

COUNCIL CORRESPONDENCE UPDATE TO NOVEMBER 19, 2025 (8:30 a.m.)

Correspondence

- (1) 2 submissions, November 6 and 17, 2025, regarding Looking Again - Michael Audain in Conversation (November 27, 2025 Invitation)**
- (2) Capilano Community Services, November 12, 2025, regarding “Join Us for One of the Best Christmas Craft Markets on the North Shore!”**
- (3) November 12, 2025, regarding “Thanks to Mayor Sager and Council” (November 6, 2025 Civic Reception)**
- (4) November 12, 2025, regarding “Potential Location for New Hotel in West Vancouver”**
- (5) November 14, 2025, regarding “bylaws” (Bear Bangers)**
- (6) 2 submissions, November 14 and 17, 2025, regarding Proposed Amendment to Tree Bylaw No. 4892, 2016**
- (7) Dundarave Festival of Lights Society, November 14, 2025, regarding Forest of Miracles (Dundarave Festival of Trees)**
- (8) November 15, 2025, regarding Provincial Housing Deregulation**
- (9) November 17, 2025, regarding “Request for Installation of Privacy Screening at the Tennis Court”**
- (10) 2 submissions, November 17 and 18, 2025, regarding Proposed Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 4985, 2018, Amendment Bylaw No. 5406, 2025 (Housing Policy Amendments) (Referred to the November 17, 2025 public hearing)**
- (11) November 17, 2025, regarding “Council Agenda Item 10.3 – Clarification Regarding Breakwaters Policy 0210”**
- (12) 2 submissions, November 17 and 18, 2025, regarding Proposed Heritage Alteration Permit 24-090 for 4798 The Highway (Referred to the December 1, 2025 regular Council meeting)**
- (13) November 18, 2025, regarding “Nov. 17 Council Meeting” (Water Utility Update and Proposed 2026 Rates)**

Correspondence from Other Governments and Government Agencies

No items.

Responses to Correspondence

No items.

From: Yvette Salazar <programs@smithfoundation.ca>
Sent: Thursday, November 6, 2025 11:28 AM
To: correspondence
Cc: Meredith Preuss
Subject: An Invitation to 'Looking Again: Michael Audain in Conversation' | Thursday, November 27 | Gordon Smith Gallery for Canadian Art

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the organization from email address programs@smithfoundation.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,

The Gordon Smith Gallery for Canadian Art will be hosting the final talk of the Speaker Series on Collecting and Collections—*Looking Again: Michael Audain in Conversation*—on the evening of Thursday, November 27, 2025.

This event will feature a conversation between myself and art collector, home builder and philanthropist, Michael Audain, preceded by a monumental announcement of a significant matching gift from the Audain Foundation made in recognition of the late artist Ann Kipling's estate gift. This monumental gift will help support the continuous work of providing impactful art education programs to the children of British Columbia.

On behalf of the Gordon and Marion Smith Foundation, I invite you or your representative to attend and join us on this extraordinary evening.

When: Thursday, November 27, 2025

Where: Gordon Smith Gallery for Canadian Art | 2121 Lonsdale Ave, North Vancouver

Time: 7-8:30 PM (doors at 6:30 PM)

Sincerely,

Meredith Preuss
Executive Director, Gordon and Marion Smith Foundation for Young Artists
Gordon Smith Gallery of Canadian Art
2121 Lonsdale Ave
North Vancouver, V7M 2K6

From: Meredith Preuss <programs@smithfoundation.ca>
Sent: Monday, November 17, 2025 6:45 AM
To: correspondence
Subject: You're Invited | Looking Again - Michael Audain in Conversation

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the organization from email address bounce-mc.us5_12301075.10141604-aa983d4ccc@mail104.sea31.mcsv.net. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. If you believe this e-mail is suspicious, please report it to IT by marking it as SPAM.

Unsubscribe

It appears that you have subscribed to commercial messages from this sender. To stop receiving such messages from this sender, you can unsubscribe.

[Click here to unsubscribe](#)

Gordon Smith Gallery

of Canadian Art

Artists
For
Kids

The Gordon
and Marion **Smith**
Foundation

**SPEAKER
SERIES**



YOU'RE INVITED

Looking Again - Michael Audain in Conversation

Dear {First name},

Join us for an evening celebrating art, philanthropy, and the legacy of collecting in British Columbia.

Thursday, November 27
Doors 6:30 PM
Program Begins 7:00 PM
Q&A 8:00 PM

Our final talk in the Speaker Series on Collecting and Collections, **Looking Again - Michael Audain in Conversation**, will take place on Thursday, November 27. The evening will feature Michael Audain—collector, custodian, and champion of the arts—in conversation with Meredith Preuss, Executive Director of the Smith Foundation. Together, they will explore the role of art in civic life, Audain's longstanding friendship with Gordon Smith, and the enduring value of investing in creative learning for future generations.

Before the talk, we will share a momentous announcement regarding Ann Kipling's legacy and the Audain Foundation's ongoing support of our work. Guests are invited to enjoy refreshments and view the current exhibition, "*From the Ground*," before the talk begins promptly at 7:00 PM.

We look forward to sharing this special evening with you.

Tickets are by donation and can be reserved via Eventbrite. Please click the button below to reserve your tickets today.

RSVP TODAY

THE | **AUDAIN** FOUNDATION

[View this email in your browser](#)

Copyright (C) 2025 Gordon Smith Gallery. All rights reserved.

