

COUNCIL CORRESPONDENCE UPDATE TO OCTOBER 1, 2025 (8:30 a.m.)

Correspondence

- (1) September 24, 2025, regarding “Fwd: Collingwood tax exemptions ???”**
- (2) September 25, 2025, regarding “Fwd: 5G: Telecoms science versus independent science. Which side has the Government chosen?”**
- (3) September 27, 2025, regarding “Bridge area maintenance”**
- (4) September 28, 2025, regarding “Batch West Vancouver”**
- (5) September 30, 2025, regarding “the rush for increased density potentially leaving behind empty lots...”**

Correspondence from Other Governments and Government Agencies

No items.

Responses to Correspondence

No items.

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Wednesday, September 24, 2025 6:59 PM
To: correspondence
Subject: Fwd: Collingwood tax exemptions ???

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.

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

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Date: Wed, Sep 24, 2025 at 6:52 PM
Subject: Collingwood tax exemptions ???
To: <correspondance@westvancouver.ca>

The WV Mayor and the Council,

I learned with great disbelief that no other private school of West Vancouver except Collingwood applied for municipal property tax exemptions.

None of their property listed in that application is an educational facility. All of them are residential. The council of Michael Smith was granting them these permissive tax exemptions by default; even for investment properties. A few years later Collingwood advertised and sold the very same lots as "prime residential properties". Subsequently to this scandal the District changed its policy. I hope we are not moving back to this dark era of WV history.

I doubt Collingwood really counts on a reward for their misbehaviour. This ballsy application is rather to test the new mayor, the new council and the vigilance of their neighbours.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Thursday, September 25, 2025 11:36 AM
To: correspondence
Subject: Fwd: 5G: Telecoms science versus independent science. Which side has the Government chosen?

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.

Please circulate this very important report to Councillors and staff!

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)
 [REDACTED] WV

Begin forwarded message:

From: Patricia Burke's Substack for Safe Tech International
 <patriciaburke@substack.com>
Subject: 5G: Telecoms science versus independent science. Which side has the Government chosen?
Date: September 25, 2025 at 4:56:00 AM PDT
To: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Reply-To: Patricia Burke's Substack for Safe Tech International
 <reply+2vwng3&ptksv&&85959715d0366d98db8810be92b1dcd31c34accc0c09fe034ba6197cad38d4db@mg1.substack.com>

↔ [Patricia's Substack for Safe Tech International](#) cross-posted a post from [Gillian Jamieson's Substack](#)



Patricia Burke Sep 25 · Patricia's Substack for Safe Tech International

Excellent overview from a UIK commentator

5G: Telecoms science versus independent science. Which side has the Government chosen?

As published in the Conservative Woman, 25th September 2025



READ IN APP ↗

Conservative Woman link

TECHNOLOGY has completely changed the way most of us live, particularly over the last 30 years. The use of mobile phones, smart gadgets and WiFi has increased exponentially, raising the question of whether there is a risk to health from the electromagnetic radiation these devices emit. The answer is, however, not readily available unless you know where to look, and there are conflicting opinions.

In summary there are two camps.

Camp One have strong links to and funding from the telecoms industry and their main expertise is electronic engineering. They play down the risks of health harm mainly on the grounds that harm occurs only if body tissue is heated by radio-frequency radiation (RFR) and that non-ionising radiation (NIR) cannot cause DNA damage. Supporters include the International Commission for Non-Ionising Radiation Protection ([ICNIRP](#)), the [World Health Organization](#), the Scientific Committee on Health, Environmental and Emerging Risks ([SCHEER](#)) and the now defunct UK Advisory Group on Non-Ionising Radiation ([AGNIR](#)).

They ignore those in Camp Two, which includes independent scientists and doctors whose main expertise is in human health, toxicology, epidemiology and biophysics, and includes electronic engineering. They say that harm occurs before the body heats up and that present safety limits need to be revised. They believe that [DNA can be damaged](#) by non-ionising radiation and that this can lead to cancer and other diseases. Many in this second group have recently come together under the auspices of the [International Commission on the Biological Effects of Electromagnetic Fields](#) (ICBE-EMF) which states that the weight of scientific evidence justifies the call for meaningful policy changes to address ever-increasing EMF exposures.

The UK government defers to Camp One and adheres to safety exposure guidelines drawn up 27 years ago and barely changed since by ICNIRP, a

self-selecting group based in Germany, and states: 'Expert groups have examined the . . . evidence . . . and their conclusions support the view that health effects are unlikely to occur if exposures are below ICNIRP's internationally agreed guideline levels.'

At the other extreme Professor James Lin, a biophysicist and professor of electronic and computer engineering at the College of Engineering, Chicago, stated recently: 'Some of the safety guidelines are irrelevant, debatable, and absent of scientific justification from the standpoint of safety & public health protection.' It is significant that Lin used to be on the ICNIRP board.

