

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

Correspondence

- (1) October 2, 2025, regarding Excavation Slope Concerns**
- (2) Stratawest Management Ltd., October 3, 2025, regarding “Urgent Safety Concern” (Sidewalks)**
- (3) October 3, 2025, regarding “Ambleside beaches rock music too loud”**
- (4) October 5, 2025, regarding “Re: Land Acknowledgement for the District of West Vancouver”**
- (5) Ambleside Dundarave Business Improvement Association, October 5, 2025, regarding “Masonic Hall”**
- (6) October 5, 2025, regarding “Parking Impark and West Vancouver Parks”**
- (7) October 6, 2025, regarding “Re. Proposed Delegation of the Administration of Covenants in Rodgers Creek and Cypress Village Areas (Item 9.7 on the October 6 Council Agenda)”**
- (8) 3 submissions, October 6, 2025, regarding Sewage Tax**
- (9) October 6, 2025, regarding “Re. Geese Mitigation (Item 4 on the Oct.6 Council Agenda)”**

Correspondence from Other Governments and Government Agencies

No items.

Responses to Correspondence

- (10) Senior Manager of Parks, October 1, 2025, response regarding “Bridge area maintenance”**
- (11) Director of Planning, Development, and Environment Services, October 2, 2025 regarding Excavation Slope Concerns**

From: s. 22(1)
Sent: Thursday, October 2, 2025 1:14 AM
To: Jim Bailey; Planning Department; correspondence
Cc: Nicole Colby; Terry Yee
Subject: Escalation: Slope Stability and Setback Deficiency s.22(1)

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 Jim Bailey:

I am writing to follow up on my previous letter of September 13, 2025, regarding excavation and slope safety at s.22(1). Although my correspondence was published in the District's weekly package, I have not received any response from staff or Council. Given the seriousness of the matter, I must now escalate my concerns.

Key Findings from My Review of District Records and Site Conditions

- The excavation for the new dwelling cut approximately five feet below grade, s. 22(1) the shared boundary with an effective slope condition that is, in large part, closer to 1:1 rather than the recommended 2:1.
- Based on my measurements of the 10.26m shared boundary, **approximately 60% s. 22(1) foundation is supported by slope conditions that do not meet the 2:1 setback ratio** recommended in provincial geotechnical guidance.
- The only exception is at the northernmost ~15% of the boundary, where a buttress pier exists behind the retaining wall. The remaining 85% the boundary has no engineered support.
- No geotechnical report reviewed under FOIPPA addressed the impact of this excavation on adjacent properties. The pool geotechnical engineer (s. 22(1)) expressly stated that his scope was limited to the swimming pool and that he had no involvement with the house or retaining walls.
- **In other words, no geotechnical engineer has ever reviewed or provided assurance regarding the slope conditions along the shared boundary between s.22(1).**

Why This Matters

Together, these conditions raise significant risks of:

- Loss of lateral support to s. 22(1);
- Soil movement or settlement during seismic or weather events; and
- Long-term slope and drainage instability along the shared boundary.

My Request

Given the absence of an adequate geotechnical review addressing adjacent property impacts, I respectfully request that the District:

1. Conduct an immediate independent review of slope and setback conditions at s.22(1), specifically in relation to their effect on s. 22(1);
2. Confirm whether the excavation and current conditions meet provincial guidelines for slope stability in seismic areas;

3. Require any necessary mitigation measures or slope reinforcement to protect [REDACTED] s. 22(1) property; and
4. Provide a written response to my concerns, given that my previous letter of September 13 has received no reply.

I trust that the District shares the responsibility to ensure that development at [REDACTED] s.22(1) does not compromise the stability or safety of neighbouring properties. I appreciate your prompt attention to this serious matter.