You are receiving this email because you opted in at our website or you contacted our office directly.

Our mailing address is:

Gordon Smith Gallery 2121 Lonsdale Avenue North Vancouver, BC V7M 2K6 Canada

Want to change how you receive these emails?

You can [update your preferences](#) or [unsubscribe](#)

From: Maralyn Wild <maralyn@capservices.ca>
Sent: Wednesday, November 12, 2025 3:27 PM
To: correspondence
Subject: Join Us for One of the Best Christmas Craft Markets on the North Shore!

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the organization from email address bounce-mc.us10_139594993.13907894-fcbd79b1c8@mail38.suw15.mcsv.net. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. If you believe this e-mail is suspicious, please report it to IT by marking it as SPAM.

Unsubscribe

It appears that you have subscribed to commercial messages from this sender. To stop receiving such messages from this sender, you can unsubscribe.

[Click here to unsubscribe](#)

[View this email in your browser](#)



CAPILANO COMMUNITY SERVICES

Christmas Craft Market

Saturday, November 15

10:00 AM - 2:00 PM

**Lions Gate Community Recreation Centre
1733 Lions Gate Lane, North Vancouver**

FOOD, MUSIC, & PRIZES

FREE ADMISSION & FREE PARKING

Dear Community Partners,

Capilano Community Services invites you to **one of the best Christmas Craft Markets on the North Shore!** ✨

Get ready to kick off the holiday season **this Saturday** at our 3rd annual Christmas Craft Market!

Join us for a festive day filled with **over 45 local vendors**, selling handmade arts, crafts, and unique treasures.

🌟 Admission is **FREE** — bring your holiday cheer and your shopping bags!

Date: Saturday, November 15

Time: 10 AM – 2 PM

Location: Lions Gate Community Recreation Centre
1733 Lions Gate Lane, North Vancouver

Enjoy a fun-filled day featuring:

- Holiday Music
- Delicious Food & Beverages
- Raffle prize draws
- Exciting Door Prizes
- A 50/50 cash draw
- FREE Parking in our underground parkade
- A fabulous Quilt Show
- A visit from Santa

And loads of holiday spirit!

🌟 Bring your friends, family and neighbours, and together, let's start celebrating the holiday season!

Contact maralyn@capservices.ca for more details.

🔗 Follow us on social media for vendor “sneak peeks” of the fabulous items you'll find at our market!

Instagram: @capilano_community_services

Facebook: @Capilano Community Services Society

We look forward to seeing you there! 🎄

From,

Maralyn Wild

Manager, Community Development



Our mailing address is:

1733 Lions Gate Lane
North Vancouver, BC V7P0C7

Want to change how you receive these emails?
You can update your preferences or unsubscribe from this list.

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Wednesday, November 12, 2025 5:12 PM
To: correspondence
Subject: Thanks to Mayor Sager and Council

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

I very much enjoyed the West Vancouver Annual Civic Reception that was held on Thursday, Nov 6. An invitation to a casual evening in the Municipal Hall Atrium to meet other like minded citizens who volunteer their time and talent for the betterment of our community is always a welcomed annual occasion. Thank you for the refreshments and a special thank you to Christine Lindsay (Administrative Assistant to the Mayor) who was most welcoming on the night.

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

West Vancouver BC

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

From: [Redacted] s. 22(1)
Sent: Wednesday, November 12, 2025 9:21 PM
To: correspondence
Subject: Potential Location for New Hotel in West Vancouver

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

Since the closure of West Vancouver's only hotel, there have been several mentions of a hotel being included in development proposals but regret at the lack of a suitable site. Has anyone suggested the former Capilano Long-term Care location for a hotel. Walking past recently, it struck me as a site full of potential for a hotel. It's just minutes from Park Royal Mall and Lions Gate Bridge and yet delightfully peaceful with views of the Brothers Creek and Capilano River. Just a thought.

[Redacted] s. 22(1)

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

From: s. 22(1)
Sent: Friday, November 14, 2025 3:43 PM
To: correspondence
Subject: bylaws

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

dear all ,

after my recent experience on November 11th at 11 10 am of s. 22(1) purposefully setting off a bear banger that exploded within less than s.22(1) i would like to propose that as in the city of Vancouver bear bangers be banned in the west vancouver district. prior to this i had never heard of a bear banger or heard one go off. we had no idea what had happened. s. 22(1) had recently bought it on the capilano reserve and thought he would have fun with his kids he admitted as much when the bylaw officer attended . the fact that he is s. 22(1) really doesn't enter into this discussion but he has always and continues to show disdain for all laws and bylaws . they have often over the years we have been here set off fireworks with nothing but warnings from the bylaw officers or fire department the fact that it is illegal to use a bear banger except to scare a bear doesn't seem to get into the picture the bylaw officers only enforce bylaws. the west vancouver police tell me they have nothing to do with enforcing federal regulation. so there is at the present no way to control the use of bear bangers in west vancouver. in vancouver it is a bylaw now. \$1000 fine under the bylaws of the city. can you think of any reason why we dont thave that bylaw hear ??? i am thinking if any of you have ever had one go off in your back yard you would have a hard time thinking there was a reason you don't pass that bylaw immediately.

thanks for your attention to this. after my second visit to the bylaw department they suggested i try and get this on the agenda

s. 22(1) s. 22(1) West vancouver.

it should be easy to get a copy of the staff report that was used to determine why vancouver created this bylaw.

