine in the park, for example), we were optimistic that in the long run this would bring in much needed resources for Lighthouse Park maintenance.

I contacted the Parks Department recently to ask how much money was raised for Lighthouse Park and how it might be spent. I emphasized our Society's desire to see more Rangers hired. In response, we were advised that in November 2024, West Vancouver Council passed a resolution to allocate revenue from the pay parking program to support Parks, Culture, and Community Services. Furthermore, the reply stated that the funds raised through this initiative are used across the district to enhance park maintenance, cultural programming, and community services—ensuring that revenue from pay parking directly benefits the community and improves amenities in our parks and recreational areas. We were encouraged to contact Mayor and Council for further details, hence the stimulus to write this letter.

This reply was quite a shock to our Society's Board members as we had a very different understanding about the use of net proceeds from pay parking. At the May 8th, 2023, regular meeting, Council passed resolution #4 that "net revenues from this program be used for maintenance of the subject parks". The pay parking program began in early February 2024.

I admit that we did not notice the changed wording in the November 2024 council resolution regarding the allocation of the funds from paid parking. We were too busy with our hands-on volunteer activities in the parks to be reading Council agendas and minutes. The fall is a very busy season for our volunteer activities. Had we been aware, we most certainly would have registered to speak at that November 2024 Council meeting to ensure that the generated funds were used for the betterment of the specific parks where they were raised and not lost to deemed higher priorities throughout the District.

Lighthouse Park Preservation Society
5371 Kew Cliff Road
West Vancouver, BC, V7W 1M3

lighthouseparkps@gmail.com
604-922-1485



It is very disconcerting to realize now that the needs of Lighthouse Park are not likely to be given priority when deciding how to use pay parking proceeds that have been absorbed into the large budget for Parks, Culture, and Community Services, an extremely broad scope within West Vancouver. The parking proceeds will be a mere drop in a very large bucket. Why was the policy changed for use of net proceeds from parking? What can be done to ensure that Lighthouse Park does receive most of the net proceeds from parking in that park?

We know that Mayor and Council appreciate the unique qualities of Lighthouse Park's old-growth forest and its value to our community. What you perhaps do not know is how understaffed that park is. For 3 days a week, a single Ranger from the Parks Department is assigned to monitor visitor activities within the park and perform certain maintenance tasks. That's it. For 4 days a week, there is no Ranger presence in the park. This is grossly inadequate coverage for this cherished old-growth park.

On Sunday May 11th, a visitor to Lighthouse Park noticed a smouldering fire at Shore Pine Point and promptly called 911 for fire department assistance. Fortunately, the Ranger was on duty (not his normal schedule) and he was able to direct the fire department staff to the exact location; they collectively responded quickly and thoroughly. The fire had likely been caused by a campfire started the night before that was not thoroughly extinguished. The firemen were surprised that the Ranger had not spotted the campfire on the Saturday evening. But of course, Ranger staff do not work evenings.

This is but one example of a situation whereby visitor behaviour in Lighthouse Park posed a threat to other park visitors, to the forest itself, and potentially to neighbouring homes. More Park Rangers are sorely needed to provide adequate oversight of park use every day. Fire is not the only risk in this park. Lighthouse Park also needs significant infrastructure improvements. The money raised from parking fees would be a big help for this park.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. I am available for further discussion at your convenience.

Sincerely,

s. 22(1)

Alexandra Mancini, President
Lighthouse Park Preservation Society

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Thursday, May 29, 2025 12:23 PM
To: Mark Sager, Mayor; Linda Watt; Christine Cassidy; Nora Gambioli; Peter Lambur; Sharon Thompson; Scott Snider; correspondence
Subject: Tragedy at Keith Rd and Bay Street intersection in Horseshoe Bay Village May 28th

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.

Your Worship and Councillors,

This event has to be ranked amongst the most tragic that has befallen the Village of Horseshoe Bay in recent decades. And, it is likely that it might have been avoided had the pedestrian sidewalk been protected by suitably designed and constructed bollards installed between Keith Avenue travel lanes and the pedestrian sidewalk.

