

COUNCIL CORRESPONDENCE UPDATE TO JUNE 18, 2025 (8:30 a.m.)

Correspondence

- (1) June 11, 2025 regarding “Forest Fire Protection”**
- (2) 2 submissions, June 13, 2025, regarding Proposed Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 4985, 2018, Amendment Bylaw No. 5386, 2025 (Ambleside Centre Local Area Plan)**
- (3) June 13, 2025, regarding Urban Forest Management**
- (4) June 15, 2025, regarding “Follow-up on Glenmore Residents Collingwood School Task Force Meeting - June 11, 2025 [Date]”**
- (5) June 16, 2025, regarding “Please forward to Mayor & Council members” (Wireless Technologies)**

Correspondence from Other Governments and Government Agencies

No items.

Responses to Correspondence

- (6) Senior Manager of Parks, June 11, 2025, response regarding “Re: Protect our parks from fire risk”**
- (7) Director of Engineering & Transportation Services, June 13, 2025, response to Lighthouse Park Preservation Society regarding “Fwd: Use of Net Proceeds from Pay Parking in Lighthouse Park”**

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Wednesday, June 11, 2025 2:05 PM
To: FOR.Minister@gov.bc.ca; correspondence; ahurford@squamish.ca;
 jcrompton@whistler.ca
Subject: [SUSPECTED SPAM] Forest Fire Protection

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

Ministry of Forests
 Honourable Ravi Parmar

Mayor of West Vancouver
 Mark Sager

Mayor of Squamish
 Armand Hurford

Mayor of Whistler
 Jack Cromton

Forest Fire Protection

I am writing as a very concerned citizen [REDACTED] s. 22(1) in West Vancouver, Squamish and Whistler.

As we see the terrible fire in Squamish grow and the devastation from fires in Pacific Palisades California, Lytton, Fort McMurray, Maui, Jasper, Nova Scotia and Manitoba there needs to be major efforts to provide clear zones of protection to our urban areas.

I am sorry but I don't see the "clear cut protection or fire break zones" in Squamish, West Vancouver and Whistler.

While I am no expert in fire prevention, we can see clearly the conditions are ripe with longer and dryer summers. Coupled with the close proximity of homes to the forest and the increased number of people accessing these areas and the sometimes irresponsible behaviour of a few people we will see more and more fires.

In reaching out to all of you. I would like the public to be well informed of the risk and the need to make "fire breaks" to protect our homes and businesses. I realize that clear cuts are not attractive but they are a lot better than burnt out homes.

In West Vancouver and Whistler the increase in density and the vast number of trees and their growth is adding to the combustible fuel should a fire start and the winds whip it up or down the hill side. These trees are overgrown and tower well above the adjacent homes.

Action must be taken now. I would appreciate your feedback.

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

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

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

From: Jacob Isaac <Jacob.Isaac@nscr.ca>
Sent: Friday, June 13, 2025 10:39 AM
To: correspondence
Cc: Nora Gambioli; Christine Cassidy; Peter Lambur; Scott Snider; Sharon Thompson; Linda Watt; Mark Sager, Mayor
Subject: CHAC Letter Re: Ambleside Local Area Plan – Request for Action
Attachments: CHAC Ambleside LAP Response - June 13, 2025.pdf

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

Dear Mayor Sager, Council, and District Staff,

Please find attached a letter from the North Shore Community Housing Action Committee (CHAC) regarding the recent deferral of the Ambleside Local Area Plan. We are writing to express our concern and to urge Council to move the Plan to public hearing without further delay.

We welcome the opportunity to discuss this further and remain available to meet at your convenience.

Sincerely,
Jacob Isaac

Jacob Isaac
Housing Advocate
Chair, Community Housing Action Committee
604.982.3309
jacob.isaac@nscr.ca

www.nscr.ca



North Shore Community Resources acknowledges and honours that we live and work on the unceded territories of the Coastal Salish people. Including the St'at'imc, Sḵwxwú7mesh (Squamish), xʷməθkʷəyʹəm (Musqueam) and səl' ilwətaʔɪ (Tseil-Waututh) Nations.

This email may be privileged and confidential. Any use or redistribution of this email by an unintended recipient is prohibited. If you receive this email in error please contact us by email.

June 13, 2025

Dear Mayor Sager and Council,

We, the North Shore Community Housing Action Committee (CHAC), are writing regarding Council's decision at the May 26, 2025 meeting to halt the Ambleside Local Area Plan (hereafter referred to as the Area Plan) and defer first reading, following concerns raised about the adequacy of public consultation in light of Minister Kahlon's May 22nd statement.

As a Committee dedicated to supporting local democracy and ensuring residents' voices are heard by their elected representatives, we agree that meaningful public engagement is fundamental to democratic decision-making, especially for a document with the long-term significance of the Area Plan. However, we do not share the view that the consultation process for the Area Plan has been insufficient, nor do we believe that the recent directive to increase density around the Park Royal and Ambleside/Dundarave areas undermines the integrity or merit of the Plan as it currently stands.