From: [Redacted] s. 22(1)
Sent: Friday, November 14, 2025 4:03 PM
To: Mark Sager, Mayor; Linda Watt; Sharon Thompson; Scott Snider; Peter Lambur; Christine Cassidy; Nora Gambioli; correspondence
Cc: Heather Keith; Jim Bailey
Subject: Proposed Amendment to Tree Bylaw No. 4892, 2016 - Council's agenda on November 17, 2025

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,

Regarding the proposed amendment to the tree bylaw that will be considered on Monday, and Ms Keith’s memorandum that does an analysis of potential impacts of the proposed bylaw (see first column in table below), I have taken the liberty of providing some observations and comments.

Considerations and scenarios (refer to Ms Keith’s memorandum)	Comments
<p>1. During re-development, properties are often cleared of trees and vegetation for ease of access during construction activities and the subsequent landscaping frequently includes fewer trees and less vegetation than what was originally present. By protecting a greater number of trees with a lower tree protection size, it is anticipated that for some properties, a greater proportion of trees will be retained in areas that are not being used for construction of structures (e.g., rear and front yards) as there would be no rationale under the bylaw for removal.</p>	<p>Anticipating more trees to be saved will help solve the key problem (identified in the Urban Forest Plan) of losing trees on development lots</p>
<p>2. Under the Tree Bylaw, the Director is required to issue a permit to remove any tree within the permitted building envelope; therefore, the proposed change in protected tree size does not impact an owner from building a dwelling that the zoning for their property allows.</p>	<p>Underscores that the proposed motions and associated changes, are not a regulatory overreach and will not impact 97% of our residents <i>Note: the consultation data, actually shows that the majority of residents are good with measures to protect our trees</i></p>
<p>3. This proposed change would not prevent an owner from removing trees from their property in advance of submitting a building permit application given that prior to the application submission, trees 75 cm DBH or greater, are only protected.</p>	<p>This is a risk, and it currently already happens, i.e. owners remove trees in advance. There are ways to mitigate, for example, educating owners and designers by pointing out that by protecting a tree means that fewer trees need to be replanted and it is a cost saving (and has obvious ecological benefits)</p>
<p>4. For properties where the existing house is much smaller than what is allowed under zoning, the permitted building envelope would be bigger than the existing house and therefore, it would be expected that just as many trees would be removed for the new building regardless of tree protection size. The result would be a</p>	<p>No trees are likely to be retained on smaller properties, and at least more are retained on “similar is size” home construction – see point 5 below. When compared to the current baseline, this will likely be a net gain in tree retention</p>

<p>greater number of trees applied for removal but not necessarily the retention of more trees than if the tree protection size was 75 cm DBH or greater.</p>	
<p>5. For properties where the existing house is similar in size to what is now allowed under zoning, meaning, the permitted building envelope would be relatively consistent and the new building wouldn't encroach further into previously undeveloped areas, there may be more trees retained as there would be no rationale to remove more trees.</p>	<p>Properties with existing homes close to zoning allowances stand to retain more trees due to reduced rationale for removal, supporting the bylaw's intent. Emphasizing this contextual difference demonstrates a sensitive understanding of diverse property scenarios and promotes equitable environmental outcomes</p>
<p>6. Although the lower tree protection size may lead to tree retention in some areas of a property, there can be challenges in building a house that require the removal of trees, including: access constraints to smaller, steep, or narrow properties; relocation of the driveway to meet the District's driveway gradient specifications; excavation activities that impact trees around the outer perimeter of the house.</p> <p>Where there is no solution to avoid protected trees, a permit may be issued for removal, as is the case with the current Tree Bylaw.</p>	<p>Owners should rightly be allowed to remove trees when there are legitimate reasons, e.g. excavation activities that impact trees around the outer perimeter of the house. The continued use of permit exemptions in unavoidable cases ensures flexibility and fairness in enforcement</p>

The proposed bylaw lowers the protected tree size threshold to better protect more trees during redevelopment while allowing residents to build within zoning limits. It balances tree preservation with practical construction needs and reflects majority community support, helping sustain West Vancouver's urban forest and its environmental benefits.

Council should vote in favor of the bylaw to advance the District's urban forest goals, uphold community values, and support balanced, responsible development.

Thank you, s. 22(1) West Vancouver. s. 22(1)

Mr. Mayor and Council,

My name is [s. 22(1)] and I live at [s. 22(1)] where my family has resided [s. 22(1)]. From our home overlooking Ambleside and Sentinel Hill, I've watched the steady decline of tree cover over the decades. Today, very few trees larger than 75 centimetres in diameter remain, the only ones currently protected under our bylaw. Given this reality, it is essential that we extend protection to trees 20 centimetres and larger in order to preserve the promised canopy.

Over Thanksgiving, our [s. 22(1)] and their families joined us. What struck me most was the concern expressed by [s. 22(1)] grandchildren, ages [s. 22(1)] about how the environmental choices we make today will shape their future. That is why I was disappointed that the three councillors opposing the amendments did not acknowledge the connection between the tree bylaw and climate change. However I do want to thank Councillor Cassidy for recognizing this crucial link.

Councillors Thompson and Watt raised legitimate concerns about potential costs to developers when protected trees must be preserved. As an [s. 22(1)] having worked with [s. 22(1)] today and while I don't want to interfere with the basic building department's process, I believe that the councillor's concerns can be addressed through a pre-design conference early in the review process.

The developer or contractor would present the required tree survey together with preliminary building footprints and landscape plans, showing patios, pools, and driveway configurations. Small design adjustments can then be made collaboratively before the project advances. Early coordination saves both trees and money, and with goodwill, these conflicts can be resolved.

