

## **COUNCIL CORRESPONDENCE UPDATE TO APRIL 22, 2026 (8:30 a.m.)**

### **Correspondence**

- (1) April 15, 2026, regarding Request for Expedited Building Permit Application Review**
- (2) Gordon Smith Gallery, April 16, 2026, regarding “Art Education, For Life: Speaker Series”**
- (3) 4 submissions, April 17 and 21, 2026, regarding Proposed Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 4985, 2018, Amendment Bylaw No. 5386, 2026 (Ambleside Centre Local Area Plan) (Referred to the April 27, 2026 Public Hearing)**
- (4) April 17, 2026, regarding “New Wall application on Esquimalt Street Development”**
- (5) April 17, 2026, regarding “Freshslice Pizza daily pollution”**
- (6) April 19, 2026, regarding “Oil spill on BPP’s Cypress Village construction site”**
- (7) Memorial Library Board Meeting Minutes – February 18, 2026**

### **Correspondence from Other Governments and Government Agencies**

No items.

### **Responses to Correspondence**

- (8) Senior Manager, Engineering Utilities Planning, Design, and Project Delivery, April 16, 2026, response regarding “Nov. 17 Council Meeting” (Water Utility Update and Proposed 2026 Rates)**
- (9) Parks Maintenance Manager, April 20, 2026, response regarding “Lawson Park Ladies Washroom”**
- (10) Supervisor, Bylaw and Licensing Services, April 21, 2026, response regarding “Freshslice Pizza daily pollution”**

**From:** [Redacted] s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 15, 2026 2:36 PM  
**To:** Permit Request; correspondence; Plans; Jim Bailey; Kevin Spooner; Mark Sager, Mayor  
**Subject:** Request for Expedited Review – Building Permit Application, [Redacted] s. 22(1)

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

Dear Mayor Sager, Mr. Bailey, Mr. Spooner, and Members of Council,

We are tenants of [Redacted] s. 22(1), and following a major fire in [Redacted] s.22(1), our household [Redacted] s. 22(1) [Redacted] s. 22(1) has been displaced for the past [Redacted] s.22(1), living far from our children’s schools and community, and lost nearly all of our belongings in the fire, with no content insurance to recover them. Our landlord has now submitted (or is preparing to submit) a building permit application to restore the home, and we respectfully request that it be reviewed as promptly as possible.

Since the fire, the insurance company has completed site safety measures, and the property is ready for reconstruction. Our landlord has been supportive throughout, including arranging temporary housing, and is working with architects to reinstate the home to its original condition.

We are not seeking special treatment, only that our circumstances be considered where possible. We will provide all required documentation promptly and are available for a pre-application meeting at your convenience.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Warm regards,  
[Redacted] s. 22(1)

[Redacted] s. 22(1)

---

**From:** Gordon Smith Gallery of Canadian Art <info@smithfoundation.ca>  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 16, 2026 4:00 PM  
**To:** correspondence  
**Subject:** Art Education, For Life: Speaker Series

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside the organization from email address bounce-mc.us5\_12301075.10144233-aa983d4ccc@mail6.atl11.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](#)

---

SPEAKER SERIES

**FASHION,  
CULTURAL  
MEMORY,  
AND DESIGN  
AS LIVING  
PRACTICE**



**ART EDUCATION,  
FOR LIFE.**

**SATURDAY, MAY 2 / 1PM**

**IN CONVERSATION**

**WITH REBECCA BAKER-GRENIER**

**Gordon  
Smith  
Gallery**

of Canadian Art

## Designer Rebecca Baker-Grenier in conversation with Meredith Preuss, Executive Director of the Gordon & Marion Smith Foundation

Join designer Rebecca Baker-Grenier in conversation for an afternoon exploring fashion as a form of cultural knowledge, creative inheritance, and contemporary expression. Grounded in regalia-making, material practice, and intergenerational learning, this talk considers how design can carry identity, memory, and responsibility forward. Through a discussion of process, visibility, and the evolving language of Indigenous fashion, the conversation asks what art education makes possible over the course of a life.

