

COUNCIL CORRESPONDENCE UPDATE TO MARCH 26, 2025 (8:30 a.m.)

Correspondence

- (1) 3 submissions, March 19-25, 2025, regarding Proposed Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 4985, 2018, Amendment Bylaw No. 5375, 2025 (NE1 Wildfire Hazard Development Permit Area Designation) (Referred to the March 31, 2025 Public Hearing)**
- (2) March 19, 2025, regarding “Request for transparency and consultation”**
- (3) 5 submissions, March 20-25, 2025, regarding Gleneagles Skatepark**
- (4) March 21, 2025, regarding “Eagle Island Infrastructure”**

Correspondence from Other Governments and Government Agencies

No items.

Responses to Correspondence

- (5) Engineering & Transportation Services, March 12, 2025, response regarding Parking on Wildwood Lane**

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Wednesday, March 19, 2025 2:05 PM
To: correspondence
Cc: Mark Sager, Mayor; Linda Watt; Christine Cassidy; Nora Gambioli; Scott Snider; Sharon Thompson
Subject: West Vancouver's Beautiful Environment: Protecting It vs. Risking Irrevocable Losses

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 reaching out to you once again for your consideration of the protection of our beautiful West Vancouver environment. Perhaps it is the speed of change at which things are occurring that explains some very concerning situations. I trust Mayor and Council want to do what is right for our community, but I am very concerned that things are being fast forwarded at a pace that does not allow for a pause to reflect and rely on a factual basis, with information from external sources e.g. consultants that do not know nor have a stake in West Vancouver's environment being quickly put forward.

I am providing the below in case of any confusion or anyone disputing the below.

1. The City of North Vancouver protects trees at 20cm > which is in the range of almost every other municipality in Metro Region; compared to DWV only protecting 75cm > (Below is the data from my previous email)

To be clear, the CVN protects trees 20cm> on the vast majority of its land i.e. over 65% + of its land. There are some zones within the "35% of the City's [of North Vancouver]' privately managed land" for which the 20cm protected tree size does not apply. (cnv.org/Community-Environment/Trees/Private-Trees)

In contrast, "In West Vancouver, 60% of the [land/tree canopy] is privately owned, which highlights the importance of everyone's involvement to maintain the rich urban forest that makes West Vancouver a distinctive place to live, work, and play." (DWV's UFMP).

The result is: our neighbours on the north shore are protecting their trees and actively encouraging e.g. "free" trees for planting for community health and safety reasons e.g. flood and heat dome mitigation. The DWV is not and proposing the opposite in point 2 below.

2. As previously indicated, but perhaps passed over, according to the DWV website, the provincial/UBCM funded Fire Smart Protocols (being deployed as broad, centralized authority principals not specific to individual community climate challenges) according to experts will leave West Vancouver's particular climate more vulnerable to atmospheric rivers, landslide, flooding and heat domes, eroding our quality of life, etc.). *Those protocols are already being deployed across "all" approximately 35,000 homes in WV, not just 45 projected new homes.* I understand that the response would be: but the Wildfire Amendment only compels about 45 new homes to do the assessment and take the advise of the FireSmart organization under its protocols. The

reality is that 35,000 homes are being compelled by wildfire authorities and incentivized by “free” assessments and “free” chipping - without a Flood Smart and Heat Dome Smart Assessment and e.g. free tree planting to address what we experience and experts advise is what we need to be preparing for, for which we are at “high risk”. (See UBC and WV’s Urban Forest Management Plan)

FireSmart Community

Print as PDF 

Share 

Home > Services > Emergency Services > Fire & Disaster

The District of West Vancouver is a FireSmart Community. This program provides residents with guidance to significantly reduce fire hazards in their neighbourhood.

The FireSmart program is designed to encourage local, self-organized groups of neighbors to implement solutions for wildfire safety by engaging and supporting homeowners, community leaders, and others involved efforts to protect people and property from wildfire.

The first step to becoming FireSmart is to educate yourself, your family, and your community. Find out what you need to know to increase the wildfire resiliency of your property and neighbourhood.

FireSmart Home Assessments

Free FireSmart Home Assessments are available for all West Vancouver neighbourhoods. View the full [FAQ](#) to learn more.

[Book a FireSmart Home Assessments](#) >

[FireSmart Chipping Services](#) >

[FireSmart Workshops](#) >

[Protect Your Home, Yard, & Neighbourhood](#) >

[Wildfire Hazard Development Permits](#) >

[Who's Looking for Volunteers](#) >

Book a FireSmart Home Assessments



The District of West Vancouver is offering free FireSmart Home Assessments to all residents interested in learning how to improve the resiliency of their homes in the event of wildfire.