This summer another biophysicist, Dr Paul Héroux, addressed the question of divergence of opinions on the health effects of electromagnetic fields (EMFs) which include both wireless radiation and EMFs from powerlines. I intend to give a general summary of the beliefs of the two opposing camps, but for a more detailed analysis I recommend the above-mentioned articles by James Lin and Paul Héroux.

ICNIRP's safety exposure guidelines, which are followed by the UK, are set at very high levels (10,000,000 $\mu\text{W}/\text{m}^2$), far above those at which harm has been shown to occur as, for example, in Dr Lennart Hardell's 5G case studies, and far higher than in countries such as India whose limits are set at one tenth of ICNIRP levels.

ICNIRP's initial 1998 guidelines were already controversial because the studies did not take account of continuous exposure or possible chronic or long-term effects. Shockingly, despite important findings since then, the revised 2020 guidelines remained almost unchanged. In addition, when ICNIRP drew up its 2020 guidelines, it appears from my research that no medically qualified person was involved.

The 2020 guidelines completely ignore the 2011 classification of RFR as a possible carcinogen by the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC). They also ignore two very large, well-conducted animal studies by the Ramazzini Institute and National Toxicology Program in 2018, which separately concluded that RFR caused heart cancer and brain gliomas in male rats. Professor Lin has said that these studies should result in a higher

classification of RFR as 'carcinogenic' or 'probably carcinogenic'.
Furthermore, thousands of other studies have shown harm.

A critique of 14 flawed assumptions made by ICNIRP can be found in this important article, which asks for guidelines providing proper protection for humans and the environment 'based on scientific evidence rather than on erroneous assumptions'. A good summary of these assumptions is appended to this letter to Indian authorities, in which they are urged not to yield to the telecoms industry's demands to raise their safety limits to align with ICNIRP's. Professor James Lin's recent article also addresses various issues with ICNIRP guidelines, including discussion of the 'roles of the military industrial complex in influencing research on the health effects and standards setting for safety levels'.

Furthermore, it is now 13 years since the Government asked the relevant expert committee to report on the potential health risks of 5G or its predecessors. The now disbanded AGNIR committee reported in 2012, but its findings were thoroughly discredited by neuroscientist Dr Sarah Starkey as it had omitted and distorted scientific evidence leading to wrong and misleading conclusions. She also noted how many personnel had dual roles or conflicts of interests by being in more than one of these regulatory bodies at the same time. The present expert committee, COMARE, holds only a watching brief having admitted it is waiting for the WHO's final report on their systematic reviews.

Thousands of pre-5G studies listed by the Bioinitiative Report have shown that RFR does damage under the thermal threshold at cellular level leading to 'non-thermal induction of reactive oxygen species, DNA damage, cardiomyopathy, carcinogenicity, sperm damage and neurological effects' in the long term. The report also states the fundamental reason that RFR is harmful to humans: 'Our hearts and brains are regulated by internal bioelectrical signals. Environmental exposures to artificial EMFs can interact with fundamental biological processes in the human body.'

The recent real-life 5G case studies by epidemiologist and oncologist Dr Lennart Hardell are of particular note. He found that, at levels which were a fraction of the ICNIRP limits, people were getting unbearable symptoms

similar to 'microwave syndrome' (as documented in Eastern Europe in the 60s and 70s) almost immediately. These are short-term effects and basically also the symptoms of electromagnetic hypersensitivity (EHS). In the UK it is often stated that RFR or 5G is safe because measurements are well below the ICNIRP levels. Hardell's work proves that theoretical safety limits are of no use if health damage is caused well within them. He also points out that the pulsed modulation (not continuous) waves from 5G and devices such as smart meters are particularly damaging to health. Yet the government wants to force smart meters on all of us.

James Lin has raised the question of how there can be such 'dissimilar assessments and inferences of the same scientific studies'. For an example of this, let us return to Camp One and look at the World Health Organization EMF Project. This has just produced its long-awaited 12 reviews of the research literature and until the last one, when it was admitted that RFR causes cancer in animals, their reviews played down the harms, except that one on infertility had to be corrected with the admission that RFR does, in fact, affect male fertility. The ICBE-EMF has taken them to task, pointing out serious flaws in several of the reviews. The EMF Project review by Karipdis et al, for example, showed little risk of cancer to humans from RFR, yet astonishingly another review using exactly the same studies showed clear risk to humans.

The issue of different scientists looking at the same studies and coming to different conclusions is described by biophysicist Dr Paul Héroux, in an article published in July this year, as a disagreement between 'officers of (the telecoms) industry and their followers' on the one hand and 'health environmentalists' on the other. He describes examples of the industry withdrawing funding as soon as their own narrative of negligible harm was in danger, and suggests that the industry was not justified in 'publicising its thermalist (heating) agenda with so many governments worldwide'.