Over the past two years, the District has hosted 25 in-person events, distributed multiple surveys, and offered a variety of online engagement tools for individuals and community groups to help shape the Area Plan. The breadth of public participation, supported by consistent, widely publicized notices in both print and digital media, is reflected in more than 3,000 contributions from West Vancouver residents and organizations. This engagement was neither rushed nor superficial. At key points throughout the process, District staff provided accessible informational materials, ranging in length and detail, to ensure that all residents, regardless of their familiarity with planning processes and terminology, could provide informed, thoughtful feedback.

To suggest that to move the Area Plan to public hearing, without further consultation with the Ambleside and Dundarave Residents Association (ADRA) or similar groups, would corrode the legitimacy of the Plan, is to ignore the success and fecundity of the completed engagement process. Further, it is essential that West Vancouver residents are confident that the time they invest engaging with District staff will result in action; when a lone community group is allowed to shift the goal posts at the last hour, delaying a public hearing warranted by sufficient consultation, this confidence is damaged. Like ADRA, our Committee was given multiple opportunities to participate, and while we would have welcomed further dialogue, we see no reason to believe that the consultation process has been anything but robust, thorough, and legitimate.

Regarding the May 22nd ministerial directive, there is no indication that the additional capacity required in an amended Area Plan by September 30, 2026, would fundamentally alter the Plan's current character. The only recommendation (*Proposed Solutions to Spur Sustainable Housing Growth, #5*) in the Advisor's Report that specifically addresses the Ambleside Town Centre suggests "gentle but increased density in the single-family areas

directly north of Ambleside and Dundarave." If the District aligns with this recommendation, it would likely result in a modest expansion of the Town Centre boundaries, allowing for gentle infill and the extension of SSMUH regulations to nearby blocks. Given that the current Area Plan already provides capacity for 1,200 additional units in Ambleside, any further changes to accommodate additional density would likely be limited in scope, particularly since the Province's primary interest appears to be increasing capacity within the Park Royal TOA. In effect, the Area Plan is unlikely to undergo substantial change, even if the Province requires the District to add more density.

Beyond the recommendation for gentle density north of Ambleside and Dundarave, a significant portion of the Report focuses on key housing challenges in the District. At the top of the list: "NIMBY Influence Preventing Growth." While our Committee acknowledges the complexity of community concerns around new development, and typically avoids using monikers like "NIMBY", we are not surprised by its inclusion in the Province's report. Recent legislation, particularly Bill 44, is designed to limit what the Province views as unreasonable opposition to necessary housing growth. The Report, on several occasions, explicitly cites ADRA's organized efforts to delay projects as a key housing challenge the District must address. Its recommendation: "reduce delays and 'moving goalposts' in development approvals."

This is why we are deeply concerned by the decision to halt the Area Plan's move to public hearing (as had been suggested by your own Planning Department) at ADRA's last-minute request. Council had the opportunity to ratify a thorough, well-considered, and widely-supported plan, one shaped by West Vancouver residents, that would directly address both of the Province's core concerns: the lack of housing growth and the ability of organized groups to block projects that do not align with a single-family home vision. By deferring to ADRA's request, Council risks confirming the very concerns raised by the Province, and, in doing so, may jeopardize the District's ability to retain control over its own planning decisions, should the Province choose to intervene and assert its authority.

For the same stated reasons that Council did not send the Area Plan to public hearing: democratic due process and a commitment to community self-determination, we now urgently request a response, naming a date when Council will *finally* follow through with first reading and send the Plan to public hearing. Delaying further only risks ceding planning authority to the Province, undermining the hard work of our community over the past two years.

CHAC is happy to meet with District staff and Council to discuss further if desired.

Respectfully submitted,

Jacob Isaac

Chair, North Shore Community Housing Action Committee

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Friday, June 13, 2025 4:52 PM
To: Mark Sager, Mayor; Linda Watt; Christine Cassidy; Nora Gambioli; Peter Lambur; Scott Snider; Sharon Thompson; correspondence
Subject: Please Adopt LAP

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.

June 13, 2025

To Mayor and Council:

I am writing to ask that the LAP be adopted as soon as possible to enable progress with regard to rejuvenating the District and enabling a building plan to accommodate the diverse and urgent housing needs of those who work in West Van but can't afford to live here. It's time you ignore the voices of negativity that so often prevail, and take action for the betterment of the community at large.

I am also writing to ask that future planning include designating the area at the foot of 16th Avenue (including the triangle-shaped lot to the east that I understand the District is negotiating to acquire), as the site of a future arts centre, including a new home for the West Vancouver Art Museum. Such a centre has long been needed, desired, and planned for, and now is the perfect opportunity for Council to make it a reality.