I urge Council to act decisively: expand protection to trees 20 centimetres and larger and preserve the green character that defines our community. The decisions you make now will shape the environmental legacy we leave for future generations.

Thank you for considering this important issue.

[s. 22(1)]

[s. 22(1)]

November 17, 2025

From: Mary Markwick <mary@dundaravefestival.com>
Sent: Friday, November 14, 2025 6:57 PM
To: correspondence
Subject: We *can* make it all better 🌲 + ❤️ + ✨ = 🌲 🌲

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the organization from email address bounce-mc.us2_5900042.9301884-53951cee26@mail123.sea21.rsgsv.net. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. If you believe this e-mail is suspicious, please report it to IT by marking it as SPAM.

Unsubscribe

It appears that you have subscribed to commercial messages from this sender. To stop receiving such messages from this sender, you can unsubscribe.

[Click here to unsubscribe](#)

[View this email in your browser](#)





we can make it all better

Right about now, our Christmas tree farmers in the Valley are harvesting a tree for you. This tree has a gift for making it all better.

Over its lifetime that tree — your tree — has provided shelter for birds and, we're told, even a bobcat now and then. Then there's the new life it breathes into the planet's atmosphere.



On November 29th, that tree will become your own beacon of hope for everyone who sees it in the **Forest of Miracles**. It will help to breathe new life into our community.

If you've already claimed a tree of your own, invite someone you love and admire to claim one, too. Send them my way – I'd love to talk.

If you've not yet claimed one, now is the time. We're coming down to our very last ones.

Remember that when you sponsor a tree of your own, especially as an Angel or Archangel, you are helping us keep the performing arts on the North Shore vibrant and alive.



Claim Your Tree in the Forest of Miracles

It always amazes me how everything can suddenly change for the better. This feeling comes to me every time we plant the Forest of Miracles at Dundarave Beach with a small army of West Vancouver firefighters. They make it all better.

I see the same thing happen for families, youth and seniors – our neighbours and friends – who are wrestling with the life challenges that could make them homeless, and the ones who don't have a roof over their heads.



Make Your Pledge to the Forest of Miracles Fund

We've created the **Forest of Miracles Fund** with the West Vancouver Community Foundation to end homelessness beautifully, all of us together.

The **Fund** allows us to save lives on the North Shore, especially in the harshest weather, when community members have lost their homes. It also allows us to transform the lives of youth, families, and seniors to prevent homelessness in the first place.

Give beautifully.

Need a hand? Don't be shy—I'd love to connect.

Love and joy come to you,

s. 22(1)



Mary Markwick
Executive Director
Dundarave Festival of Lights

[778.847-1426](tel:778.847-1426)

p.s. Save the dates:

THE DUNDARAVE FESTIVAL 2025

🌲 **Dundarave Christmas Fair — Saturday, Nov 29, noon–dusk**

Lighting Ceremony 4–5 pm

(Please have your lights plugged in for full impact. Decorations can be added anytime.)

You can decorate your tree early:

Thursday Nov 27 or Friday Nov 28

🌟 **The Ultimate Canadian Christmas**

- Nov 29 — Dundarave Christmas Fair
- Dec 6 — Nativity & Paddle Songs
- Dec 13 — World Christmas
- Dec 20 — Wassail & Bonfire Night

🌙 **Un-decorate: January 8–10**



CLAIM YOUR TREE. MAKE YOUR PLEDGE



Copyright (C) 2025 Dundarave Festival of Lights Society. All rights reserved.

You are receiving this email because we want to celebrate the ways you've been part our Festival community in previous seasons, and we want to make sure you have the chance to shine with us.

Our mailing address is:

Dundarave Festival of Lights Society P.O. Box 91766 West Vancouver, BC V7V 4S1 Canada

Want to change how you receive these emails?

You can [update your preferences](#) or [unsubscribe](#)

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Saturday, November 15, 2025 6:07 PM
To: correspondence
Cc: Mark Sager, Mayor; Christine Cassidy; Linda Watt; Peter Lambur; Nora Gambioli; Sharon Thompson; Scott Snider

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

Good Afternoon Mayor and Council,

In my view, the NDP's most recent stealth attack on British Columbian property owners, taxpayers and our democracy, is Bill M216. It would have a particularly significant impact on West Vancouver, and like municipalities.

Fortunately, M216 showed up on the radar of the Greens, including West Vancouver's Jeremy Vllincourt and the Conservatives, in time to oppose it. "*Pushback grows against B.C. NDP's stealthy housing deregulation manoeuvre*", Vancouver Sun, November 14, 2025

Apologies for mixing metaphors, but in my view M216 would put the development foxes in charge of building unnecessary hen houses (given our current glut of available housing) and with no oversight. This will undoubtedly have a human and environmental cost to DWV, putting the profits in the hands of the developers.

Without unbiased oversight by people with no monetary interest, as designed into our democratic system to have municipal oversight, self-interested for-profit developers will go after environmentally protected land. This has happened in BC already, and in the case of Ontario where developers went after Ontario's "quiet and nature based" environmentally protected Greenbelt bringing shocking, proven corruption. We can expect the same.