How to book



To book a FireSmart Home Assessment please email fireprevention@westvancouver.ca.

Please note you will be asked to provide permission for a local FireSmart representative to walk on your property without anyone home. We do not require access inside the home.

An email will be sent to confirm your appointment.

During the assessment

During a FireSmart Home Assessment, a local FireSmart representative will visit your home and provide recommendations on how to help reduce the risk of wildfire on your property.

You will receive a  [FireSmart Home Assessment Score Card](#)  identifying ways you can make your property FireSmart. Building construction types and materials, landscaping around homes, and the presence of combustible materials will be included in the assessment.

Plus, properties with completed assessments qualify for free wood-waste FireSmart Chipping Services.

FireSmart Chipping Services

West Vancouver is offering a free FireSmart Chipping Service to homes that have completed their FireSmart Home Ignition Zone Assessment. This FireSmart project is designed to reduce the wildfire fuel levels on private property and is a significant immediate step you can take to increase your wildfire resiliency.

How to Request the FireSmart Chipping Service:

1. Book a FireSmart assessment. This ensures essential FireSmart information is shared, including structural and landscape considerations.
2. Homeowners clean up their property and pile natural woody debris with no gravel or loose leaves curbside.
3. Email firedepartment@westvancouver.ca to arrange for the chipping crew to attend and remove the piles of material. Please ensure to include your name, email address, home address, and top 3 dates for service.

Homeowners do not need to be home to receive the chipping service and they can continue to receive the service as required and funds are available.

3. Also a clarifying question: if Mayor and Council vote to pass the Wildfire Hazard Amendment for the province and the (conflict of interest) UBCM's "Fire Smart" organization to deploy (without doubting their good intentions) will that be now or sometime later giving away DWV property owners' rights to control our \$3.2b in natural assets e.g. our trees and other vegetation and therefore our quality of life and ability to prepare ourselves for the climate challenges of landslides, atmospheric rivers, floods and heat domes? i.e. will the province/ UBCM turn around and say they are going to deploy their protocols in West Vancouver as they see fit for our est. \$3.2b in natural assets, and liveable, leafy green street neighborhoods? As the saying goes, if these "free" assessments and "free" chipping from the province and the UBCM is really free, with no strings attached, that is a situation generally considered too good to be true. Is this maybe one of the reasons why no other municipality in Metro Region is deploying these protocols for their entire municipality, but doing the opposite?

	Minimum Size of Trees Protected in cm (DBH)	Maximum Fine for Cutting Protected Trees
Burnaby	30	\$10,000
Delta	50	\$50,000
Langley, District	15	\$100,000
Lions Bay*	20	\$50,000
Maple Ridge	50	\$10,000
New Westminster	20	\$10,000
North Vancouver, City	20	\$50,000
North Vancouver, District	75	\$50,000
Port Coquitlam***	37	\$1,000
Port Moody	10	\$10,000
Richmond	20	\$50,000
Surrey	20	\$20,000
Tsawwassen First Nation***	18	\$2,000
Vancouver	20	\$10,000
West Vancouver	75	\$1,000
White Rock	20	\$10,000
Metro Region Average	31	\$27,125

**Difference of WV
Compared to:**

Metro Region Average	-44 cm protected	-\$26,125
DNV & CNV Average	-28 cm protected	-\$49,000.00

Note: Pitt Meadows, the small villages and Bowen Island were excluded as incomparable because they don't have any min. tree size or fines, or I couldn't locate the data.

*Sometimes : the protected tree size is even smaller for rare species; the fine is higher for "significant trees"; there is actually jail time in situations where the fine is small; for most municipalities the fine is per tree cut and many stipulate the fine is per day for as long as the contravention continues; municipalities require the replacement costs to replant 3-5 new trees for every illegally cut tree in addition to the fine. * Has no upper limit. It identifies a minimum of \$6000 per tree when multiple trees are cut, so this is an estimate of \$50,000; **protects trees between 15-45cm depending on tree size and so the average of 37 was used; *** protects trees 4.5 meters tall, so the average dbh for the average species was used as an estimate.



Sincerely

s. 22(1)

West Vancouver

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Sunday, March 23, 2025 4:51 PM
To: correspondence
Cc: Mark Sager, Mayor; Sharon Thompson; Linda Watt; Scott Findlay; Nora Gambioli; Christine Cassidy; Peter Lambur; Jim Bailey; Heather Keith
Subject: Expanded Wildfire Hazard Development Permit Area and Enhanced Tree 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.