RSVP



Works by Rebecca Baker-Grenier. Images by Caroline Miller Photography

Rebecca Baker-Grenier is of Kwakiutł, Dzawada'enuwx, and Słkwxwú7mesh ancestry. She is a multidisciplinary artist with a BA from the University of British Columbia with a Major in the Indigenous Studies Program. Rebecca began fashion design in 2021 and is apprenticing under established Indigenous designer and artist, Himikalas Pam Baker. She completed the Indigenous Couture Residency at the Banff Centre for the Arts and Creativity, 2022. Rebecca debuted her first full collection at New York Fashion Week, September 2022, followed by Vancouver Indigenous Fashion Week. She has presented

her collection at SWAIA Santa Fe Indian Market fashion show, August 2023, Vancouver Fashion Week, 2023, Vancouver Indigenous Fashion Week 2023/ 24, and Indigenous Fashion Arts, Toronto 2024. She was the recipient of the 2021 YVR Emerging Artist award for her fashion design. Her dress, 'Wazulis' was on display at the YVR Vancouver Airport, 2022 and was part of an exhibit at the Museum of Vancouver, 2023. Her cedar and ermine cape was on display at the Bill Reid Gallery, 2023-24 and her vest and skirt 'Held by Generations' is at the Museum for Natural History, New York 2024-25. She was featured in the October 2024 issue of Elle Canada. Her work has also been featured in Vogue and worn on red carpets.

There is an intimate ancestral connection with the art that Rebecca creates, representing her lineage as an Indigenous woman. Rebecca has been creating her personal and families' sewn and beaded pow-wow regalia since the age of eleven. She is the regalia designer for the Dancers of Damelahamid's productions (2016 – present) with her works dancing on national and international stages.

MORE



[View this email in your browser](#)

*Copyright (C) 2026 Gordon Smith Gallery of Canadian Art.*

*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](#)

---

This email was sent to [correspondence@westvancouver.ca](mailto:correspondence@westvancouver.ca)

[why did I get this?](#) [unsubscribe from this list](#) [update subscription preferences](#)

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

---

**From:** ADRA westvan <adrawestvan@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, April 17, 2026 2:09 PM  
**To:** correspondence  
**Subject:** ADRA's Letter to the Minister of Housing - BC Housing Directives  
**Attachments:** Letter to Minister of Housing.pdf

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

Dear Mayor and Council,

Please find attached a copy of a letter ADRA sent to the BC Minister of Housing and Municipal Affairs on April 17, 2026 in response to the recent provincial directives on the Local Area Plan for Ambleside Centre.

Yours truly,

Melinda Slater, Vice-President  
Ambleside & Dunderave Residents Association  
P.O. Box 91641  
West Vancouver, B.C. V7V 3P3

Please do not redact.



## Ambleside & Dundarave Residents Association

[adrawestvan@gmail.com](mailto:adrawestvan@gmail.com)

Ambleside & Dundarave Residents Association  
P.O. Box 91641  
West Vancouver, B.C. V7V 3P3

April 17, 2026

The Honourable Christine Boyle  
Minister of Housing and Municipal Affairs  
Province of British Columbia

Dear Minister Boyle,

### **Re: Objection to Provincial Enforcement of the Draft Ambleside Centre Local Area Plan (LAP)**

On behalf of the Ambleside and Dundarave Residents Association (ADRA), we write to formally and unequivocally object to the Province enforcing the current draft Ambleside Centre Local Area Plan (LAP).

ADRA has been a committed and constructive stakeholder throughout the LAP process. However, despite sustained engagement and repeated submissions, our core concerns—and those of the broader community—remain unaddressed. As such, we cannot support the imposition of this plan in its current form.

At the heart of our objection is a fundamental misalignment between the draft LAP and the long-standing, consistently expressed vision of Ambleside residents. For decades, community studies and consultations have established the importance of preserving and enhancing Ambleside's defining qualities: its small-scale, seaside village charm and its vibrant mix of independent, local businesses. This is not anecdotal—it is supported by years of planning work and reinforced by extensive public engagement, including the Imagine Ambleside initiative, which identified "Charm," "Locality," and preservation of a "Village Atmosphere" as central community priorities. Residents have been unequivocal: growth must enhance, not erase, these defining qualities.

The draft LAP, however, moves in the opposite direction. It introduces excessive height and density along the waterfront and within the commercial village—changes that risk permanently eroding the very character that defines Ambleside. The proposed scale of development threatens sunlight access, public views, and the human-scale streetscape that residents value. Height and density must be reduced to levels that are demonstrably "village appropriate."