If Bill M216 were to pass, developers will make decisions for their profit benefit to the exclusion of community interests of trees, soil stability and future soil erosion, heat domes for the elderly, atmospheric rivers down stream and the like. That will include contractors deciding a friendly warning chat from Bylaw is worth dumping toxic substances into environmentally protected creeks that happens even now (e.g. November 2023 [this correspondence](#) to Mayor and Council on page 3, note para 5, full documents what is becoming common and a flagrant example in a recent news story in BC.)

As was the case in Ontario when its Greenbelt was opened up with relaxed legislation, , developers will focus on WV's "Greenbelt", and in particular our environmentally protected creeks for increased profits selling nature-based setting developments – with DWV residents and wildlife paying the cost of our irreplaceable and necessary mature trees being cut down and impervious, cheap paving, etc. causing atmospheric rivers and heat domes, etc.

I am not knowledgeable enough about legislative workings to say, but it seems to me that considering the M216 possibility, this is the time to tighten up our Tree and related bylaws and close any loopholes. It

seems fitting that both housing development and the Tree and related bylaws are on the agenda for Monday.

Below are some of my suggestions to close the loopholes in the Riparian, Tree, and related bylaws.

Sincerely,

s. 22(1)

Bylaw Are My Suggestions for your Consideration of the Loopholes that need to Closed for the Riparian areas that Cause Confusion and Waste Significant Time (documented examples of all of the below can be re-sent if needed)

1. Enforce our provincially, legislatively delegated responsibility to enforce the Riparian Area Regulation and discontinue ad hoc decisions by enforcing the RAR's "no new human disturbance" in the riparian areas: no structures , including no paths or steps, etc.
2. Amend the Watercourse Protection Bylaw to comply with the basics of the RAR and remove the discretionary permissive aspects of it that has crept in DWV over the years by: protecting all *trees and all vegetation* (grasses and shrubs) in the riparian areas like the other municipalities.
3. Give the Watercourse Protection Bylaw/RAR pre-eminence over all the other related bylaws (Tree Bylaw and Boulevard bylaw etc.) . This will prevent: Land Development staffed responsible only for boulevard trees, encouraging developers/owners to tidy up their "boulevard" area by cutting environmentally protected and crucially needed riparian area trees, shrubs and grasses in the riparian area; and allowing policy 2.6 exemptions if the developer/owner does not want to have to plant shade tolerant plants and now wants more sunlight after buying their property.
4. Require proof that any illegal structure (e.g. a shed in a riparian area) for which a developer is given credit for removal was there prior to 1994/RAPR/RAR. Otherwise, developers are then given a "credit" to build in another protected riparian area.
5. Get community property owners on board by sending out mailers to all owners who own property adjacent to the riparian areas that explains:

why the riparian area trees and vegetation (grasses and shrubs) cannot be cut for their properties protection as well as the community (e.g. atmospheric river flooding, heat domes, etc.). so that ignorance is no longer an excuse of the laws; the difference between the responsibility to clean up woody debris to prevent atmospheric river flooding (e.g. dead tree branches) versus illegally cutting live trees/branches which inversely contributes to atmospheric river events; the reason some neighbouring properties may have the trees/vegetation removed and even paving is because it was done pre 1994/RAPR/RAR and before we knew the damage it caused to the environment; and toxic substances cannot be dumped n the creek because it kills our fish and consequently wildlife.

The Tree and Related Bylaws Protections (over and above the protections for riparian area trees above)

6. Remove from the bylaws the authority of tree cutting service arborists to decide if trees should be cut. As you know, we have lost 2-2.5% of our tree canopy while other municipalities are gaining - a staggering number of trees in about two years. As the Green Party and Conservatives point out in

opposing M216, developers, and I say tree cutting service arborists are developers being paid by owners/developers to cut trees for profit, are in a conflict of interest in making decisions which and whether trees should be cut.) I will provide separately a document of examples -just in my one block radius - from an FOI disclosure documenting tree cutting arborists successfully recommending protected trees be cut down in violation of provincial and municipal bylaws e.g. purely for aesthetic. In my view the Tree Bylaw proposed amendments should eliminate not increase the reliance on tree cutting company arborists for the reasons stated below:

“Both the B.C. Greens and the Conservatives are blasting the bill for handing further control to developers. Green MLA Jeremy Valeriote...while the private professionals who would be hired by developers to review their projects would be “technically competent and have all the right intentions,” there “are a few bad actors out there, which is the reason for the need for regulation” and independent oversight....**“It’s especially troubling that the B.C. government’s red-tape-cutting measures, particularly Bill M216, “institutionalize conflict of interest,”** say the group of urbanists. ...When certified professionals hired by developers are empowered to approve the very projects from which they earn their income, the integrity of the system collapses.”
(Vancouver Sun, “*Pushback grows against B.C. NDP’s stealthy housing deregulation manoeuvre*”, Nov 14, 2025) **emphasis added**

7. Require protected tree “pruning” and/or trees being pruned and riparian “existing landscaping” approvals to have an assigned percentage e.g. 20% of tree branches trimmed. Otherwise, tree cutting arborists paid for and at the direction of developers/owners/utility workers will pollard a tree of its branches to a stump. Again, there are many documented examples available for your review.
8. Protect trees at 20 cm across the district (*with all riparian area trees and vegetation protected above) as do most other municipalities averaging at 20-30cm and increase the fines for illegal tree cutting to be at least in the range of other municipalizes at upwards of \$100K in comparison to WV at \$1k. The exact data is detailed in my March 19, 2025 correspondence.

New AI Tree and Forestry apps to resolve Staff’s concern that they don’t have time to enforce 20cm tree sizes and greater.