Sincerely,
[REDACTED] s. 22(1)



Virus-free www.avg.com

From: Gabriela Alvarado Luna <gluna@stratawest.com>
Sent: Friday, October 3, 2025 10:42 AM
To: correspondence
Cc: s. 22(1)
Subject: Urgent Safety Concern
Attachments: BCS 2177 - City Hall, West Vancouver - Oct 2025.pdf

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

Hello,
Please see attached letter from Strata Corporation BCS 2177

Kind Regards,

Gabriela Luna
Administration



#202 – 224 West Esplanade
North Vancouver, BC, V7M 1A4



STRATAWEST
MANAGEMENT LTD.
Professional Property Managers

Mayor and Council,
West Vancouver
750 17th St,
West Vancouver, BC,
V7V 3T3
correspondence@westvancouver.ca

Executive Group Development
1038 - 1055 W Hastings St,
Vancouver, BC V6E 2E9
info@executivegroupdevelopment.com

Toby Rogers
Land Development Technician,
West Vancouver
750 17th St,
West Vancouver, BC,
V7V 3T3
trogers@westvancouver.ca

Engineering Department,
West Vancouver
750 17th St,
West Vancouver, BC,
V7V 3T3
engineeringdept@westvancouver.ca

From: Strata Corporation BCS 2177

Re: **Sidewalks on Taylor Way, Clyde and Marine drive**

On behalf of the council of Strata 2177 on Waters Edge Crescent I am writing to request you immediately install a temporary sturdy path to the intersection of Taylor Way and Marine drive. In our building, the residential building on 6th Street and the Amica building on Clyde. We have many elderly people who need canes or walkers.

The construction signs direct you from Marine Drive, along 6th to Clyde. Last Thursday one of our elderly owners had a nasty fall while walking on Clyde to catch a bus at Park Royal. Her lovely face is badly damaged and is now covered in horrible bruises. An elderly gentleman was stopped by one of our owners while he was attempting to cross Taylor Way from Clyde Street to get to the mall. Every day there are people walking on the Taylor Way traffic lane because the sidewalk has been torn up and closed.

No notice was posted or circulated informing residents in advance we were losing both sidewalks to the intersection and would have no access to Park Royal or buses. The sidewalk on Clyde Street ends at the sales building and it's quite dangerous walking to Taylor Way for someone not totally steady on their feet. The sidewalk in front of Amica is better but ends up where Amica ends and crossing over Clyde is dangerous, especially in the dark evenings. Our only access is to walk a gravel, unlit, dark trail to 100 Park Royal or beyond.

The new walkway through the building under construction will be beautiful once it's finished and the fences around the building are removed but that may not be until the end of November! We have many elderly people here, one that I know has been badly hurt, and the gentleman who was stopped from crossing Taylor Way could have been killed.

Thank you in advance for your immediate attention to this matter.

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Friday, October 3, 2025 10:43 AM
To: correspondence
Cc: Mark Sager, Mayor; Christine Cassidy; Nora Gambioli; Peter Lambur; Scott Snider; Sharon Thompson; Linda Watt
Subject: Ambleside beaches rock music too loud

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: My wife and I have lived in our condo [REDACTED] s. 22(1) in West Vancouver for 28 years. We loved this location up until this summer when the loudly amplified music started coming out of that new licensed business on the beach next to the Old Ferry Building at the base of 14th Street. It was every night, from the late afternoon right up until 10 pm and was simply TOO LOUD. This is no place for an outdoor "club" playing loud music every night all summer long. The Ambleside beaches are meant as family areas, not a hangout for LOUD rock music and drinking way into the evening. We live [REDACTED] s. 22(1) from the Old Ferry Building, on the [REDACTED] s. 22(1) of a concrete condominium building, yet the amplified base and drums penetrates into our condo. Our only relief from this pounding music is to close all of our double glazed windows but then we suffocate. These older buildings do not have circulating air systems and we all rely on the ocean breeze to cool our suites. At street level below our building we do not hear the music so loudly, but getting up higher in the building it gets loud as there are not the number of other buildings high enough to block the sound.

This has become a real problem. We implore the city of West Vancouver, and city council, to not allow this to continue next summer. The 10 day Harmony Music festival in the middle of the summer is fine.....BUT this turning of Ambleside into one large Ambleside outdoor music club all summer long is not acceptable. Over many years we have spent time in several cities, usually near beaches and parks, and we have never had this problem in any of those other cities. Outdoor restaurant patios are lovely. They do not blast this amplified music and destroy other citizens enjoyment of life. Where are the anti-noise bylaws? We are entitled to reasonably quiet enjoyment of our neighbourhood. We pay the taxes.

Thank you for hearing our concerns. Hopefully this email does get passed on to our mayor and council.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

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

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Sunday, October 5, 2025 9:53 AM
To: correspondence
Subject: Re: Land Acknowledgement for the District of 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.

Dear Mayor and Council Members,

Thank you for the important work you do on behalf of West Vancouver's diverse communities.