We have seen in just the past few years instances where drivers of private and commercial vehicles have purposely ploughed into pedestrians unprotected by passive barriers between the vehicle and the pedestrians. The vehicles in those cases were "weaponized", so to speak, and did murder and injury to the pedestrians so targeted.

We have yet to hear what caused this mishap this week in the Village of Horseshoe Bay. Was it mechanical failure, driver inattention or purposeful intent? Whatever the reason, it would not have occurred had the elementary precaution of installing robust bollards been taken.

But, having now occurred with the tragic loss of life of a 4-year old child, with the child's mother hospitalized in critical condition, and with the mother's friend hospitalized in stable condition, we clearly see the social and personal cost that the want of effective personal protection of pedestrians at Keith and Bay has given rise to.

There are several measures that can be taken by the cognizant authorities.

- Translink's contractor, Coast Mountain Bus, must ensure that its apparatus operators are properly trained and supervised and are not working while under the influence of intoxicants or medications that would prevent safe operation under all conditions of the apparatus assigned to them;
- The articulated apparatus fleet that is customarily operated on the Rt. 257 line between Horseshoe Bay and Vancouver should be maintained to a higher standard of operational readiness at all times;
- Translink's inspectors should be more vigilant and should be more visible at and near the vicinity of the Rt. 257 stop at Keith Rd. to ensure that the operators of the apparatus are exercising the care and attention that is required of its non-exempt employees assigned to the apparatus fleet on Rt. 257.
- West Vancouver Council should commission an engineering study of the feasibility of installing a line of robust protective bollards on Keith Road right-of-way parallel

with the roadway to separate the pedestrian travel lane from the travel lane frequented by Translink buses and private and commercial vehicles, and if the study finds that it is practicable to install a line of sufficiently robust protective bollards, then Council should fund and expedite the installation of the same forthwith.

Life lost can never be recovered, but we can take measures to ensure that a similar recurrence never again gives rise to a tragedy of this week's dimensions or worse.

We must take action to prevail. Time is of the essence.

Your servant,

s. 22(1)

West Vancouver, BC

s. 22(1)

s. 22(1)

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Wednesday, May 28, 2025 9:39 AM
To: Mark Sager, Mayor; Linda Watt; Nora Gambioli; Peter Lambur; Christine Cassidy; Scott Snider; Sharon Thompson; correspondence
Subject: Disappointed LAP Public Hearing Motion Defeated

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.

May 28, 2025

To Mayor and Council:

I am writing to express my disappointment that on Mon May 26 2025 you defeated a motion to put the Ambleside LAP to public hearing.

It seems once again Council is being held hostage by a single interest group to the exclusion of other voices in the community with diverse concerns, ensuring three things:

1. The community's commercial district will continue to deteriorate, driving away potential new businesses and discouraging young families and others from wanting to work and live here;
2. Costly taxpayers dollars and valuable staff time will be wasted as more 'studies' on the LAP are undertaken (ie, compromises made in order to appease one particularly vocal citizen's group unhappy with anything that smacks of growth and change in our community);
3. Democracy will continue to be undermined by your reluctance to consult with the residents who put you in office.

At your next meeting, I urge you to reconsider your decision not to have the LAP go to public hearing this spring. It's vital that citizens have the opportunity to plan their own futures, and what more can be accomplished on the LAP during the summer anyway?

Thank you in advance for taking this step.

[REDACTED]
s. 22(1)

West Vancouver, BC

[REDACTED]
s. 22(1)

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Thursday, May 29, 2025 1:15 PM
To: Mark Sager, Mayor; Christine Cassidy; Linda Watt; Peter Lambur; Scott Snider; Sharon Thompson; Nora Gambioli; correspondence
Subject: Stalled Ambleside LAP hearing is a missed opportunity

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 writing to express my disappointment regarding Council's decision not to approve a public hearing for the Ambleside Local Area Plan (LAP) at Monday evening's meeting. It is troubling to see what appears to be a concession to a small but vocal group that consistently opposes change—change that would help revitalize Ambleside and benefit the entire community. This group does not represent a significant portion of our residents, yet their influence seems disproportionate.

When this Council first came into office, you made sure you got things done - not always with due process - but many things moved forward. What happened to that intent on Monday night?