They are new, but the Arboreal app appears to be in use in Canada and the US by local governments.

The Arboreal app uses the LiDAR in iPhones 12 and Pro model and are is effectively free with a \$36 annual fee for unlimited use.

In my experience here is what happens when a call is created for a suspected illegal tree cutting and where the App fits into the process (of course it may be very useful in other ways that I am not aware of, but below is what I know of first hand.)

- A Bylaw Officer attends at the site of a reported illegal tree cutting. By default, they enforce the Tree Bylaw (not the Watercourse Protection Bylaw/RAR perhaps because of its implementation complications) to see if a large tree is at issue. I do not believe they check for protected species.

If the size of the tree isn’t clear, they/their manager contacts land development /environmental (if it’s a riparian area) or a district arborist to go on site to determine size/species. **If the Bylaw Officers had the e.g. “Arboreal” they would know fairly immediately the tree size and species. Here again are two brief 1–3-minute videos of the Arboreal App in action:** youtube.com/watch?v=e6f-kN_t0bQ&t=110s

and [youtube.com/watch?v=w9kbmwffue4&t=16s](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=w9kbmwffue4&t=16s). **Coincidentally the videos show 20cm sized trees being derived by AI.**

s. 22(1)

West Vancouver

From: [Redacted] s. 22(1)
Sent: Monday, November 17, 2025 11:28 AM
To: correspondence
Subject: Request for Installation of Privacy Screening at the Tennis Court

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

Dear Council Members,

I am writing to respectfully bring to your attention a concern regarding the recent maintenance work carried out at the tennis courts [Redacted] s.22(1) in Burley Drive [Redacted] s. 22(1). During the repair process, several trees that previously provided natural privacy [Redacted] s. 22(1) were removed. As a result, the [Redacted] s. 22(1) from the tennis courts, which has significantly affected our [Redacted] s. 22(1)

We fully understand the necessity of maintaining public facilities; however, the removal of these trees has created an unintended impact [Redacted] s. 22(1). Considering that the District is now installing a new fence at the tennis courts, we kindly request that a privacy screen or similar visual barrier be incorporated into the design. This addition would help restore the privacy that was previously ensured by the trees.

We greatly appreciate the Council’s ongoing efforts to improve community spaces and believe that this small adjustment would provide a fair and practical solution for both residents and tennis court users.

Thank you very much for your attention to this matter. We would be grateful for an opportunity to discuss this issue further or to provide any additional information if needed.

Sincerely,

[Redacted] s. 22(1)

[Redacted] s. 22(1) west Vancouver

BC, [Redacted] s. 22(1)

From: Eric Fiss [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Monday, November 17, 2025 11:41 AM
To: correspondence
Subject: WV Housing Policy Update – OCP Amendment Bylaw

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.

Re: WV Housing Policy Updates - OCP Amendment Bylaw

I am in favour of the proposed **West Vancouver OCP Housing Amendments** which will strengthen housing affordability for our most vulnerable residents and provide numerous benefits for our community.

I appreciate that there are many types of affordable housing. These include smaller market homes that are less expensive to purchase and various forms of rental housing, including co-ops, secondary suites and apartments. There is also housing needed by the most vulnerable members of our society. I am particularly concerned about making the delivery of this type of housing a priority in the OCP.

In reading the very thorough Staff report for the **OCP Housing Policy Amendments** I learned that the OCP Refresh is based on the **Interim Housing Needs Report** that was presented to Council in December 2024 and posted on the District website.

The **2024 Housing Needs Report** calculated theoretical needed units by components that include household type. In addition to the housing need component for anticipated housing growth, the Housing Needs Report components include specific types of affordable housing for vulnerable residents. These include:

- extreme core needs housing;
- housing for the homeless;
- housing for individuals experiencing housing needed due to the constrained housing market, such as youth living with parents who want to move out and for seniors seeking to downsize or move into supportive housing; and
- new housing units needed to restore local vacancy rates to levels representing a healthy and well-functioning rental housing market.

The **OCP Housing Policy Amendments Report** identifies capacities in the District to meet the potential need for these four types of households over the next 20-years. This includes land that can be redeveloped in line with policies and zoning. As well, it includes replacement of seniors' and supportive housing on sites that had supportive housing but have been lost

due to closures. These sites need to be re-developed with added numbers of supportive affordable housing.

As stated in the current Policy 2.1.19 of the OCP, to meet the needs for affordable housing, the District would continue to explore the opportunities proposed by senior levels of government to provide affordable housing on public lands. This includes federally, provincially and municipally owned lands. This would reduce the cost of housing and improve project viability through partnerships, such as the Kiwanis Seniors' Housing on Gordon Avenue. Creation of an inventory of available publicly owned sites would assist in this initiative. The proposed addition of the words "incentivize and enable" to Policy 2.1.19 strengthens the commitment of the District to seek these opportunities.

According to the **2025 Second Quarter Financial Report**, the Affordable Housing Reserve Fund currently holds nearly \$8 million. Additional funds for affordable and non-market housing could potentially be made available by Council from the nearly \$12 million in the Non-restricted Community Amenity Reserve Fund. It is time to think about using these resources to tackle the shortage of affordable housing in the District. If we start now, we can potentially deliver the first 5-year quarter OCP estimate of 150 to 200 affordable housing units by 2030.

The OCP refresh will benefit our community by emphasizing policies for supportive housing and rent stabilization. And to quote from the West Vancouver **2025-2029 Five-Year Financial Plan**,

"providing affordable housing options . . . would provide a larger tax base to pay for community services, create a vibrant community . . . and reduce taxes".