I am writing after attending the Survivors Flag Raising this morning at City Hall—my second time attending as a resident of the District.

I wish to share a concern that West Vancouver's current land acknowledgement may not be fully accurate. Unlike the City of Vancouver, West Vancouver is not within the traditional territory of the Tsleil-Waututh or Musqueam Nations. Here, we are on the traditional and ancestral lands of the Squamish Nation. The wording of the current acknowledgement appears to have been adapted from Vancouver's, which rightly includes all three Nations, but does not reflect the distinct history and geography of West Vancouver.

As we continue the work of Truth and Reconciliation, I respectfully request that the District review and update its land acknowledgement in consultation with the Squamish Nation to ensure it is both accurate and appropriate. My understanding—confirmed in conversations with Traditional Knowledge Keeper and Councillor Bucky Baker of the Squamish Nation, and shown at the Lil'—is that these lands are recognized as belonging to the Squamish people alone. This is also clearly reflected in the territorial maps on display at the Lil'wat Squamish Cultural Centre in Whistler.

I believe it is important that our District take the initiative to correct the record and properly honour the original stewards of this land.

Thank you for considering this request.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

From: Ambleside Dundarave BIA <info@ADBIA.ca>
Sent: Sunday, October 5, 2025 6:24 PM
To: Mark Sager, Mayor; Linda Watt; Peter Lambur; Christine Cassidy; Sharon Thompson; Scott Snider; Nora Gambioli; correspondence
Subject: Masonic Hall
Attachments: Letter of support for Masonic Hall.pdf

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the organization from email address info@adbia.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.

Please find attached a letter regarding Masonic Hall on behalf of the ADBIA.

Regards,

Maureen

Maureen O'Brien

Executive Director

Ambleside Dundarave Business Improvement Association

604-210-3500

info@adbia.ca

"It Takes a Village to Make a Village"



October 3, 2025

District of West Vancouver
750 17th Street
West Vancouver, BC
V7T 3V3

Re: Support for the Masonic Hall Redevelopment Proposal to Proceed to Public Consultation

Dear Mayor and Council,

On behalf of the Board of the Ambleside Dundarave Business Improvement Association, I am writing to express our support for the Masonic Hall redevelopment proposal moving forward to a Public Consultation.

We believe this project represents a positive and much-needed addition to our commercial core. The proposed height is appropriate for the area and will present as three levels at street level, ensuring the building remains pedestrian-friendly and consistent with the surrounding streetscape.

Equally important, the proposed design is attractive, distinctive, and thoughtfully planned. It offers something unique compared to the more generic, cookie-cutter style of many recent developments. This project has the potential to set a higher standard for design in our community and to create a building that residents, visitors, and businesses alike will be proud of.

The redevelopment would also provide significantly more community space than the current building, meeting our need for flexible, welcoming places that bring people together and enhance vibrancy in our town centres.

Finally, the addition of new housing within the commercial district will directly benefit local businesses. A stronger residential base in Ambleside supports shops, restaurants, and services, ensuring the long-term vitality of our community.

For these reasons, we respectfully urge Council to allow this proposal to move forward to Public Consultation, where the community can provide further input. We believe it offers lasting value to Ambleside and to West Vancouver as a whole.

Thank you for your consideration.

Regards,

s.22(1)

Maureen O'Brien
Executive Director, ADBIA

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Sunday, October 5, 2025 8:28 PM
To: correspondence
Subject: Parking Impark and West Vancouver Parks

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

Mayor and Council..

Yet another debacle. First the insane purchase of the unusable Boat House in Horseshoe Bay and now the insensitive parking issue at Ambleside Park.

Ambleside is not only for walkers and people enjoying their pets on the dog beach. It is a huge space for sports. Young people practicing and playing sports.

Many gracious and generous individuals have donated large sums of money for these facilities to be built. For youth to enjoy and be able to use the facilities to

enhance their lives and skills. Now in your wisdom you have brought in a fee for the parents who bring these children to the teams they represent.

Some parents in opposing teams travel to West Vancouver from Surrey and other surrounding cities. Often they travel over two hours to reach our beautiful district. They are then faced with a 3 hour

metered parking ticket. Close to \$20. (\$20 is sufficient to buy groceries to make dinner for a family of 4). You all need to get real and get a complete understanding of the economic situation in this Province.