If this action is taken there is no need to move the Art Museum to the Boathouse at Horseshoe Bay, even temporarily, as has been proposed. Save the money it will cost to retrofit the building (millions I understand) and put it toward an amenity that will be a legacy forever, serving residents of all ages and attracting visitors to the heart of Ambleside to enjoy our shops, restaurants, parks and beaches.

I see from Council Correspondence that you received a letter on June 5 from Ruth Simons, ED of UNESCO's Howe Sound Biosphere Region Society. She made an offer to take over the Boathouse as a prime location for the kinds of research they undertake. In her words: "UNESCO is the UN's agency for education, science, and culture, and it is these elements that we envision for the Boathouse building."

I urge you to take advantage of this great offer — or at least to consider others that may be on the table — and put the District's resources into creating a permanent, purpose-built arts facility that all of West Vancouver can enjoy.

Thank you for listening,

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

West Vancouver, BC

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Friday, June 13, 2025 7:03 PM
To: Mark Sager, Mayor; Christine Cassidy; Nora Gambioli; Sharon Thompson; Scott Snider; Peter Lambur; Linda Watt; correspondence
Cc: Heather Keith; Jim Bailey

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

Dear Mayor and Council Members.

I'm writing about our urban forest—a vital resource for our community's health, climate resilience, and quality of life.

I appreciate that district staff are developing a bylaw to require tree planting on private development sites after construction. This is a positive step, and I fully support it. However, I believe we need to go further.

The district's own Urban Forest Management Plan identifies the main reason we're losing our urban forest: the widespread removal of existing trees when lots are clear-cut for development. Unfortunately, replanting new trees cannot fully replace the mature canopy we lose. To put this in perspective, we've lost 2% of our tree canopy in just three years—that's about 40,000 trees. This is a staggering loss, and no amount of replanting, on either public or private land, can make up for it in the short term.

So, what's the solution? We need a holistic approach. While new tree planting is important, we must also do everything possible to protect existing mature trees during development. Mature trees provide irreplaceable ecological benefits—clean air, shade, habitat, and stormwater management—that young trees simply can't match right away.

I urge Council to strengthen the new bylaw by including strong protections for existing trees wherever possible. Let's make every effort to preserve our mature urban forest for current and future generations.

Thank you for your commitment to a greener, healthier community.

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Life long West Van Resident [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
[REDACTED] West Vancouver, BC [REDACTED] s. 22(1)

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Sunday, June 15, 2025 8:54 PM
To: Mark Sager, Mayor; correspondence
Cc: Linda Watt; Christine Cassidy; [REDACTED] s. 22(1); [REDACTED]; Nora Gambioli; Scott Findlay
Subject: Follow-up on Glenmore Residents Collingwood School Task Force Meeting - June 11, 2025 [Date]

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

•
• Dear Mayor Sager,

Thank you for attending the Glenmore Residents Collingwood School Task Force meeting along with Councillor Cassidy on June 11 (Councillor Watt was unable to attend). Your engagement on the Task Force means a great deal to our community.

Follow-Up Meeting with Engineering to discuss key safety measures the Task Force reached consensus on that will not be implemented

We are appreciative of the measures approved by Council on April 14th focusing on Glenmore Neighbourhood Traffic Calming: (new 1.8m wide gravel pathways, raised crosswalks, rapid flashing beacons, and edge line painting to create wider travel lanes). <https://westvancouver.ca/mayor-council/council-highlights>

However, several key safety measures the Task Force reached consensus on will not be implemented, including:

- Raised curb treatment for gravel pathways/sidewalks to provide proper separation from roadway traffic
- Speed zone designations along Glenmore Drive
- Solutions for parking congestion on Glengarry Drive
- Traffic flow improvements at the Morven and Glenmore intersection
- Strategic placement of speed bumps on Glenmore Drive

We believe Engineering made an error in approving a gravel pathway without adequate separation from the roadway, particularly given the intense Collingwood school-related traffic that our neighbourhood experiences. Our concern is that proceeding with an incomplete solution this summer may provide a false sense of accomplishment while failing to address the core safety issues that motivated the Task Force in the first place.

Following the June 11th meeting, Municipal Manager Scott Findlay reached out to arrange a follow-up discussion with Engineering staff. However, he has made it clear that the current plans are final and will proceed this summer as approved, with no possibility for modifications or adjustments based on our upcoming meeting.

The meeting with Engineering is scheduled for Tuesday, June 17th, where Engineering will walk us through their current plans and explain their rationale for not proceeding with the additional measures the Task Force endorsed. We will document these explanations, though we are disappointed that the District appears unwilling to engage constructively on the comprehensive solutions our community needs.