Dear Mayor and Council,

I am writing regarding the proposed expansion of the Wildfire Hazard Development Permit Area (DPA) (see staff's report to Council on February 5, 2025) to include all homes undergoing redevelopment within the District.

This proposal assumes that prolonged droughts and higher temperatures will significantly elevate wildfire risks in our community. We will wait to see from staff the extent to which this assumption is supported by science. Meaning, that should the assumption hold then the expansion of the Wildfire DPA needs to be considered by Council. Should there be little evidence, then I do not support expanding the Wildfire DPA.

In implementing potential new regulations, I urge you to ensure they are reasonable, balanced, and carefully aligned with our shared goal of preserving West Vancouver's valuable urban forest—an asset that provides ecological services valued at approximately \$606 million. Specifically, I ask that the amended DPA regulations:

- **Be science- and evidence-based**, relying on current research and best available data.
- **Be tailored specifically to West Vancouver's unique conditions and needs**, rather than adopting generalized approaches from other regions such as the Okanagan or Los Angeles.
- **Embrace technological best practices**, including innovations such as early fire detection systems.

One potential implication of expanding the DPA is that more trees may be removed, with fewer opportunities to plant species deemed a fire risk. Therefore, now is an ideal time to strengthen existing tree protection regulations. As staff are already working on introducing a bylaw to increase tree replacement and planting requirements on development sites, I strongly recommend augmenting this effort by protecting existing mature trees—specifically those greater than 20 cm in diameter—whenever possible.

Our community's urban forest vision aims to achieve a 52% canopy cover, representing a "no net loss" target based on our initial benchmark. Protecting mature trees and planting new ones will help us realize the many critical benefits trees provide, including:

- Stormwater management to reduce flooding risks
- Soil stabilization to prevent erosion and landslides
- Shading and cooling streets during heat waves
- Carbon storage to mitigate greenhouse gas emissions (and in turn, reduce wildfire risks!)
- Essential habitat for local wildlife
-

Thank you very much for your continued leadership and commitment to protecting West Vancouver's environment and community safety.

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

From: s. 22(1)
Sent: Tuesday, March 25, 2025 10:51 PM
To: correspondence
Subject: I do not support Staff's Expanded Wildfire Hazard DPA

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

Mayor and Councillors, our group, s. 22(1), met recently to digest the content of Heather Keith's presentation at the Monday council meeting, February 24th. We were very pleased that at least had councillors questions, one about the possibility of incorporating new remote sensing systems in our repertoire and the other, how the tree canopy targets set out in the UFMP could be met if the Wildfire Hazard DPA zone was expanded to include properties District-wide. The staff report was extreme and seemed inappropriate for a municipality located in a Coastal temperate rainforest, the CWH Zone. The rationale behind including the recent wildfires in Los Angeles County when formulating a wildfire strategy for West Vancouver needs to be explained.

Let me take you through our group's reasoning and discussion.

Initially, let me say that few lessons have been learned from previous wildfires. But doing more of the same, over and over and expecting a different result will not protect us. And scaring residents is unreasonable, and we should expect more from our professionals. This wildfire treatment should be applied to drier forests like the BC Interior and even Los Angeles. The Fire Smart rules might be appropriate in the interior where they have 1000+ hectare fires descend on a community. Larger wildfires are so rare here that we do not have the experience to say that this "deforestation" procedure will actually help. By contrast, wildfire lessons learned from the Okanagan Mountain fire (2003), Fort McMurray (2016) and Kelowna (2023) appear better suited to areas outside of the Lower Mainland - maybe the L.A. Consultants' reports are based on how they believe urban forest biology works. These experts need to be part of the discussion but not leading it.

By expanding the Wildfire Hazard DPA, we would lose many of the benefits provided by mature trees. The removal of trees, large and small, plays a key role in hydrological disruptions - think of the recent floods in the District, maybe future landslides - Cypress Village? Port Coquitlam had two recent landslides as a result of an atmospheric river. If we take out the big trees and leave or plant smaller trees and bushes, we are removing older growth values, and there is no decrease in wildlife risk because we are interfering with the cool moist micro-climate under our urban canopy. Taking down all of these trees and vegetation results in increased drying, stronger winds and lower relative humidity. And deaths have resulted from the heat domes. We are also degrading wildlife habitat. We need a transformative change; maybe our management of the urban forest should require cutting down fewer trees, not more.