We have the honour of having the richest postal code in Canada and yet you lack the sensitivity to understand the hardships that many families have to even get their kids

equipment and then to get them to the game. And yet you have had the genius to cash grab from these neighbours of ours. And their children. You are mean and insensitive.

I, along with many I know are embarrassed by such greed.

I have resided here [REDACTED] s. 22(1). Paid taxes. Paid my dues as a long time Volunteer. Given back to my community. Which you just take away in a moment of pure greed. It is a disgrace. You should all be ashamed.

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

West Vancouver

s. 22(1)

BC

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Monday, October 6, 2025 8:42 AM
To: Mark Sager, Mayor; Christine Cassidy; Nora Gambioli; Peter Lambur; Linda Watt; Scott Snider; Sharon Thompson; correspondence
Subject: Re. Proposed Delegation of the Administration of Covenants in Rodgers Creek and Cypress Village Areas (Item 9.7 on the October 6 Council Agenda)

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 concerned about the proposal to delegate administration of covenants in the Rodgers Creek and Cypress Village areas to the Director of Planning, Development and Environment Services. While the change is presented to streamline processing of development applications and building permits in the CD3 and CV zones, it also reduces transparency and limits public opportunity to engage on amendments that may affect unit counts, floor area, building height, and other material aspects of a development.

If a developer seeks covenant amendments to reflect changing market or site conditions, those amendments should be presented to Council with the public given the opportunity to observe and participate. Covenants function as explicit promises to Council and the community about a project's final form and public benefit, and they are a central part of the rationale used by both staff and developers to justify approvals. Delegating their amendment to an administrative decision risks undermining public trust and removes an important forum for accountability.

In light of this, covenant amendments that materially alter development obligations should be considered by Council at a public meeting so that elected representatives and the community can review, question, and weigh the proposed changes before they are finalized.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

West Vancouver

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Monday, October 6, 2025 10:03 AM
To: correspondence
Subject: Sewage Tax

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

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

October 6, 2025
District of West Vancouver
Municipal Hall
750 17th Street
West Vancouver, BC V7V 3T3

Dear Mayor and Council,

Subject: Request for Exemption from Proposed Sewage Tax for Lawrence Way Residents

I am writing on behalf of the residents of Lawrence Way to respectfully request an exemption from the proposed new sewage tax. Our street does not have access to municipal sewage services, as all properties on Lawrence Way rely on privately maintained septic systems. Consequently, imposing a sewage tax on our households would be inequitable, as we do not benefit from the infrastructure or services this tax is intended to support.

The residents of Lawrence Way independently manage and maintain our septic systems, bearing all associated costs, including regular inspections, pumping, and repairs. These systems effectively handle our wastewater needs without reliance on the district's sewage infrastructure. As such, we believe it is fair and reasonable to exempt our street from the proposed tax, aligning with the principle that taxation should correspond to services received.

We kindly request that the District of West Vancouver review our situation and confirm that properties on Lawrence Way, or any other streets reliant on septic systems, are excluded from the sewage tax. Alternatively, we would appreciate the opportunity to discuss this matter further or provide additional documentation to support our request.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. We value the district's commitment to fair governance and look forward to your response. Please feel free to contact me at [REDACTED] s. 22(1) if further information is needed.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED] s.22(1)

From: s. 22(1)
Sent: Monday, October 6, 2025 10:05 AM
To: correspondence
Subject: Council meeting on Sewage taxes

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.

From: s. 22(1)
s. 22(1)
West Vancouver, BC s. 22(1)
Mobile: s. 22(1)
Email: s. 22(1)

Oct 6, 2025

West Vancouver Municipal Council
750 17th Street
West Vancouver, BC V7V 3T3

Dear Members of the West Vancouver Municipal Council,

I am writing to express my concern regarding the proposed inclusion of sewage fees in property taxes for residents of s. 22(1) Lawrence Way, West Vancouver, where s.22(1) I reside s.22(1). Our property relies on a private septic system, which we maintain at our own expense, incurring annual costs of several hundred dollars and the eventual need for costly replacement.

While I understand the rationale for incorporating sewage fees into property taxes, this change would impose an unfair financial burden on households like ours that do not utilize municipal sewage services. I respectfully urge the Council to reconsider this proposal or to grant an exemption for properties on septic systems, including those on Lawrence Way and Pasco Road, which, to my knowledge, also rely on private septic systems.