Outstanding Items for Collingwood School

Glenmore residents await Collingwood School's written response by the end of June 2025 regarding our key requests regarding its Morven campus turf soccer field in close proximity to adjacent homes:

6. Construction of a noise abatement fence along adjoining residential properties on Glenmore Drive (noting Sport England's Design Guidance Note recommends a 40-meter minimum distance between sports fields and neighbouring residences to mitigate noise levels below 50 dBA; currently, the 15.5-meter separation at Collingwood School's Morven campus turf soccer field falls well short of this guideline, creating an industrial-level noise impact on residential properties); and
7. The School's retention of private security to enforce permitted hours of use for the Morven campus turf soccer field

We also look forward to engaging with the School's Board of Governors and Mr. Ryan Cohen, Chair of the Land and Capital Planning Committee, within the same timeframe. We have also asked the school to outline how residents may provide input to their noise consultant to help define an effective scope of work.

Next Steps

While we will participate in the upcoming Engineering meeting on Tuesday, we remain concerned that the current approach may not fully address the comprehensive traffic calming measures our neighbourhood requires. We appreciate your ongoing support and hope that future Council deliberations will provide opportunities to revisit these important safety issues and provide meaningful community consultation.

Thank you for your continued attention to these matters.

Best regards,

s. 22(1)

West Vancouver, BC

s. 22(1)

From: s. 22(1)
Sent: Monday, June 16, 2025 3:26 PM
To: correspondence
Subject: Please forward to Mayor & Council members

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.

Ladies and Gentlemen;
You are supposed to protect our health! Please get informed about the dangers of not just 5G but also 4G and 3G! Much information in the material below!

Thanks

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

‘5G — The Untold Story’: New Documentary Spotlights Health Hazards of Wireless Radiation

The world’s first documentary on the real-world health effects of 5G features interviews with previously healthy residents of Stockholm, Sweden, who experienced serious health problems within days of having 5G antennas activated near their homes. Symptoms included insomnia, headaches, fatigue, tinnitus and heart palpitations.

by **Suzanne Burdick, Ph.D.**
JUNE 16, 2025



[RSS](#)
REPUBLISH
PRINT

SHARE
0 COMMENTS
LISTEN TO THIS ARTICLE

Download Play

00:00/04:31 1X

“5G — The Untold Story,” the world’s first documentary on the real-world health effects of 5G, garnered hundreds of views within hours of its June 11 premiere on YouTube.

The film features interviews with previously healthy residents of Stockholm, Sweden, who experienced serious **health problems** within days of having 5G antennas activated near their homes. Symptoms included insomnia, headaches, fatigue, tinnitus and heart palpitations.

“Most people are uninformed or misinformed about the health risks of 5G antennas and towers,” Mona Nilsson, co-founder and director of the **Swedish Radiation Protection Foundation** and one of the film’s writers, told **The Defender**.

Nilsson said she hopes the documentary will raise **public awareness of 5G** as a “very important health issue.”

“The so-called **safety limits** applied in most countries all over the world — including in the USA — allow the public to be exposed to levels of this kind of radiation that are well documented to be harmful,” Nilsson said.

Current regulatory limits around the world “have obviously been set to protect the industry’s needs instead of public health,” she said. The situation runs against what we “must expect from a democratic society.”

‘It is time for a wake-up call’

The film documents how Nilsson teamed up with **Lennart Hardell, M.D., Ph.D.**, to write **case reports** that scientifically document people’s experiences of health problems resulting from 5G.

For the reports, Hardell and Nilsson measured the radiation levels at the people’s homes and reported the residents’ symptoms. They also documented how the symptoms swiftly disappeared when the residents relocated somewhere with lower radiation levels.

Hardell, an oncologist and epidemiologist with the **Environment and Cancer Research Foundation**, who has authored more than 350 papers, almost 60 of which address **radiofrequency (RF) radiation**.

Hardell, one of the first researchers to publish reports on the toxicity of **Agent Orange**, emphasized that case reports are important for documenting the **toxicity** of an environmental exposure.

“It is time for a wake-up call,” Hardell said. “The public — including the medical profession — needs to recognize RF radiation as a causative factor for health issues.”

So far, Nilsson and Hardell have published **eight case reports** and one **summary** of seven of them.

Children may be more sensitive to RF radiation

Nilsson explained that 5G — which started being rolled out in Stockholm and elsewhere in 2020 — was intended to provide faster transmission speed than 3G and 4G networks.

5G uses higher frequencies than previous generations and may emit 10 to 100 times higher radiation levels. These high radiation levels are making some people sick, she said.

Soon after the 5G rollout in Stockholm, people reached out to the Swedish Radiation Protection Foundation complaining of symptoms, Nilsson said.

The film opens by noting that Stockholm was recently named a top city for **overall 5G experience in Europe**, according to MedUX, a company that quality tests telecommunications networks.

One of the men interviewed in the film described what happened when 3G and 4G antennas near his apartment were upgraded to 5G.

“They put up a lot more antennas,” he said. Suddenly, the telecom apparatus became “three times bigger ... and what worried me [was that] I saw that they were pointing it directly to my apartment.”

Within the first week, he experienced a “hard beating” of his heart, fatigue and headaches.