Many councillors have expressed concerns, In the era of housing affordability challenges, about the burden developers will experience with another ad-on requiring extra time and the expense of complete tree/vegetation removal, monitoring, final inspections, etc. Heather Keith mentions that the onus will be on applicant to do the work. Or will inspections be an additional workload for staff? Heather Keith, when questioned, mentioned that maybe every tree on these lots does not need to be removed, and that there

is an alternative to complete removals -- removing the lower branches or skinning up trees. From what I have seen in the District, this option is not taken up and clearcutting continues on redeveloping properties. However, if this is an option, why not enforce this option as best practices? We do need to balance the risks and benefits.

Since this report mentions Los Angeles as a comparison, I would like to add a few facts presented by scientists explaining the County's devastating wildfires. In L.A, there was a "fuel load" following a multi-decade trend of declining fall precipitation. However, the rain that did fall resulted in the wettest conditions L.A. had seen over the last 10 years. This moisture encouraged the growth of native grasses and chaparral. However, it was followed by extreme heat and an historically dry fall. The result was that the new growth became parched, setting the conditions for an explosive fire further fueled by the Santa Anna winds that blow in the fall/winter. This is described as "hydroclimatic whiplash" - a sudden switch from extremely wet to extremely dry conditions. This sudden transition does not represent anything the District has experienced and certainly not an occurrence that should be referenced in formulating a wildfire strategy.

Dr. Michael Feller, Associate professor emeritus at UBC Faculty of Forestry, (recently deceased) was adamant that the Wildfire Development Permit Area for West Vancouver was excessive in its original concept, prior to this most recent report. What might he think of what the District is proposing now — 100% inclusion? There is agreement that building a home with a non-combustible roof, hardening other structures with fire-resistant materials, screening on fire resistant vents, as well as having a reliable sprinkler system, (Banff as a reference) is thought by some experts, I refer to Rachel Woodhurst BC FireSmart Program Lead, and the provincial FireSmart Liaison, to provide nearly 90% protection for the homeowner. And locating urban development in lower risk areas is also advisable.

We are requesting that the mayor and council reassess this wildfire/Fire Smart strategy. The CWH zone has the lowest risk of an L.A. catastrophic wildfire. We have on the North Shore, the ability for rapid detection and rapid response, the ability to detect and suppress a wildfire before it spreads, which is a community focused method to protect residents from possible wildfire. The five wildfires referenced in this report were small_ the largest being 3 hectares near Strip Creek, detected on Sunday knocked down by Monday, with Mayor McLaughlin quoted as saying:"It's absolutely nothing." And this is not to diminish the severity of wildfires. Absolutely not! The district should also look into remote sensing systems which have a record of alerting authorities of a fire 25 minutes before any 911 calls (reference Penticton SenseNet trial). We should not implement this FireSmart program for 15,000 or more homes while we wait for Metro to make a decision on these new technologies. There are two of these companies with which I have some familiarity, and there are others, in Ontario, Halifax (and I think that Alberta has invested in one) One company is the aforementioned SenseNet, a local company whose owners were willing to give the District a 50% discount last year, a nod to a local municipality, and the other is Dryad, a German based company - I think that one councillor mentioned this - California is trying out 400 of these sensors in the Jackson Demonstration Forest.

We know that dealing with climate change through landscape management is a gross diversion from the real solutions. But that is a topic for another discussion. This plan will result in devastating the forested character of the District of West Vancouver. It will affect our ability to reach our UFMP canopy cover target. One size does not fit all. We do not share the climate of either the BC Interior or La County. Mayor and Council should not accept this proposed and unproven Wildfire Strategy. There are other ways to keep us safe- early response and early detection, and I have included some of them.

Thank you .

Regards,

s. 22(1)

s. 22(1)

West Vancouver, BC

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Wednesday, March 19, 2025 3:30 PM
To: Mark Sager, Mayor; Christine Cassidy; Linda Watt; Peter Lambur; Scott Snider; Sharon Thompson; Nora Gambioli; correspondence
Subject: Request for transparency and consultation

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've been reflecting on what I learned after addressing Council on March 3 about my concerns about lack of public consultation on major decisions such as a new location for the West Vancouver Art Museum.

I also attended the March 10 Council meeting. There I heard Sharon Thompson acknowledge that Council has received feedback that residents want more consultation. While she did not acknowledge this as a failing, she did say that Council has to first have "an idea" to speak about to the public. Exactly. You need to start talking to the public when you have a big "idea" and not after a decision is made behind closed doors. The former is "consultation; the latter is "FYI".