While I understand that revisions to the LAP are required to meet provincial directives, a public hearing would have provided a valuable opportunity for community input on those changes. As someone with a particular interest in the inclusion of a dedicated, central arts centre within the LAP, I am especially concerned that this important conversation has now been silenced. An arts centre would not only enrich our community but also help drive traffic to the commercial area—a benefit recognized in the City's own Economic Plan which highlights the arts as a key contributor to revitalization.

I respectfully urge Council to reconsider and to move quickly to schedule the Ambleside LAP public hearing. This would not only allow for meaningful community feedback but also serve as an opportunity to strengthen local democracy—something that, in my view, has been significantly eroded.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. I look forward to seeing progress and renewed engagement on this important initiative.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

West Vancouver, BC

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Friday, May 30, 2025 5:16 PM
To: correspondence
Cc: Nora Gambioli
Subject: Ambleside Plan

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

Dear Mayor and Council,

I'm very disappointed that the Ambleside Centre plan has stalled - again. Nora Gambioli is the only Councillor with a sense of urgency. Ambleside needs revitalizing and residents need more multi-family housing.

Please get on with it! Why not show the province that you don't need their nudges and their supervision?

Sincerely

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

West Vancouver

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

From: M Slater <melroy1058@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 2, 2025 12:28 PM
To: correspondence
Cc: Christine Cassidy; Nora Gambioli; Peter Lambur; Scott Snider; Sharon Thompson; Linda Watt
Subject: May 26/25 Council Agenda item #3 - Proposed Ambleside Centre Local Area Plan.

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

Dear Mayor & Council,

With reference to the proposed Ambleside Centre Local Area Plan (LAP), the height and density depicted in this LAP is a far cry from examples referenced in the ADBIA's wonderful *Imagine Ambleside* report, which looks to places such as Carmel by the Sea, Steveston and Edgemont Village as places to emulate. *Imagine Ambleside* emphasized low-rise, village charm and had widespread community support while this LAP is taking a very different direction. It places undesirable height on our waterfront and in our commercial village contrary to residents repeatedly stated preference for village charm, small, independent shops and access to sunlight and views.

Height and density must be brought down to a "village appropriate" level before sending this to a public hearing, which is the final step before approving or rejecting the plan. A public hearing is a one-way dialogue, it is not a forum for questions to be answered, and no changes can be made to height or density after a public hearing closes. Further, new provincial legislation will fast-track development applications that are consistent with the LAP – public hearings will be eliminated, residents will have no opportunity to provide comment or influence what gets built. This makes it even more crucial that we get this LAP right. If that means taking more time to do so, then so be it.

It is critical that residents understand what is being proposed and that they can easily compare this to potential growth capacity within existing zoning. It is reasonable to provide adequate time and resources to facilitate this. To that end 3D modelling and height descriptions in feet or meters (not just storeys) are essential. 3D modelling is not restricted to a physical model as Planning staff inferred but can be achieved with high-quality computer-generated images which are not particularly expensive or time consuming. I'm surprised our Planning staff lack knowledge or expertise of a resource that seems indispensable to their line of work. But a simple solution would be to outsource this to someone who specializes in 3D imaging. It is astounding that something as elementary as height descriptions in feet/meters has never been provided despite numerous requests. Such obstructions contribute to unnecessary delays.

I was alarmed to hear a few comments supporting some excessive building heights because “*we have to put density somewhere*”. This rationale is flawed and lazy. On one hand we are hearing that density *doesn't* need to go in Ambleside's commercial core as Park Royal, Taylor Way and Cypress Village will be densifying. There is also a convincing argument that existing zoning already provides adequate capacity for growth. The notion that we must keep growing or that a stable population is unsustainable (as the Provincial advisor's report to Housing Minister Ravi Kahlon claims) is patently false. It is an undisputable fact the opposite is true: **continuous population growth is unsustainable**. It is high time we address the elephant in the room that is exponential growth. That is a conversation that must be had with all levels of government.

It is regrettable that Councillor Gambioli took exception to the Ambleside & Dundarave Residents Association's (ADRA) reasonable request for more time to consider this important document and engage with their members. More disappointing still is Councillor Gambioli's baffling efforts to discredit this key stakeholder group.