One day, his ex-girlfriend came by the apartment. “After half an hour sitting in my living room, she felt pain in her brain and started to cry,” he recalled.

The film also reports that **children** may be more sensitive to RF radiation than adults.

One of Hardell and Nilsson’s case reports documented that an **8-year-old developed severe headaches** when he started attending a school near a 5G cell tower

“Unfortunately,” Nilsson said, “the industry has shown no interest in the results of our studies and the reported serious health effects of their new 5G technology.”

According to Nilsson, the 5G rollout is intended to meet the needs of the **telecommunications industry** rather than benefit the public.

As of July 3, 2024, **438 scientists and medical doctors** signed the 5G appeal, which calls for a moratorium in light of research that already shows RF radiation can harm human health.

Watch the documentary here:

Swedish Radiation Protection Foundation

185 subscribers

5G THE UNTOLD STORY

Share

Related articles in The Defender

- [‘High Certainty’ Cellphone Radiation Linked to Cancer in Animals, WHO Study Finds](#)
- [5G Towers Can Make Healthy People Sick, Two Case Reports Show](#)
- [Kids Developed Headaches, Stomach Pain, Sleeping Issues While at Vacation Home Near Multiple 5G Antennas](#)
- [U.S. Invests \\$1.5 Billion to Spur 5G Rollout Despite New Evidence of ‘Devastating’ Health Issues](#)
- [Scientists Call for Moratorium on 5G After Study Shows Regulators Ignoring Health Risks of Radiation](#)**Suzanne Burdick, Ph.D.**
-

Suzanne Burdick, Ph.D., is a reporter and researcher for The Defender based in Fairfield, Iowa.

Categories: [5G/EMR](#), [Electromagnetic Radiation](#), [Health Conditions](#), [Radiofrequency Radiation](#), [Smart Devices](#), [Toxic Exposures](#), [Wireless](#)

Tags: [5G](#), [Cell Towers](#), [Cellphones - Smartphones](#), [Electromagnetic Fields - EMF](#), [Electromagnetic Radiation - EMR](#), [Radiofrequency Radiation - RFR](#), [Wireless - Wi-Fi](#)

From: Jill Lawlor
Sent: Wednesday, June 11, 2025 9:31 PM
To: s. 22(1)
Cc: correspondence
Subject: Re: Fire Safety in Parks

Good evening s. 22(1),

Thank you for your email and for your care and advocacy for Lighthouse Park.

I'd be very happy to meet with you in person at Lighthouse Park to walk through some of these matters, hear more about your observations, gain a better understanding of your concerns, and discuss the measures we're putting in place this summer. I believe meeting onsite will give us a valuable opportunity to align on both the challenges and potential solutions.

Please let me know your availability in the coming weeks, and I'll coordinate a time that works for both of us.

Appreciatively,

Jill

Jill Lawlor (she, her, hers)
Senior Manager of Parks | District of West Vancouver
t: 604-921-3467 | c: 604-418-3657 | westvancouver.ca



We acknowledge that we are on the traditional, ancestral and unceded territory of the Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw (Squamish Nation), səliłwətał (Tsleil-Waututh Nation), and xʷməθkʷəyəm (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: s. 22(1)
Sent: Monday, June 9, 2025 8:09 PM
To: Jill Lawlor; correspondence
Subject: Re: Protect our parks from fire risk
Attachments: DWV-#5824974-v1-2025 05 16 2327-s.22(1).pdf (1).pdf

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 Jill,

Thank you for your letter of May 21st in response to my May 15th letter to Mayor and Council (attached).

I'd like to respond to a few points that you raise and ask some additional questions:

1. Ranger presence and reliance on the public: I'm glad to read that the Parks Department considers the Shore Pine Point fire on May 11 a reminder of the importance of continued vigilance in Lighthouse Park and, by extension, in other District parks.

I'm very concerned, however, that so much responsibility for that vigilance is put on the general public and that the Parks Dept relies on the public to report concerns and issues.

I do not think that relying on a passerby to notice and report a fire is sufficient or wise. I think it's asking an awful lot of the public to be responsible for noticing fires and knowing what to do.

- What if the passerby is in an area of the Park where there is no cell phone reception? There are many such areas.
- What if the passerby doesn't have a cell phone?
- What if the passerby simply doesn't know what to do?
- What if the fire is spreading and the person can't easily get out of a more remote area of the Park and fire equipment can't get in?
- What if there is no passerby?
- What if the passerby sees people in the process of using a flame, reminds them of the bylaw, and is assaulted verbally or physically?
 - This has happened to me on numerous occasions when I have reminded people smoking cigarettes that smoking is not allowed in the Park. I've had men yell and swear at me and shake their fists at me. It's scary! When I reported this to the Parks Dept, staff advised me to stop reminding people not to smoke for my own safety. So I no longer tell people not to smoke, and that in itself feels like a fire risk for the Park - particularly as you rely on members of the public, like me, to monitor fire risk.

Relying on the public to monitor the Park for fires is not enough.