Thank you for your time and consideration. I am hopeful that this issue is an oversight and that the Council will address it by exempting septic system users from the proposed sewage fees. Please feel free to contact me at s. 22(1) or s. 22(1) if further discussion is needed.

Sincerely,
s. 22(1)

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Monday, October 6, 2025 12:39 PM
To: correspondence
Cc: Mark Sager, Mayor
Subject: North Shore Wastewater Treatment Plant Levy

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

Mayor and Council:

I live on Lawrence Way. The District provides no sewage services to Lawrence Way homes (nor, I believe, to Pasco Road homes). Consequently, I and other homeowners have had to invest in our own sewage treatment plants, which cost tens of thousands of \$ to install and have very significant maintenance and operating costs.

It has just been brought to my attention that the District proposes to fund the incremental costs (the cost overrun) of the North Shore Wastewater Treatment Plant through a levy to be applied not through utility bills but on the basis of assessed value through property taxes.

This means that homeowners like me would be paying for a service we cannot use (as recognized in the absence of a sewage line on my utility bill) on top of the expenses we have incurred installing our own treatment plants.

This is grossly unfair.

I urge you to exempt properties like mine from this levy.

Sincerely

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

West Vancouver

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Monday, October 6, 2025 12:48 PM
To: correspondence; Mark Sager, Mayor; Nora Gambioli; Christine Cassidy; Peter Lambur; Scott Snider; Sharon Thompson; Linda Watt
Subject: Re. Geese Mitigation (Item 4 on the Oct.6 Council Agenda)

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 appreciate the work Parks staff have done to reduce the presence and impacts of Canada geese, including modified mowing and irrigation schedules, use of fencing and water-feature adjustments, and increased cleaning. Some measures have shown results, though others—such as shoreline fencing—have been repeatedly undermined by public interference (according to the Council report).

Before the District invests further in consultant-led nesting and molting surveys and pursues any potential future federal permits, I urge us to fully exhaust lower-cost, non-permit options that are proven to reduce goose use over the long term. To date, the District has done relatively little permanent landscape modification, which is widely recognized as one of the most durable and wildlife-friendly ways to discourage geese.

Specifically, the District should prioritize establishing dense shoreline and buffer plantings—tall grasses, native shrubs, and emergent aquatic plants—designed to block sight lines of the geese (not people) and limit easy access between water and turf. These plantings make sites less attractive to geese and reduce nesting and brood-rearing opportunities. Redirecting some of the time and cost savings from reduced mowing, watering, and fertilizing toward planting and maintaining these buffers would also lower GHG emissions from equipment and increase on-site carbon sequestration.

I recognize that naturalized buffers may not be suitable for all recreational surfaces, which will still require seasonal cleaning and maintenance. Rather than relying primarily on repeated consultant studies and permit applications—which are costly and likely to produce only temporary results when used in isolation—the District should adopt an integrated approach that emphasizes habitat modification, sustained public education (especially to stop feeding, directly, or indirectly), and clearly identified tolerance zones.

The Council report notes that the City and District of North Vancouver do not currently face the same Canada Goose issues. Investigating their approaches and identifying specific practices we could replicate should be a priority and an easy “win.”

Finally, I note that staff's list of "Categories of Mitigation" in the Council report ranks "Population Control" (lethal measures) and "Hazing" first and second, with "Landscape Modification" and "Public Education" listed afterward. This ordering is essentially the inverse of the approach recommended by the Government of Canada, which prioritizes prevention through stopping feeding, landscape modification, and public education before considering scaring techniques and lethal control.

I respectfully request that Council direct staff to develop a prioritized, budgeted plan to implement shoreline and buffer plantings across priority park sites, paired with no-feeding education and to report back on costs and timelines before commissioning consultant studies or permit applications.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

s. 22(1)

West Vancouver

From: Jill Lawlor
Sent: Wednesday, October 1, 2025 11:07 PM
To: s. 22(1)
Cc: correspondence
Subject: Bridge Area Maintenance

Good evening s. 22(1)

Thank you for your email. The land and area you identified are considered part of the provincial highway system and are owned by the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure and maintained by a contractor. We have contacted the contractor and requested that the bushes be trimmed and the grass cut. This request will be reviewed and processed by their team.

Thank you for bringing this to our (and their) attention.