Kudos to ADRA's president, Heather Mersey, who clarified some of the misstatements made about ADRA, noted the need to **unite rather than divide the community**, and reaffirmed ADRA's commitment to work hard to ensure a good result that the community fully supports.

Sincerely,

Melinda Slater
1058 Keith Road
West Vancouver

Please do not redact

From: s. 22(1)
Sent: Monday, June 2, 2025 2:50 PM
To: correspondence
Subject: Ambleside Centre Local Area Plan

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

The outcome of Council's deliberations on May 26 that left the approval process for the Ambleside Centre Local Area Plan (LAP) in limbo is an embarrassment. Everyone knows that the proposed LAP has been the subject of a very thorough engagement process. The issues are well understood and anyone who has had questions, concerns or constructive comment has had plenty of opportunity to make their voices heard. There are no surprises in the proposed plan.

Lengthening the process in speculation that significant new insights might somehow yet be discovered is a waste of time. Nor is it appropriate to deliberately slow walk the process as a tactic to facilitate efforts to frustrate, delay and oppose the LAP.

A political trend is underway known as supply side progressivism and Council should pay attention to it. It recognizes that public decision making on new development has become too bogged down in process, deference to narrow interests, over-regulation and undue complexity, resulting in inordinate delays, uncertainties that undermine business confidence, ballooning construction costs, and economic stagnation. Change is needed so that things can get built again. The sad state of the Ambleside commercial area exemplifies what happens (or doesn't) as a result of these self-imposed impediments.

Policies to address these constraints and unleash development are clearly reflected in the priorities of the new federal government, and by the province in initiatives such as Bills 14 and 15. More specifically, they are being reflected in federal and provincial housing supply initiatives, and in particular recent directions to West Vancouver provided by Minister Khalon to increase density, which if anything should be seen as justification for Council to move forward with the LAP approval process with more alacrity.

Unfortunately, Council's delaying of the Ambleside LAP process exhibits the kind of political behaviour that is seen as holding up progress for the benefit of a few. It almost looks like a taunt to the province, which may decide to be even more assertive. Careful what you wish for.

Council has before it a very well developed proposed LAP that has broad public support. Council should move it forward, for the benefit of West Vancouver as a whole, and allow a public hearing without further delay.

You were elected to make decisions, not to engage in indecision, dithering, and unseemly deference to a single lobby group. Please do your job.

s. 22(1)

West Vancouver

From: s. 22(1)
Sent: Tuesday, June 3, 2025 10:12 PM
To: correspondence; Sharon Thompson; Scott Snider; Christine Cassidy; Mark Sager, Mayor; Linda Watt; Peter Lambur; Nora Gambioli
Subject: LAP Ambleside Commercial

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

Dear Mayor and Council:

I have been reviewing the LAP Ambleside document for the commercial zone. This document needs to be thoroughly vetted to ensure that residents are heard and that every detail meets the needs of our community. Delaying the vote for first reading and the ensuing Public Hearing will ensure that oversights are minimal and that its intentions are clear. Residents, commercial interests and local government should all feel confidence in this plan going forward. There are no second chances. There is no need to rush.

As a long-time local resident, I have some concerns and questions.

1. 1. It appears that several properties are earmarked for zoning changes allowing for significant height and density increases. If that is the case, I understand that West Vancouver would no longer be able to collect CACs and share in the uplift value of these properties to provide for community improvements. If that is true, owners of these properties would reap a windfall profit at the expense of the community. It would be a transfer of wealth from the community (West Vancouver) to the property owner who may or may not even live in this community. Is that the intention? Despite a general distaste for spot zoning, and endless public hearings, I believe it is preferable to losing CAC funds that the community desperately needs.
2. 2. We need to develop concepts, not make prescriptions. This document will guide us for the next dozen or more years. Things can change drastically in that amount of time. Our needs may be quite different in 2040, and we need to allow for that flexibility. I realize that the LAP is meant to guide property owners and to eliminate endless variance requests, but as we saw in the last Council meeting, that is not happening.
3. I also have some questions regarding the ADBIA. I have been told by several people, including members, that membership is open to businesses and property owners, but that only property owners have the right to vote. (That is not the case in other BIA jurisdictions.) I also note that many ADBIA board members are property owners. Therefore, I do wonder if the primary purpose of this organization has become a vehicle for the benefit of the local businesses or for the personal financial interests of the property owners. Are there any conflicts of interest in this regard? I also have observed that the Executive Director is firmly resolute in forwarding the stance of the ADBIA on several issues to the point of public alienation. Whom is she representing?