Confirmation of the control exerted by the telecoms industry is seen in the WHO EMF Project, whose final conclusions are expected imminently by governments worldwide. Its leader Emilie van Deventer is a member of the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE), which has long prioritised international pro-telecoms lobbying efforts aimed at the WHO. The

EMF Project itself was compromised by conflicts of interests, since it began as a close collaboration between the WHO, ICNIRP and the electric, telecoms and military industries, and was partly financed by industry lobbying organisations. These details and the unsuitable credentials of those involved are described by Dr Lennart Hardell in his [2017 article](#).

ICNIRP's conflicts of interest were highlighted by the [Court of Appeal in Turin](#) when it confirmed the causal link between mobile phone use and cancer. It found ICNIRP-influenced studies to be invalid, the [judges writing](#): 'The Tribunal recognises that telephone industry-funded scientists, or members of the ICNIRP, are less reliable than independent scientists'. Why is this not acknowledged and acted upon by our government?

I believe that the UK Government actively seeks to sweep the issue of health damage from EMFs under the carpet. I [investigated two issues](#) which seem to prove this. The reason must relate to a Government agenda which is much more important to it than public health. Scientists have several times called for more protective safety exposure guidelines and for the health risks to be investigated by telecoms-independent scientists, but instead there is a proliferation of wireless radiation from smart meters, WiFi, Bluetooth, Tetra and phone masts with people using smartphones continuously in public as never before.

Growing mistrust of the WHO, as well as the growing awareness that industry funding and conflicts of interest create bad science, should lead us require the government to recognise the health risks of non-ionising radiation and to take robust action on our behalf. It seems outrageous that the telecoms industry has so much say in matters of public health while scientists and doctors are simply ignored.

 LIKE  COMMENT  RESTACK

Originally posted on



Gillian Jamieson's Substack Gillian Jamieson

Subscribe

Articles on the health effects of the wireless radiation, which now surrounds us all.

© 2025 Patricia Burke

Safe Tech International, PO Box 543, Taneytown, MD 21787

[Unsubscribe](#)

Get the app

 Start writing

From: 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 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 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,
s. 22(1)
west van

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Sunday, September 28, 2025 5:47 PM
To: correspondence
Subject: Batch 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

I am writing in support of maintaining the Batch hospitality operation in West Vancouver. We are long time residents [REDACTED] s. 22(1) the Batch location, and can confirm it is a perfect fit for this locale.

It attracts a positive demographic with music, food and beverage to suit. There are no noise or litter issues but lots of positive feedback from visitors.

Regards

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Tuesday, September 30, 2025 11:51 AM
To: correspondence
Cc: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Subject: the rush for increased density potentially leaving behind empty lots...

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 the Mayor and Council,

The drive for more density in West Vancouver is well intentioned, but the current approach often backfires. Older, more affordable homes are demolished to make way for speculative projects that depend on market conditions. When those projects stall or fail, the community is left with vacant lots, unfinished shells, and fewer homes than before.

4652 Clovelly Walk is a clear example.

- Until 2016, the property held an older home with an addition that could have supported two families.
- It was torn down, sat empty for years, then construction began in 2021 on a 7,500 sq. ft. single home.
- Today, it remains an unfinished shell wrapped in Tyvek, listed “as is” and unsold—even after the asking price dropped from \$5 million to \$3.75 million.

Meanwhile, the same developer has demolished two more homes on Douglas Street in Horseshoe Bay for a proposed nine-unit townhouse project. The full project is on the market for \$6,899,000 or marketed at \$1.689 million per unit. The development is neither affordable nor designed for aging in place.

What the community has right now are three empty lots with no housing on them. Neighbours are left to live beside unfinished and abandoned projects. **That is not increased density—it is lost density.**

This outcome isn’t inevitable—it is a policy choice. By making it easier and faster for residents to improve their own properties, Council could achieve more meaningful and resilient density. Specifically:

- **Streamline approvals** for renovations, secondary suites, and coach houses.
- **Lower permit costs** for resident-led projects.
- **Prioritize resident applications** over speculative developments.

These changes would allow residents to add housing that actually serves the community—secondary suites for renters, income streams for families, and options that let seniors age in place while keeping wealth in the family.

If the goal is to strengthen neighbourhoods and deliver real housing options, the District must ask: *Who benefits most under current regulations—speculative developers or existing residents?*

We urge Council to give residents the tools to be part of the density solution, and to prevent development mistakes that leave behind empty promises, vacant lots, and fewer homes.

Sincerely,

s. 22(1)

West Vancouver, BC

s. 22(1)