Although residents want and need to be consulted on major decisions, we don't want consultation paralysis either so we want transparent decision-making criteria too.

In light of this, Mayor Sager told [REDACTED] s. 22(1), after the March 3 Council meeting, that Council is considering the possibility of a land swap for a new arts facility with a donor-in-waiting. Without question you need to consult with residents about this idea early and not when you are already in process of negotiating a deal. Need I remind Council of what happened when you sold the beach access at 30th without consultation?

Specifically, could you kindly let the community know what your consultation plans are regarding:

1. Whether the Art Museum moves to the Boathouse or not? Horseshoe Bay was not deemed a suitable location by past extensive research, and for all we know, the Boat House might never be deemed a suitable building for housing valuable art pieces. We need professional advice. Which professionals are you using to advise you on what the "suitability criteria" are for a building housing valuable artwork? What renovation would be required and is it even feasible for this location?
2. If this is to be a temporary location for the West Vancouver Art Museum, would it be better for it to stay where it is instead of moving it temporarily and then moving it again? If it is to stay where it is, what are your alternate plans for the Boathouse property West Van now owns? What criteria will you be considering for keeping it in the Gertrude Lawson House?
3. The possible land swap in exchange for an arts facility?

Thank you. I look forward to hearing from you.

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

West Vancouver, BC

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Thursday, March 20, 2025 9:22 AM
To: correspondence
Subject: Gleneagles Skateboard Park Redevelopment 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.

Hello,

I've just heard the news about the plan to demolish the Gleneagles skateboard park to make way for pickle ball courts. I'm writing to express my support for the skateboard park and my strong opposition to the plan to tear it out.

I'm an old skateboarder [REDACTED] s. 22(1) and have been utilizing the Gleneagles skatepark since it was built. I now live in Vancouver but continue to make the trip over to West Van to use the park regularly. This is a unique park design which makes Gleneagles stand- out as a world- class park.

I'm originally from [REDACTED] s. 22(1) but moved out this way many years ago, largely due to access to skateboard parks and facilities in this area which were just beginning to be built around this time. I cannot understate the significance of spots like Gleneagles which brought me [REDACTED] s. 22(1) to live, work and play.

Additionally, skateboarding continues to grow in BC, Canada and around the world. We've finally made it to the international stage with skateboarding now being part of the olympics. Facilities like Gleneagles skateboard park are essential for the next generation of skateboarders to have spaces to practice, have fun, and hone their skills. Gleneagles could well play a role in the development of our future athletes.

Please let me know if there are any other steps I can take to help support the maintenance of Gleneagles skateboard park and to ensure it's future.

Thank- you,

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

Vancouver, BC

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

From: s. 22(1)
Sent: Saturday, March 22, 2025 1:54 PM
To: correspondence
Subject: Re: Automatic reply: Please Save The Gleneagles Skatepark.

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 Members of the West Vancouver City Council,

I urge you to reconsider the proposed demolition of the Gleneagles Skatepark. This space is not just concrete and ramps—it is a lifeline for vulnerable teens grappling with a mental health crisis intensified by the pandemic. Over the last three years, youth have endured unprecedented isolation, disrupted social connections, and the erosion of routines that once anchored their lives. Zoom classes, lockdowns, and the absence of in-person interaction have left many teens battling anxiety, depression, and a profound sense of disconnection. The skatepark has been one of the few constants in their lives: a place to breathe, move, and rebuild resilience.

Skateboarding is more than a sport; it is a culture of creativity, perseverance, and community. For teens who struggle to thrive in traditional team environments or structured activities, the skatepark offers a judgment-free zone where they can challenge themselves, forge friendships, and reclaim agency over their bodies and minds. Physical activity is scientifically proven to reduce stress and improve mental health, but the skatepark’s value runs deeper. It is a sanctuary where marginalized youth—those who may not fit into conventional sports or social circles—find belonging and purpose.

Replacing this space with pickleball courts would send a devastating message to these teens: that their well-being is secondary to trends or convenience. While pickleball is a valuable recreational activity, it caters largely to adults and does not address the urgent needs of adolescents navigating a post-pandemic world. West Vancouver has a responsibility to prioritize spaces that actively combat the youth mental health epidemic. The skatepark is one of the last remaining hubs where teens can unplug from screens, escape academic pressures, and simply *exist* without expectation.

I implore you to explore alternative solutions that preserve this critical resource. Invest in mental health by protecting spaces that heal. Let Gleneagles Skatepark remain a testament to our community’s commitment to its youth—a place where hope rolls forward, one ollie at a time.