4. 4. I believe that the Masonic Hall land should be retained solely for community use with no zoning change. As this community grows and as we attempt to meet the demands of the Provincial Government, that property will be needed to meet critical future needs in this community.
5. 5. Lastly, I would like storeys identified in measurements – metres or feet. It makes a difference. In commercial and mixed-use buildings, the ground floor standard is 20 feet. That is one storey!! This information has been requested by many people and in many workshops which I have attended. It should have happened by now. I trust this is merely an oversight and will be corrected.

Yours truly,

s. 22(1)

West Vancouver, BC s. 22(1)

From: Heather Mersey <adrawestvan@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 4, 2025 8:28 AM
To: Mark Sager, Mayor; Linda Watt; Sharon Thompson; Peter Lambur; Christine Cassidy; Nora Gambioli; Scott Snider; correspondence
Cc: Scott Findlay; David Hawkins; Jim Bailey
Subject: Local Area Plan - Ambleside Centre

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

Dear Mayor and Council,

Since receiving the proposed LAP Ambleside Centre Plan on May 6, 2025, ADRA Directors have held several meetings to review this proposal. We have identified various concerns which we outlined in our email of May 25ⁿ. In our view, it is in the best interests of the community that these matters are addressed before the LAP proceeds further.

As a key stakeholder it is important to ensure we are reflecting the views of our membership, and ideally of the greater community. To that end, we are planning a town hall meeting for mid-September.

Key concerns we'd like to address include:

1. Recently introduced provincial mandates negate public hearings for development proposals that align with the LAP. Public Hearings are a legally constituted way to inform and engage the public. Eliminating public input sets a dangerous precedent and is contrary to ADRA's core belief that informed and engaged residents are key to a healthy community. We believe residents should have a say in how their community grows. Our concern is that wording in the LAP will prevent this by allowing development proposals that conform with heights prescribed in the LAP to circumvent public hearings. Of particular concern are the two "special" sites (Fresh Street and Village Square), with proposed heights of 16 and 14 storeys. Redevelopment applications that conform with these heights would not be subject to public input. Consider maintaining existing zoning on these two sites to enable public input on redevelopment proposals.
1. Community Amenity Contributions (CACs). Section 03, Land Use Designation and Policies, item #1 (Low-Rise Heart) proposes an increase in density of up to 2.0 FAR (3-4 storeys) with no amenity contributions required for most of the low-rise designated area. Our concern is the potential financial impact to the district and loss of flexibility to either require or waive CACs. Also, the potential financial impact to business owners and operators from property tax increases associated with upzoning. Consider maintaining existing zoning.
1. Masonic Hall site. Site has been zoned Community Use (CU) and enjoyed preferential tax treatment since approximately 1950. Given the added densification of our community, limited community facilities and scarcity of CU zoning, consider maintaining exclusive Community Use zoning for this site.
1. Activated Waterfront – proposed heights/densities cut off waterfront rather than "activate". This proposal is placing density at the very place we don't want height. Doesn't fit with village concept. Consider maintaining existing zoning.
1. 1800 block to be placed back in the Commercial Zone (currently in Apartment Zone).
1. When future development is looked at it should be considered in the context of whether it complements Ambleside's village character and maintains or enhances the quality of life of our citizens. Our past Official Community Plans all referenced quality of life aspects. Consider including this in the LAP.

To facilitate a town hall discussion, we request:

1. Heights in measurement be added to the proposed LAP (e.g. feet or meters, not just storeys).
1. Include currently zoned height and density alongside of proposed changes to allow a better understanding and ease of comparison.
1. 3D images created with computer software depicting current zoning and proposed changes.
This would be useful not only in LAP discussions, but almost all rezoning processes.

We look forward to hearing from you as soon as possible as we continue to work towards a Local Area Plan that has broad community support.