In conclusion, the **Interim Housing Needs Report** and the **OCP Housing Policy Amendment Report** identify shortages in the need and availability of affordable housing for extreme core need housing, housing for the homeless, new housing opportunities for young adults and seniors, and for maintaining an affordable rental housing supply. The amendments will benefit individuals in search of housing and liveability for our community. In the face of a slowdown in market-driven development, the opportunities to support affordable housing should be addressed with real action now to achieve our community's long-term vision.

Thank you

Eric Fiss

s. 22(1)

West Vancouver, BC

s. 22(1)

s. 22(1)

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Tuesday, November 18, 2025 2:12 PM
To: correspondence
Cc: Hope Dallas
Subject: Late entry(with permission) on OCP Update

Importance: High

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 write this letter with permission, after chatting with Ms. Hope Dallas and understanding that the Zoom transmission difficulties encountered with my attempt to join the Public Hearing by zoom—lay with the District's IT connectivity-and not my end. Thus this special exemption to allow this letter to you today.

I will summarize my thoughts as best I can (it should not take even five minutes to read!)

The topic of the need for housing diversity in West Vancouver is one with which I have had some involvement since [REDACTED] s.22(1) the Dialogue on Housing Working Group in 2008.

In that day, in the discussions leading to the revised OCP-presented in 2018(I believe) ,the community response was overwhelming in support of greater diversity (and that continues today-as seen from the charts staff recently presented on the current consultation)

Our community overwhelmingly (higher than 70 percent in every category) are asking for more diversified housing choices-and they need them now.

They are looking for :(among other things) -Seniors housing, in all forms (very needed) -smaller/accessible units (Infills , multiplexes) -affordability(possibly more rental possibilities) -being able to age in place-(staying in our community) -Housing for our care, service , first responders staff.

That is the purpose of this OCP update requirement -to see how the District plans on meeting its needs. I am pleased to see actual targets -and possibilities for reaching them in the Plan presented.

I would , in addition, suggest a variety of process strategies be incorporated into the implementation of this Plan.

These to include:

- Setting achievable five year implementation plans for each housing type.
- Looking for provincial (and now federal initiatives) the District might be able to connect to -Such as the transit moneys that were proposed -which unfortunately WVD failed to take advantage of.
- Look at the possibility of using District lands to build some of this needed housing .
- Include housing accessible to seniors (in many possible forms) as a priority in the planning .

In closing, I do want to again thank Ms.Dallas and city staff in reaching out to me in trying to fix the problems encountered with Zoom yesterday. I appreciate it.

I ask for the same type pf problem solving approach in finally getting at resolving a housing dilemma that has existed-and been talked about in our community for far too long-but have yet to see long term on going solutions....

Respectfully,

s. 22(1)

West Vancouver, BC

s. 22(1)

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Monday, November 17, 2025 2:12 PM
To: Sue Ketler; correspondence
Cc: Mark Sager, Mayor; Christine Cassidy; Nora Gambioli; Peter Lambur; Scott Snider; Sharon Thompson; Linda Watt
Subject: Council Agenda Item 10.3 – Clarification Regarding Breakwaters Policy 0210
Attachments: WV Foreshore Alteration-2.JPG; WV Foreshore Alteration-1.JPG; WV Foreshore Alteration-3.JPG; WV Foreshore Alteration-4.JPG

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

Good afternoon, Ms. Ketler,

A few weeks ago, while walking along a beach in West Vancouver, I noticed an area of foreshore that had been altered. Rocks and boulders had been moved, and fill material had been deposited and compacted. An excavator was working in the area. When I asked the contractor whether the area would be restored following the work (for a private property located above the beach), I was told that the alterations would remain, as a breakwater was to be installed at that location.

I have a question related to this foreshore work and Item 10.3 on the November 17 Council Meeting agenda -- the recommendation to approve proposed Breakwaters Policy 0210 and Moving Buildings Over Foreshore Policy 0211.

Your memorandum of October 28, 2025, states that the updates to these two policies were administrative (e.g., updated using the new policy template; changed from Administrative Policy to Council Policy; and definitions of terms added). You also noted that “the intent of the policy remains the same.”

The stated intent of Breakwaters Policy 0210 includes ensuring “that the foreshore remains accessible, environmentally healthy, and consistent with community values for public enjoyment of waterfront land.” Section 4.1 further specifies that “The District will not approve any private residential or non-commercial breakwaters being constructed along the foreshore.”

Since it appears that the District currently has a Breakwaters Policy in effect, and that the intent of this policy will remain unchanged if and when it transitions to a Council policy, I wonder whether some form of special approval has been extended to this contractor, or whether he was mistaken—or simply hopeful—that circumstances might allow such a project.

Are you aware of any plans to build a private residential or non-commercial breakwater along the West Vancouver foreshore?

If there has been a recent attempt to build such a breakwater, how would the proposal before Council—transitioning the District’s Breakwaters Policy (and the Moving Buildings Over Foreshore Policy) from

administrative to council policy—affect that attempt? Would the ultimate decision rest with Council rather than staff?

I would also like to ask about the Coastal Marine Management Plan (April 2022). This plan represented three years of work by the Coastal Marine Management Plan Working Group and was intended to provide “a policy framework informed by past and recent initiatives to guide District Council and staff in the management of coastal areas and assets.” My understanding is that a consultant was hired a couple of years ago to bring recommendations from the plan forward. Could you advise what progress has been made in this regard?