Appreciatively,

Jill

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



We acknowledge that we are on the traditional, ancestral, and unceded territory of the [Sḵwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw](#) (Squamish Nation), [səlilwətał](#) (Tsleil-Waututh Nation) & [xʷməθkʷəy̍əm](#) (Musqueam Nation). We recognize and respect them as nations in this territory, as well as their historic connection to the lands and waters around us since time immemorial. *Learn more about each of these Nations; click each name to visit their official website.*

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Saturday, September 27, 2025 2:37 PM
To: correspondence
Subject: Bridge area maintenance

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

Good afternoon,

My name is [REDACTED] s. 22(1) I'm a homeowner here in west van.

I'm emailing to bring to council's attention the lanes leading southbound to lion's gate bridge. They are surrounded by rusting poles and tails that require painting. The shrubs that are overgrown for the area should be trimmed back and grass cut too.

The current state doesn't leave a good impression for visitors leaving our city and those of us who live here, paying taxes for a community that is small enough to maintain small yet high traffic spaces like this.

Please let me know if council would like support identifying similar high traffic areas around the city. I'd be happy to help and I have experience sitting on a community board myself.

Thank you for your work,
[REDACTED] s. 22(1)
[REDACTED] west van

From: Jim Bailey
Sent: Thursday, October 2, 2025 1:50 PM
To: s.22(1) Planning Department; correspondence
Cc: Nicole Colby; Terry Yee; Kevin Spooner
Subject: RE: Escalation: Slope Stability and Setback Deficiency at s.22(1)

Dear s.22(1)

After receiving your original email dated September 11th, we sent out an inspector the next day. He told us that he spoke to you and your questions and concerns were addressed.

In your email of today, the same issues are raised. Be advised that the Geotechnical engineer on record has given us written approval on the slopes regarding the excavation. We rely on professionals to ascertain whether or not an excavation is safe. After the pool is constructed then the site will be backfilled under the Geotechnical Engineer's review. We do not have any concerns at this time on this property. We can arrange to have another meeting on site if that will help.

Best,
Jim

From: s. 22(1)
Sent: Thursday, October 2, 2025 1:14 AM
To: Jim Bailey; Planning Department; correspondence
Cc: Nicole Colby; Terry Yee
Subject: Escalation: Slope Stability and Setback Deficiency s.22(1)

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 Jim Bailey:

I am writing to follow up on my previous letter of September 13, 2025, regarding excavation and slope safety at s.22(1). Although my correspondence was published in the District's weekly package, I have not received any response from staff or Council. Given the seriousness of the matter, I must now escalate my concerns.

Key Findings from My Review of District Records and Site Conditions

- The excavation for the new dwelling cut approximately five feet below grade, s. 22(1) the shared boundary with an effective slope condition that is, in large part, closer to 1:1 rather than the recommended 2:1.
- Based on my measurements of the 10.26m shared boundary, **approximately 60% s. 22(1) foundation is supported by slope conditions that do not meet the 2:1 setback ratio** recommended in provincial geotechnical guidance.
- The only exception is at the northernmost ~15% of the boundary, where a buttress pier exists behind the retaining wall. The remaining 85% the boundary has no engineered support.
- No geotechnical report reviewed under FOIPPA addressed the impact of this excavation on adjacent properties. The pool geotechnical engineer (s. 22(1)) expressly stated that his scope was limited to the swimming pool and that he had no involvement with the house or retaining walls.
- **In other words, no geotechnical engineer has ever reviewed or provided assurance regarding the slope conditions along the shared boundary between s.22(1).**

Why This Matters

Together, these conditions raise significant risks of:

- Loss of lateral support to s. 22(1);
- Soil movement or settlement during seismic or weather events; and
- Long-term slope and drainage instability along the shared boundary.

My Request

Given the absence of an adequate geotechnical review addressing adjacent property impacts, I respectfully request that the District:

1. Conduct an immediate independent review of slope and setback conditions at s.22(1), specifically in relation to their effect on s. 22(1);
2. Confirm whether the excavation and current conditions meet provincial guidelines for slope stability in seismic areas;

3. Require any necessary mitigation measures or slope reinforcement to protect [REDACTED] s. 22(1) property; and
4. Provide a written response to my concerns, given that my previous letter of September 13 has received no reply.

I trust that the District shares the responsibility to ensure that development at [REDACTED] s.22(1) does not compromise the stability or safety of neighbouring properties. I appreciate your prompt attention to this serious matter.

Sincerely,
[REDACTED] s. 22(1)



Virus-free www.avg.com