Respectfully submitted,

Heather Mersey, President

Ambleside & Dundarave Residents Association
s. 22(1), West Vancouver, B.C

Please do not redact ADRA information

--

Visit our website: ADRAwestvan.ca

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Wednesday, May 28, 2025 11:23 AM
To: Mark Sager, Mayor; Christine Cassidy; Nora Gambioli; Peter Lambur; Scott Snider; Sharon Thompson; Linda Watt; Jim Bailey; David Hawkins; Michelle McGuire; Lisa Berg; correspondence
Cc: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Subject: Proposed development of 2550 Queens Ave

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

To our respected Mayor and Councillors of West Vancouver:

We are OPPOSED to the proposed sub-division and development of 2550 Queens Avenue.

Our address is [REDACTED] s.22(1) Queens property in question.

The houses proposed for 2550 Queens would not be considered affordable (BC Gov. mandate) and is not a solution for lack of affordable housing. Two large houses squeezed onto two small narrow lots does not fit into the character of the neighbourhood and is not well integrated, nor does it exemplify community values.

Residents of Queens bought their homes because they enjoy the ambience, environment and quality of their neighbourhood. They enjoy their gardens, privacy and landscapes,

Infrastructure requirements such as roadways, police, fire, parks, community centers, water, sewer are years old and need to be updated prior to major changes to any of West Van's many areas before such a new precedent of densification is set.

For this, and many other reasons, we are OPPOSED to the proposed development of 2550 Queens Ave.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

West Vancouver, BC

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Wednesday, May 28, 2025 3:56 PM
To: Christine Cassidy; Nora Gambioli; plambur@westvancouver.ca; Scott Snider; Sharon Thompson; iwatt@westvancouver.ca; Jim Bailey; David Hawkins; mmcquire@westvancouver.ca; Lisa Berg; correspondence
Subject: Opposing Dev. 2550 Queens Ave.
Attachments: Opposed.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.

Dear councilors of West Vancouver,

Please find attached my opposition to the proposed development at 2550 Queens Ave.

Kind regards,

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

[REDACTED] West Vancouver BC

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

Letter to Councilors Opposing the Proposed Development at 2550 Queens

Dear Councilors,

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed development at 2550 Queens, which entails the construction of two large houses squeezed onto two small and narrow lots. This plan is deeply concerning as it does not align with the established character of our cherished neighborhood.

One of the defining qualities of Queens is its harmonious and thoughtfully designed residential spaces, which have attracted residents who value the aesthetics and overall ambiance of the area. Many homeowners, [REDACTED] s. 22(1) chose to settle here [REDACTED] s. 22(1) appreciate the unique qualities of the neighborhood—qualities that foster a sense of community and tranquility. Allowing such disproportionate development would jeopardize these attributes and undermine the very essence of what makes Queens special.

Furthermore, doubling the housing density while potentially quadrupling the number of residents would place undue pressure on the community's infrastructure and resources. Schools, roads, green spaces, and other public facilities are not equipped to handle such a surge in population within a confined area. This type of development risks creating congestion, reducing quality of life, and ultimately eroding the sense of community we have worked so hard to preserve.

One of the most immediate consequences of the proposed development would be a surge in traffic and noise. The number of vehicles on the roads is expected to rise considerably. This increase can lead to congestion, longer commute times, and elevated levels of stress for residents. Moreover, the added burden on existing roads and public transport systems may necessitate costly upgrades or expansions, further disrupting daily life.

I urge the council to reconsider this proposal and prioritize developments that respect the character and capacity [REDACTED] s. 22(1) neighborhood. While I understand the need for housing, I believe that solutions can and should be found that do not compromise the quality or integrity of established communities.

Thank you for taking the time to consider my concerns. I trust that the council will make a decision that reflects the values and interests of [REDACTED] s. 22(1) residents.

Sincerely

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

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

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

From: [REDACTED] s.22(1)
Sent: Tuesday, June 3, 2025 5:59 PM
To: correspondence
Subject: Regarding - Rezoning of 2550 Queens Avenue

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

My family moved to [REDACTED] s.22(1).

I am opposed to the Rezoning of 2550.

We need more green not less.

We need less vehicles not more - We have speeding traffic at all times of the day and night.

Thank you very much to our wonderful and hard working Council for all you do.