Thank you for your time and consideration. I look forward to your reply.

Kind regards,

s. 22(1)

West Vancouver



From: s. 22(1)
Sent: Monday, November 17, 2025 6:31 PM
To: correspondence
Subject: Heritage Alteration permit 24-090 for 4798 Highway

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

Hello,

Please see below, my comments regarding Heritage Alteration permit 24-090 for 4798 Highway.

I am an s. 22(1) who has lived in West Vancouver for s.22(1). During this time, and prior to moving here, I have worked on a variety of new home construction projects as well as numerous renovations across various neighbourhoods in West Vancouver.

The proposed design integrates very nicely with its surroundings. The colours and textures complement the natural environment. The home's design also demonstrates a thoughtful response to the lot's unique shape and size. The design presents an open and inviting presence. Homes with an inviting presence foster a stronger sense of community and encourage openness and connection among neighbours.

s.22(1) walk through both renovations and new home builds previously completed by the landlord proposing this work. Each project has been authentic to its setting, tastefully executed, and built to a high standard. Their attention to landscaping and lighting is consistent and I have no doubt the proposed design will be an aesthetically positive addition to this street throughout the day and into the evening.

Thank you kindly,

s. 22(1)

West Vancouver, BC

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Tuesday, November 18, 2025 10:54 AM
To: correspondence
Subject: Heritage Alteration Permit 24 - 090

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

I am writing to support the proposed Heritage Alteration Permit 24-090 for 4798 The Highway.

The submitted design is extremely attractive and fits in beautifully with the surrounding community, perhaps even more so than many other homes built in the area in the past decades. The neutral colour palette, large windows, and the use of greenery, stone and shingles help the proposed structure organically blend into the lot. It is evident that the individual(s) developing this property have made every effort to take into account the current heritage bylaws, concerns from neighbours, and design requirements for the Lower Caulfeild area.

I am particularly interested in this proposal as I grew up in the Caulfeild area [REDACTED] s. 22(1) and my mother spent [REDACTED] s.22(1) Pilot House Road home was replaced by a structure less harmonious with its surroundings than the building proposed at 4798 The Highway. I treasure the lower Caulfeild area and see the proposed development as an enhancement to this lovely neighbourhood.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

Vancouver, BC

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

From: s. 22(1)
Sent: Tuesday, November 18, 2025 7:52 PM
To: Mark Sager, Mayor; Sharon Thompson; Linda Watt; Scott Snider; Peter Lambur; c cassidy; Nora Gambioli; correspondence; sfindlay@westvancoouver.ca
Subject: Nov. 17 Council Meeting

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

Dear Mayor and Council:

I attended the regular Council Meeting last night (Nov. 17) and was frankly dismayed at the presentation regarding Report 4: Water Utility Update. I considered commenting at the end of the meeting, but I chose not to as I did not want to publicly embarrass anyone involved.

It is reasonable to expect that any report presented at an open Council Meeting can be explained clearly so community members, Council and even small children can understand.. Unfortunately, this was not the case during the presentation on the Water Utility Update.

During the presentation, two tables (not in the Report to Council) were displayed: one showing the median increase in rates for single-family dwellings, and another displaying the average increase for multi-unit dwellings. Councillor Thompson raised questions about the meaning of "median" and the underlying metrics. Several individuals attempted to clarify, but there remained significant confusion regarding the interpretation of the data. Comparisons with Metro data in one of the attempts to clarify were not helpful as we had no context or Metro data. Councillor Thompson's questions were not clearly addressed. Did the presenters actually understand their material?

Specifically, regarding the median increase for single-family dwellings, it was unclear whether the metric was based on property assessment, water usage, or the previous year's water bill. One response indicated assessed value, which seems unlikely given that water meters are in use. Water charges are not related to property tax levies. While it appeared the chart reflected previous bills, it is uncertain how that would translate into charges for the following year, as this does not seem logical. Water usage was also suggested as a basis, which is probably the most plausible explanation considering the presence of water meters.

I am not confident in the accuracy of the explanations offered, and I request clarification on this point.

As a reminder, "median" refers to the mid-point in a set of data – half of the values will be above that point, half below. It is generally the best measurement to use when there is a small number of outliers in the group. During the presentation, one presenter attempted to explain "median" by stating that half would pay more and half less. This explanation sounded as if it referred to individual water bills, but it seems intended to describe the median increase —meaning half would pay more than the estimated median increase and half would pay less. There was repeated reference to the word "median," but it remained unclear: the median of what, exactly?

In contrast, "average" is the general value of a set of data with similar values. If there are a small number of outliers in a small set of values, the average can be skewed and become an unhelpful measurement. Did the presenters actually know the difference between median and average?

For example, consider a company with five employees: one earns \$300,000 annually, two earn \$20,000, and two earn \$30,000. The median salary is \$30,000, which is more representative of employee earnings than the "average" salary which would be \$80,000, which does not accurately reflect most employees' earnings.

In addition, water is not metered in individual units in most multi-family buildings in West Vancouver. Water usage is metered by building and the cost is shared by all owners or residents in each building. Therefore, the "average" is the measure used to determine estimated rate increases, as individual dwelling usage cannot be measured. I suspect this is an accurate forecast as there are a large number of multi-unit residences in West Vancouver.

I look forward to a reply.

Yours truly,

s. 22(1)

West Vancouver, BC, s. 22(1)

s. 22(1)