I no longer feel safe walking in Lighthouse Park in the hot, dry summer months because of the fire risk that's posed by Park users who disobey the rules, particularly when there is not full-time day and evening Ranger presence.

When I was growing up here, our family frequented Lighthouse Park. At the time, there were Rangers on duty full-time and two lighthouse keepers and their families living in the cottages at the lighthouse that are now empty. Until four years ago, s. 22(1) lived in one of the cottages and acted as a caretaker for the Park, daily walking the trails and checking for hazards. Another couple lived in the second cottage until two years ago, and while they weren't caretakers per se, at least their full-time presence in the Park helped.

Why have we lost the oversight and caretaking that we used to have in the Park?

If we used to have full-time Rangers, why can't we have them again?

The need for full-time Rangers is even more important today than it was when I was younger now that our summers are warmer and drier. This type of weather is likely going to continue and potentially worsen. We need more Rangers.

I'd like to see a return of full-time Park Rangers and an enhancement of Ranger presence in the Park during the hot, drier months that includes evenings (until at least 10pm) when Park users are more likely to have campfires or cook a meal. I really believe that's the only wise thing to do. The fire risk from people disobeying the rules is too great. We should be paying for that level of protection.

2. Ban on charcoal, briquette, hibachi BBQs and allowing propane BBQs: You mentioned in your letter that you are implementing a ban on all charcoal, briquette, and hibachi-style barbecues this year, allowing only propane barbecues.

I'm confused - does that mean that propane barbecues are allowed in Lighthouse Park?

I thought all of these were already banned in Lighthouse Park.

Could you please explain specifically what you mean and how this ban will help prevent fires in our parks?

3. Working with Bylaws: In your letter you mention that you "work closely with our Bylaws, Police, and Fire partners to assist with both preventative patrols and emergency response."

If Rangers cannot issue tickets to people disobeying the fire and smoking bans in parks, could you please explain how you will ensure an immediate response from Bylaw officers in these instances?

My personal experience when I have phoned Bylaw officers for issues requiring immediate attention is that their response has been too slow to be effective, i.e. the perpetrator of an illegal activity has left the scene by the time Bylaw officers arrive.

4. Education campaign: I am pleased that Fire and Parks will explore a targeted education campaign to bring fire safety awareness to park users. That's great. As human activity is the most likely cause of fires in our parks, educating the public is a necessary prevention measure.

Could you please provide more details of your education campaign and when it will be implemented?

- For instance, will it include an education campaign in West Van schools before school ends for the summer?
 - The small park s. 22(1) that I referenced in my May 15 letter is frequently used by groups of teenagers in the summer for socializing and evening partying. They often are smoking despite non-smoking signs that the Parks Dept installs each summer in that park. As I mentioned in my May 15 letter, in the summer of 2023 there was a fire there that by chance s.22(1) happened to notice.
 - I hope your education campaign will include raising awareness amongst school students before the summer holidays.
- Will your education campaign be regional and coordinated with education campaigns of other municipalities in Metro Vancouver? Many of the visitors to West Van parks come from other cities, so how will they be made aware of the necessity to follow rules related to fire risk in our parks?

In addition to my four questions above that pertain directly to points in your May 21 letter, I have some further questions related to protecting Lighthouse Park:

5. Staff at entrance gate to the Park: Over the past few summers during the driest periods, additional staff have been on duty at the entrance to Lighthouse Park parking lot to monitor and remind visitors as they arrive that smoking and flames are banned. This staffing has been great.

Will this staffing at the entrance gate occur again this summer? And will these staff be on duty throughout the evening hours? (i.e. until 10pm when it gets dark).

Please note, I do not view additional staffing at the Park entrance as an alternative to increased Ranger presence in the Park. The staff at the entrance do not monitor behaviour inside the Park, which Rangers do. We need both.

6. Metal boxes with fire equipment throughout the Park: I remember seeing metal boxes dispersed throughout the Park that I understood contained fire equipment so that it was readily accessible in the event of a fire. They seem like a great idea, particularly for more inaccessible areas of the Park.

Do these boxes still exist throughout the Park?

7. Fire hydrants in the Park: There are a number of fire hydrants in Lighthouse Park. Are they in good working order and inspected regularly?

8. Revenue from pay parking: Pay parking has been in effect in Lighthouse Park and other parks for over a year now. How is the revenue from Lighthouse Park pay parking being used to protect and maintain Lighthouse Park?

I look forward to hearing back from you with more information and responses to my questions.

Thank you very much for your time,

Kind regards,

s. 22(1)

West Vancouver

s. 22(1)

On Wednesday, May 21, 2025 at 01:22:29 p.m. PDT, Jill Lawlor <jlawlor@westvancouver.ca> wrote:

Good afternoon s. 22(1),

Thank you for taking the time to share your thoughtful message and concerns about Lighthouse Park.