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

[REDACTED]

From: [Redacted] s. 22(1)
Sent: Friday, May 30, 2025 9:40 AM
To: correspondence; Mark Sager, Mayor; Nora Gambioli; Scott Snider; Sharon Thompson; Linda Watt; Peter Lambur
Cc: Heather Keith; Jim Bailey
Subject: Concerns and proposed solutions - Urban Forest

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,

Thank you once again for the opportunity to speak at Monday’s Council meeting regarding the April 11, 2025, motion to protect trees greater than 20 cm in diameter on private development properties. While the motion was defeated 3-2, I appreciate your willingness to engage on this important issue.

I did touch on how residents have heard your **concerns, proposed solutions**, and offered to provide a summary. Please see below.

On Monday, I asked you two questions:

- Do you truly support the **long-term vision** of achieving a 52% canopy cover target—a “no net loss” standard based on the initial benchmark? If so, how have your recent decisions and actions advanced this goal?
- Whose **interests are you prioritizing**? Is it the residents who have voiced their support for tree protection, or a narrow stakeholder group opposed to such measures?

I look forward to hearing your perspectives on these questions. To further this dialogue, I will be reaching out to Councillors Lambur, Thompson, and Watt—who voted against the April 11 motion—to request brief meetings.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

[Redacted]
 [Redacted]

West Vancouver

Summary of Concerns and Solutions

Many of the solutions below were generated during a West Vancouver Urban Forest Workshop on Feb 6 2025, where 24 residents participated. The following stakeholder groups were involved: DWV Streamkeepers, Positive Voices, Urban Tree Alliance, Urban Forest Guiding, Old Growth Conservancy, and Friends of Cypress Bowl.

Council concerns to introducing the > 20 cm regulation	Resident ideas provided
1. Budget constraints	1. Use “design thinking” principles (like process mapping and brainstorming) are used to build a bylaw and process that is simple, efficient and that decreases the need for more people 2. Use volunteer engagement and community involvement in supporting staff (e.g. water trees on sidewalks to free staff to help elsewhere) 3. Require tree protection and replacement plans as part of the development approval process (zoning bylaw), ensuring trees are considered from the earliest stages of planning

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Place more responsibility for meeting potential bylaw requirements on development applicants as a way of reducing potential staffing requirements 5. Do a pilot in lower density areas like Ambleside and Dundarave (learn from it) without more staff 6. Reallocate an existing staff member to support the arborists and bylaw enforcement teams 7. Build a business case (in other words the dollar value or the return on investment) to inform decisions 8. Use the environment resource fund to staff tree work 9. Plan for budget in 2026
<p>2. East and west differences, inequitable distribution – Ambleside’s tree canopy is 19% vs 23% in Vancouver</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Target areas where the need is the greatest 2. Do a pilot in the eastern parts of the District. Implement the bylaw, learn from it and decide on next steps
<p>3. Residents do not want more regulation <i>(please note: the data shows that the majority do)</i></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Engage and educate residents on the benefits (highlighting success stories and community benefits e.g., improved property values and flood mitigation) 2. Offer incentives 3. Streamline processes (make processes simple and customer-friendly, reducing frustration and the perception of bureaucracy)
<p>4. Safety, ensuring residents are safe from unhealthy trees <i>(please note: safety must be a priority. No bylaw should prevent residents from removing a tree that is deemed unsafe)</i></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Proactive identification and mitigation of hazardous trees (pruning, bracing, or removal if necessary) 2. Provide residents with clear channels to report potentially hazardous trees, and ensure prompt, professional response
<p>3. Densification trends and demands</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. See densification as a driver to protecting our current trees. Densification will and should happen, and protecting trees as best we can is imperative 2. Implement tree replacement and planting requirements

Comment on the April 11 Motion

The April 11 motion specifically targeted trees on private development lots (currently 40 permits in the District). Many of the concerns raised by Council are less relevant to this motion:

- **Safety:** The motion only applies to new developments and does not prevent homeowners from removing hazardous trees.