Your Fellow Resident,

s.22(1)
[Redacted Signature]

Horseshoe Bay

From: s. 22(1)
Sent: Tuesday, March 25, 2025 10:33 AM
To: correspondence
Subject: Re: Gleneagles skate bowl plans

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

West Vancouver has a long history with skateboard parks. The West Vancouver Secondary School site was the location of the first serpentine skateboard bowl in Canada to my knowledge. It was long since filled in and it would be a shame to now lose the Gleneagles bowl.

BLOCKEDnorthshoreheritage[.]org/blog/2024/5/30/under-inglewoodnbspthe-art-amp-archaeology-of-a-buried-skateparkBLOCKED

Larson Bay park which is only a couple blocks away just had its tennis court removed - it would have made sense to repurpose the court for pickleball. Waste of tax dollars to remove a court and then build a new one so close by. The land there is now a muddy flat patch of grass which hardly anyone uses. This could easily be turned into the pickleball courts accessed by the trail beside the golf course from the community center.

Leave the skate bowl as-is and add the pump track where the dirt terrain park currently is. s.22(1) use the bowl regularly and enjoy seeing parents, teens and children gathered there on a daily basis anytime I walk by. A pump track will also serve these multi-generations and more diverse activities. Pickleball only caters to one sport and not all generations of people.

s. 22(1)

West Vancouver, BC

On Mon, Mar 24, 2025 at 7:48 AM correspondence <correspondence@westvancouver.ca> wrote:

Thank you for your correspondence.

The District's Correspondence Policy requires the correspondent's name and civic address in order to be included in a correspondence package. Your full name and civic address may be provided in a reply to this email, or you may wish to re-send the correspondence with your full name and civic address included.

Please do not hesitate to contact Legislative Services at 604-925-7004 if you have any questions.

With regards,

Neetu Shokar



.....

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

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

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

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Saturday, March 22, 2025 11:44 PM
To: correspondence <correspondence@westvancouver.ca>
Subject: Gleneagles skate bowl plans

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

Hello,

I recently saw online that there may be plans to change the Gleneagles skate bowl into paddle courts?

Is there somewhere I can find out more information about this?

[REDACTED] s.22(1) to the skate park and somehow haven't heard about it.

I enjoy skating the bowl and would be concerned to see it go. Especially to become courts when the tennis courts at the top of Larson Beach park were just removed. It's only a couple blocks away and would serve the same purpose.

Thank you,

s. 22(1)

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Tuesday, March 25, 2025 11:34 AM
To: correspondence
Subject: The true value of Glen Eagles skatepark

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

Hi there,

The true value of Glen Eagles Skatepark benefits everyone in the community. The problem is that the park is misunderstood by non-park users, putting it at risk of being dismantled. I'm writing to express the importance of keeping the Glen Eagles concrete skatepark intact while also serving more users by building pickleball courts around the existing concrete park infrastructure, instead of destroying it.

I am a [REDACTED] s. 22(1) park user, giving me intimate knowledge of the park and the community it serves. With respectful and collaborate intent, I hope to provide greater context of the value of Glen Eagles concrete skatepark, such that it can remain intact.

IT IS MULTI-GENERATIONAL SKATEPARK BY DESIGN

Due to Glen Eagles skatepark's inclusive design features, many generations of users can participate. Mothers come with their sons. Fathers with their daughters. Teens show up with their friends. On a hot summer evening, you can find children as young as 5, and adults in their late 50's, all safely enjoying the same park. As a [REDACTED] s. 22(1) park user myself, Glen Eagles is *THE* skatepark that generations enjoy together. This gives people a productive, active, inclusive place to meet, mixing people of a variety of walks of life around a positive sport

DESIGNED FOR RIDERS OF ALL LEVELS

To the untrained eye, it can be challenging to see the progression features built into the park's design. Here's how it works: Beginners can build their skills in the small bowl. There are two "rollers" in the main bowl that beginners practice pumping to gain skills. Intermediates use the features in main bowl. Experts connect the various bowls by jumping in-between them. Because it's a concrete bowl, its 100% consistent every time, creating the safe conditions progression.

ENJOYED ON MULTI-MODALITIES

Don't let the name "skatepark" mislead - Glen Eagles skate park serves 8 different user groups. Skateboarders, Scooter riders, MTB riders, BMX bikers, children's Strider bikes, Roller Bladers, Roller skaters (yes there is a crew of freestyle roller skaters - primarily women who frequent the park!) of all ages. Plus, there's are some RC car drivers who challenge themselves driving their remote-control cars around the turns and over the speed bumps when other users aren't in the bowl. What they can do is quite creative.