We share your concern about the risk of fire in our parks, particularly as we head into the summer season. The fire at Shore Pine Point on May 11 is a serious reminder of the importance of continued vigilance. We're grateful to the passerby who reported the incident, and to the quick response of our Park Ranger and the Fire Department, which thankfully prevented a more serious outcome. Like many parks across the province, we rely on the public to report concerns and issues as a vital part of keeping our parks safe.

To clarify, Park Rangers are present in Lighthouse Park during the day three days a week and also conduct daily visits unless unforeseen circumstances arise. We recognize that fire risks tend to increase during evenings and weekends, and we work closely with our Bylaws, Police, and Fire partners to assist with both preventative patrols and emergency response.

While bylaws and signage are in place to prohibit smoking and open flames, we understand that enforcement alone is not always sufficient. In response to ongoing concerns, we are implementing a ban on all charcoal, briquette, and hibachi-style barbecues this year, allowing only propane barbecues. This policy is being adopted across the North Shore, and updated signage will be installed shortly. Additionally, Fire and Parks will explore a targeted education campaign to bring fire safety awareness to park users.

Thank you again for your dedication and concern for our parks. If you have any further questions, please don't hesitate to reach out.

Warm regards,

Jill

Jill Lawlor (she, her, hers)

Acting Director of Parks, Culture & Community Services | District of West Vancouver

t: 604-921-3467 | c: 604-418-3657 | [westvancouver.ca](https://www.westvancouver.ca)



We acknowledge that we are on the traditional, ancestral and unceded territory of the Sḵwx̱wú7mesh Úxwumixw (Squamish Nation), səliłwətał (Tsleil-Waututh Nation), and xʷməθkʷəy̍əm (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: s. 22(1)
Sent: Friday, May 16, 2025 11:27 PM
To: correspondence
Subject: Fw: Protect our parks from fire risk

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

Dear Council Correspondence,

I forgot to cc the Council Correspondence email when I sent this letter (below) to Mayor and Council on Thursday May 15. Could you please add it to the correspondence file?

Thank you,

s. 22(1)

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: s. 22(1)
To: Mayor Mark Sager <mark@westvancouver.ca>; Christine Cassidy <ccassidy@westvancouver.ca>; Nora Gambioli <ngambioli@westvancouver.ca>; Lambur Peter <plambur@westvancouver.ca>; Snider Scott <ssnider@westvancouver.ca>; Thompson Sharon <sthompson@westvancouver.ca>; Linda Watt <lwatt@westvancouver.ca>
Sent: Thursday, May 15, 2025 at 09:28:19 p.m. PDT
Subject: Protect our parks from fire risk

May 15, 2025

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

I live in s.22(1) and am fortunate enough to have grown up here. It's wonderful to live in a place like West Vancouver with access to such incredible nature, specifically, beautiful parks and forests, like the unique old growth forest in Lighthouse Park, and to a healthy beneficial tree canopy. Thank you for protecting them.

I'm very concerned about the risk of fire in our parks, particularly as we enter into another summer season.

Last weekend, on Sunday May 11, there was a fire in Lighthouse Park at Shore Pine Point.

A passerby noticed it, and found the one Park Ranger on duty. They called 911 and fire trucks came into the park. Luckily, the fire was put out before it spread far. Apparently, the fire started from a campfire the night before. I was told that one of the firefighters was surprised when he learned that a Park Ranger is in the park only three days a week and not in the evenings, so no one was on duty on Saturday evening when the campfire was illegally lit. By Sunday morning, the fire had spread.

What if that passerby had not been there or had not seen it on Sunday?

I too was shocked to learn that there was only one Park Ranger on duty on Sunday, and that he is in the park only three days a week, and not past 4pm. When I asked about summer Ranger duty, I learned that in previous summers, Ranger presence has increased in that Park Rangers have been in the park more than three days per week, but only in the day time. Rangers have not been on duty in the park after 4pm even in the summers. Yet it is during evenings and after-dark hours that park visitors are likely to light a campfire or cook a meal on a hibachi or barbecue.

Without a sufficient number of Rangers in the park during the days *and* evenings, who is monitoring human activity and fire risk?

I'm terrified to think of a fire in Lighthouse Park, particularly with so few Park Rangers and with so many relatively inaccessible areas within the park.

The risk of another human-caused fire in Lighthouse Park or other parks is real.

The main cause of fires in our parks and forests in West Van is human activity. Despite bylaws and signage prohibiting smoking and other flames, people continue to disobey them, illegally smoking and using campfires and open-flame barbecues, stoves and hibachis in parks.

For example, during a recent summer in Lighthouse Park in the middle of the dry weather, I walked past two men in a remote east section of the park carrying a portable barbecue that they told me they were going to use to cook their dinner, saw people cooking on a hibachi at Juniper Point, saw a man cooking on an open flame in the parking lot, and saw the remains of campfires on a number of rocky outcrops. I frequently see individuals and groups of people smoking cigarettes in Lighthouse Park. As well, I have regularly seen the remains of campfires along Caulfeild Park in the summers.