- **Canopy Inequity:** *Not directly relevant, as the motion focuses on new development, not existing disparities.*
- **Densification:** *The motion protects trees outside building footprints, so it does not impede new home construction.*
- **Added Costs:** *Streamlining the zoning bylaw process—including tree protection rules—need not be cumbersome or costly.*

From: M Slater <melroy1058@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 2, 2025 12:04 PM
To: correspondence
Cc: Christine Cassidy; Nora Gambioli; Peter Lambur; Scott Snider; Sharon Thompson; Linda Watt; Mark Sager, Mayor
Subject: May 26 Council Agenda item #4 – Preliminary Development Regarding Proposal for 1552 Esquimalt Avenue.

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

Dear Mayor & Council,

Regarding the Wall Centre's infill development request to add a 19-storey, 3.0 FAR apartment building at 1552 Esquimalt with 139 strata units secured as rental for 6 years.

I was dismayed to see Council (apart from Councillor Gambioli), reject staff's recommendation that this proposal be amended to comply with the OCP prior to soliciting public consultation.

As Councillor Gambioli so rightly pointed out, we have recently approved an LAP for the Ambleside Apartment Area which involved abundant public input. Before the ink has dried, we are being asked to consider a proposal that doesn't meet the requirements of this newly created plan. I agree with Councillor Gambioli – this undermines council's credibility in the public's eye.

For years now residents have asked for a degree of certainty about what may be built. They are sick and tired of having to monitor and attend meetings and public hearings and provide comment every time a developer brings forward a request that doesn't conform with our OCP. Residents expect LAPs to shield them from this onerous process by establishing clear guidelines for acceptable development and they expect council to uphold these guidelines.

The rationale given for considering this spot-zoning includes an attractive design and that extra strata density will provide Community Amenity Contributions and greater property tax revenue. There was also comment that limiting the rental term was necessary for the developer to obtain financing. (Mayor Sager said he fully believed the applicant would retain the rental tenure beyond 6 years and appeared willing to accept this on nothing more than good faith).

Such arguments indicate the newly minted LAP lacked the foresight to address these apparent issues or secure desired amenities or outcomes and needs to be revised. Does council really want to go there? I think not. Please uphold the LAP.

Sincerely,

Melinda Slater
1058 Keith Road
West Vancouver

Please do not redact.

From: s. 22(1)
Sent: Monday, June 2, 2025 12:12 PM
To: correspondence
Cc: Mark Sager, Mayor; Christine Cassidy; Nora Gambioli; Peter Lambur; Scott Snider; Sharon Thompson; Linda Watt
Subject: Request for a 4-way stop at 23rd and Jefferson

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

We are residents s. 22(1) and we're calling on the District to take immediate action to make our neighbourhood safer—for drivers, pedestrians, and especially for children.

On April 24th, 2025, a serious crash occurred at this intersection. A driver heading south on 23rd Street blew through the stop sign and was struck by a car legally traveling west on Jefferson Avenue. The impact was severe: the vehicle was thrown off the road, destroying a fire hydrant and three mature boulevard trees in the process. Thankfully, no one was seriously injured—but it could have ended very differently.

This isn't the first time something like this has happened. Drivers frequently ignore the stop sign on 23rd Street. Meanwhile, cars on Jefferson Avenue (which has no stop sign) proceed through the intersection, expecting it to be clear. This mismatch is dangerous—and it's only a matter of time before someone is seriously hurt or worse. The intersection sits just one block from two elementary schools. Every day, children, parents, and families walk this route.

Another collision that occurred just a few months ago resulted in damage to a hydro pole. That driver fled the scene. The police were involved in both cases, including report s. 22(1), filed after the April 24th crash.

We strongly believe that a 4-way stop is the most effective low-cost solution to this ongoing danger. Many local drivers already treat the intersection with caution, recognizing the risk. Making it official would reduce confusion, slow down traffic, and help prevent a future tragedy.

We urge the District to act now and install a 4-way stop at the intersection of 23rd Street and Jefferson Avenue. Let's not wait until someone gets seriously injured—or worse—before making this change.

We have created a petition so that people who are in favour of this can register their support: [BLOCKEDforms\[.\]gle/JXRSZXpxBYep69nV9BLOCKED](https://BLOCKEDforms[.]gle/JXRSZXpxBYep69nV9BLOCKED)

Yours sincerely,

s. 22(1)

[Redacted signature block]