FOSTERS A SAFE AND INCLUSIVE COMMUNITY

The park is the epitome of an inclusive environment where everyone gets a turn to skate/ride. It doesn't matter who got to the park first, the skill level of participant, the culture and etiquette at the park is inclusive. Everyone gets a turn, then the order repeats. The most heartwarming thing is, no matter a person's skill level, everyone encourages, provides tips, and supports one another, making it a safe and healthy environment for families, girls and boys, women and men, and spectators sitting on the bench and watching as they walk by.

THE BOWL DESIGN INCLUDES AN ENDLESS LOOP PUMPTRACK

No matter your age, park users of all levels "pump" around the bowl linking corner to corner creating a continuous pump track. Even small children can link the turns, safely building their confidence, while keeping their wheels on the ground. This is what makes Glen Eagles unique, as there are no other concrete bowls in Canada with this shape, allowing for continuous pumping. What's more, because the design also includes higher walls than a traditional pump track, it also accommodates freestyle style riding, making the existing bowl design truly multi-use – and something that a dedicated pump track design can't achieve.

IT'S FREE TO KEEP THE CONCRETE BOWL INTACT

Due to sunk costs to build Glen Eagles skatepark, replacing the public infrastructure of the park unnecessarily costs taxpayer money to demolish, properly dispose and construct a pump track in its place.

THE TRUE COST OF BUILDING A PUMP TRACK

It's a frivolous waste of taxpayer dollars to replace existing high functioning infrastructure. This is exactly the type of press that media likes to exploit, and gets communities enraged. Let's look at the real build costs to taxpayers:

- Sicamous, BC: the city awarded for \$397,000 to build a pump track
- Chilliwack BC: pump track at The Landing site cost \$500,000 for construction, with funding increased to \$750,000 to allow for artificial turf, to protect it from rapid deterioration caused by BC's heavy precipitation.

Other cost references

- Marie Davidson BMX Track in Nanaimo, which includes a pump track, cost \$1.9 million
- Jordie Lunn Bike Park in Langford BC, which includes a pump track, cost \$2 million

THE PARK AND PICKLEBALL CAN SUCCESSFULLY CO-EXIST

The underutilized space around the existing concrete park in structure, consisting of dirt jumps, a starting hill, and a flat asphalt area is a lower cost, area that fits 3 pickleball courts (based on the proposed dimensions of 34'x64' per court). My hope, and the thousands of other users that have made their voices clear on the [change.org](https://www.change.org/p/save-gleneagles-adventure-park-horseshoe-bay-skatepark) petition (<https://www.change.org/p/save-gleneagles-adventure-park-horseshoe-bay-skatepark>) that destroying the park costs unnecessary tax payer money, hurts community, and leaves generations of park users a gap in their quality of life in the Sea to Sky corridor.

Glen Eagles is the only true bowl design that includes a continuous pump track in the sea to sky. Let's keep it for generations to come.

Thank you for reading,

s. 22(1)

North Vancouver BC

s. 22(1)

s. 22(1)

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Tuesday, March 25, 2025 12:42 PM
To: correspondence
Cc: mayorandcouncil@westvancouver.ca; municipal.clerk@westvancouver.ca
Subject: Are you ready to destroy a West Van landmark?

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

To Mayor and City Council,

I am writing with urgency and deep concern over the proposed removal of the Glen Eagles Skatepark. If this plan moves forward, it would be a grave and irreversible mistake — one that would destroy a vital piece of public infrastructure, gut a thriving multi-generational community hub, and waste hundreds of thousands (if not millions) in taxpayer dollars.

Let me be clear: Glen Eagles is not just a skatepark. It's a one-of-a-kind facility — the only concrete bowl of its kind in the Sea to Sky region, and one of the only ones in Canada that functions as both a bowl and a continuous pump track. Its thoughtful design supports progression for beginners, intermediates, and experts alike. It serves eight different user groups — from skateboarders and BMX riders to roller skaters, scooters, RC car enthusiasts, and families with small children.

Removing this space in favor of pickleball — a sport that already has dozens of courts across the region — is not just shortsighted, it's unjust. You'd be tearing out a high-functioning, heavily-used, inclusive, and entirely free space for youth and families — and replacing it with something that exists in abundance elsewhere.

What's more, the financial cost of this decision is staggering. Demolishing Glen Eagles and replacing it with a new facility would easily run into the high six figures. Similar builds across BC — such as in Chilliwack, Sicamous, and Langford — have cost anywhere from \$400,000 to \$2 million. And for what? To destroy something that already works?