I also frequently observe people smoking in a small park on Clovelly Walk [REDACTED] s. 22(1). It's a beautiful spot just off the Clovelly Walk trail and with a view of the ocean. It is bordered on the north by the trail, and on the west, south and east by private properties and homes. It has understandably become a popular place for people to sit and enjoy the view, and for evening and night-time social gatherings, particularly in the summer. Despite the Parks Department placing a no-smoking sign in high summer, people still smoke there. [REDACTED] s. 22(1). In the summer of 2023, there was a fire there, which [REDACTED] s. 22(1) only happened upon by chance as he walked by. Luckily, he was able to put it out. What if he had not been there and it had spread?

Last May, as you may have read in the news, there was a fire on the Stanley Park causeway that is believed to have been caused by a discarded cigarette. [BLOCKEDvancouver\[.\]citynews\[.\]ca/2024/05/14/fire-stanley-park-causeway-cigarette/BLOCKED](#)

The Lighthouse Park fire last Sunday, the Stanley Park fire last May and the Clovelly Walk Park fire in the summer of 2023 are warnings for all of us. They are obvious examples of the risk cigarettes and other human-caused flames pose to our parks and, by extension, to the lives of visitors in the parks.

I urge you to put in place measures to protect our parks from fire risk. This will cost money; but the potential consequences of not doing so will have so many more far drastic costs.

Please note that by "measures to protect our parks from fire risk," I am not referring to the BC Fire Smart guidelines. Removing trees comes with its own huge costs and would drastically alter our environment. I do not think that is the solution.

I look forward to hearing about the steps you will take to protect our parks from fire.

I would be happy to meet or talk with you to discuss ideas.

Thank you,

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

West Vancouver

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

From: Engineering Department
Sent: Friday, June 13, 2025 9:03 AM
To: lighthouseparkps@gmail.com
Cc: Engineering Department; correspondence; Mark Sager, Mayor; Peter Lambur; Christine Cassidy; Sharon Thompson; Linda Watt; Nora Gambioli; Scott Snider
Subject: District of West Vancouver Engineering Enquiry: s. 22(1) - Use of Net Proceeds from Pay Parking in Lighthouse Park

Hello Alexandra,

Thank you for your message and for your continued commitment and advocacy for Lighthouse Park.

On May 8, 2023, Council approved that net revenues from the Pay Parking Program be directed toward the maintenance of destination parks where pay parking is collected. This commitment has been upheld. In Lighthouse Park, staff continue to support the park's daily maintenance and upkeep — recent work has included trail repairs, vegetation management, signage upgrades, and waste removal. While a Park Ranger is stationed at Lighthouse Park three days per week, rangers endeavour to visit the park daily, as resources and circumstances permit.

In November, Council expanded the scope of how pay parking revenue may be used to support the broader work of the Parks, Culture & Community Services Division (PCCS). This change helps reduce the need to levy taxes for these programs. Importantly, it does not detract from the ongoing commitment to reinvest in the parks where pay parking is collected, including Lighthouse Park.

The District has indeed committed to reinvesting net proceeds from the Lighthouse Park pay parking program into park operations for Lighthouse Park. As you are aware, Lighthouse Park is located on federally owned land leased from the Department of Fisheries and Oceans (DFO) and as such, DFO is responsible for all major capital projects, including infrastructure upgrades and approvals. We understand that DFO is currently undertaking a review of the capital needs for all facilities within Lighthouse Park. Revenue from pay parking at Lighthouse Park has been used to pay for existing operating and maintenance costs of the park and has helped to offset increases to general property taxation that would otherwise be needed to provide this funding.

A dedicated reserve has been established specific to Lighthouse Park, and any surplus pay parking funds (after operating and maintenance costs) are transferred to this reserve. The 2024 surplus totaled \$3,795, and while allocation decisions have not yet been finalized, we will take your suggestion regarding additional Ranger resources into consideration.

We are grateful to the passerby who recently reported a smoldering fire in the park, and to the quick response of both our Park Ranger and the Fire Department, which fortunately prevented a more serious outcome. Like many natural parks across the province, we rely on the public to report concerns, and we appreciate this partnership in helping keep our parks safe.

Park Rangers are present onsite at Lighthouse Park three days per week and conduct daily visits otherwise. We work closely with our colleagues in Bylaw, Police, and Fire to support both preventative patrols and emergency response efforts when needed.

Staff will continue to evaluate the appropriate level of coverage at Lighthouse Park. Based on emerging needs and outcomes, a request for additional Ranger hours may be brought forward through the fall budget process. As with all staffing proposals, this would be subject to a rigorous evaluation to ensure that resources are allocated effectively and responsibly.

Jenn Moller, Director, Engineering & Transportation Services
Engineering & Transportation Services | District of West Vancouver
engineeringdept@westvancouver.ca | 604-925-7020

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