This isn't just a misstep — it's a full-scale public failure in the making.

There is a better way. The surrounding area has more than enough room to accommodate pickleball courts without removing the bowl. The community has already voiced its opposition through petitions and public engagement. This park is not just a recreational space — it's a cultural landmark, a space for youth development, and a hub for active, inclusive community life.

Please don't make a permanent mistake for the sake of a temporary trend.

Glen Eagles must be preserved — for this generation and the next.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

Homeowner and resident of North Vancouver

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

North Vancouver, BC

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Friday, March 21, 2025 5:08 PM
To: correspondence
Subject: Eagle Island Infrastructure

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 address concerns regarding the televised council meeting held on May 27, 2024, during which eight representatives from the Eagle Island Residents Association made misrepresentations regarding Eagle Island barge access and the “one barge per legal lot” nonsense. Despite subsequent communication from other Eagle Island residents and former residents refuting the allegations made, nobody has yet received any word back from council.

[REDACTED] s.22(1) had supposedly broken a time immemorial social contract of “one barge per legal lot” Councillor Cassidy made the comment that she was “leaning toward punitive measures” to be taken [REDACTED] s. 22(1). The assumption of guilt was disgusting, but we doubt an apology is forthcoming.

I would like to thank the Eagle Island residents [REDACTED] s.22(1) shock and sympathy at how the drama and outrageous misrepresentations made by this group, even ended up as a story in the North Shore news.

A renter who stated he was an executive on the EIRA Board insisted “there is no capacity for any additional barge moorage,” Recently, this same individual has had to access the Eagle Island dock since the private dock, he normally uses is undergoing repairs. He apparently moors his barge with no problems and with no complaints from any of his comrades who spoke in front of council. I am not sure if any of them recognize the irony.

[REDACTED] s.22(1) disposed of his derelict second barge which had been moored at the dock for years. Since it’s removal (as I have mentioned numerous times before) barge space remains status quo. Additionally, rowboats continue to use stanchions available for barges on the north side of Eagle Island dock.

Of course, most of us know why the nonsense about two barges have been made such an issue ...because this group, under the direction of one man, [REDACTED] s. 22(1) [REDACTED] s.22(1) would require two barges, (Even though he himself now has now built FOUR Buildings on his own smaller property) Is it any wonder [REDACTED] s.22(1) have now left the Eagle Island Resident’s Association quite fed up with the politics and hypocrisy.

s. 22(1)

West Vancouver

.

From: [Engineering Department](#)
To: s. 22(1)
Cc: [Engineering Department](#)
Subject: District of West Vancouver Engineering Public Enquiry - s.22(1) - Wildwood Lane Parking
Date: Wednesday, March 12, 2025 12:18:55 PM

Hello s. 22(1)

Thank you for emailing your concerns regarding parking on Wildwood Lane.

In the summer of 2024 safety concerns for the pedestrians walking along Wildwood Lane were brought to the Engineering Department. As a result of these concerns a walking path was created along the north side of Wildwood Lane and no parking restrictions implemented.

In conjunction with the changes it was requested that the south side of the block have restricted parking due to congestion in the area from school and church traffic. This request was supported by:

- a signed petition by 250+ residents, reported in the North Shore News, see link below
 - <https://www.nsnews.com/local-news/residents-petition-to-fix-dangerous-west-vancouver-street-9235475>
- Westcot Elementary School Administrators
- District of West Vancouver Mayor & Council.

While we will share your feedback/concerns there are currently no plans to change the restrictions.

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

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Wednesday, March 12, 2025 4:32 PM
To: correspondence
Subject: RE: street parking

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

Dear City of West Vancouver Mayor and council,

I realize that you have many important issues to deal with and that the one that I am writing to you about is of little significance. However, I am hoping that you will speak to your traffic department about the following issue.

For decades people have met at St David's Church in West Vancouver to coordinate carpooling to locations up Howe Sound so as to reduce our use of vehicles. We have parked our cars along the south side gravel shoulder of Wildwood Lane, west of the church. No properties front this section of road and the parked vehicles have not interfered with the flow of traffic along this road. For some inexplicable reason your traffic department has installed 2.5 hour limit signs along this shoulder. This time limit is basically the same as a "no parking" sign as all of our trips exceed this time limit. It seems counter to present day philosophy to eliminate the ability for people to carpool and the time limit seems like a spiteful and meaningless gesture.

Yours truly,

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

Vancouver, BC

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)