Equally concerning is the shift in focus. The primary objective of the Ambleside Centre LAP should be the revitalization and enhancement of the commercial village – not the provision of housing. While housing has a role to play, it must remain secondary in this context, supporting—not driving—village renewal. Instead, **the current plan is disproportionately shaped by previously**

**embedded housing targets that were neither appropriately scrutinized nor supported by the community**, resulting in a plan that prioritizes residential yield over the community's vision for a charming, small, retail-focused waterfront village.

This emphasis is particularly unjustified given that significant residential growth is already accommodated within Ambleside's designated high-density apartment area and is also anticipated for Ambleside's single-family neighbourhoods, not to mention the high-density residential development expected for the Park Royal/Taylor Way corridor. Ambleside's commercial village should not be distorted to absorb residential growth more appropriately located elsewhere.

Compounding these concerns is a **lack of transparency and meaningful public understanding**. Despite repeated requests for information necessary to understand the implications of the plan, residents have been asked to evaluate abstract policies without a clear picture of their real-world impacts. **This undermines informed participation and renders the consultation process fundamentally flawed**. Residents must be able to clearly understand and evaluate what is being proposed, including how it compares to development potential under existing zoning.

In addition to these overarching concerns, ADRA reiterates the following specific issues that must be addressed before any plan can be considered acceptable:

- Comprehensive 3D imaging that illustrates the impact of proposed height and density.
- Building heights must be expressed in absolute measurements (feet or metres), not merely storeys.
- Erosion of future public input – the integration of LAP provisions into the Official Community Plan raises serious concerns about the potential elimination of future public hearings on major developments (e.g., the Fresh Street site). This is unacceptable.
- The role and intent of Community Amenity Contributions require far greater transparency, particularly regarding whether increased density is being used to fund public infrastructure.
- The 1800 block should be returned to a Commercial Zone designation rather than Apartment Zone.
- The former Masonic Hall site should remain zoned for community use, especially in light of anticipated population increases.
- Formal recognition and protection of village character from 13th to 19th Street as a guiding planning principle.

We are also deeply concerned by the process itself. A central issue for ADRA is not only the content of the draft LAP, but the integrity of the process that produced it. Despite extensive engagement activities, the process has too often lacked the transparency, clarity, and responsiveness required for meaningful public participation:

## **Process Concerns – DISTRICT OF WEST VANCOUVER**

### **Difficulty Accessing Core Materials**

The draft LAP itself has been difficult to locate on the District's website and, at times, effectively impossible to find using the site's search function. For a document of this significance, this lack of accessibility is unacceptable. Residents should not have to rely on indirect links or prior knowledge to find and review a plan that will shape their community for decades.

### **Inadequate Visualization and Information**

Residents have repeatedly requested basic tools necessary to understand the implications of the plan—most notably 3D imaging and clear height measurements in feet or metres. These have never been provided. Reviewing abstract policies and storey counts on paper does not allow residents to grasp the real impact on scale, shadowing, and views. Without this, consultation cannot be considered informed.

### **Failure to Incorporate Feedback**

While engagement opportunities were offered, there is a widespread perception that input was not meaningfully incorporated. Core community priorities—preserving village character, limiting building height, and prioritizing small-scale commercial vitality—have remained largely unchanged in successive drafts.

### **Shifting Scope and Predetermined Outcomes**

The process has been constrained by housing targets previously embedded in the Official Community Plan. As a result, the LAP has evolved not as a community-driven vision, but as a mechanism to accommodate those targets. This undermines the credibility of the process and suggests that key outcomes were predetermined.

### **Uncertainty and Delay Impacts**

The draft LAP was presented to the public in May 2025 but failed to achieve broad community support, resulting in a Council stalemate. Since that time Council has provided no direction and the process has effectively stalled. This prolonged uncertainty has left residents, businesses, and property owners in limbo—discouraging investment, delaying improvements, and allowing the future of Ambleside to drift without transparency or accountability.

### **Process Concerns – PROVINCIAL ROLE**

ADRA has serious concerns regarding the Province’s role, particularly as it relates to both process integrity and reliance on flawed inputs:

#### **Reliance on a Flawed Provincial Advisor’s Report**

The Province’s actions appear to have been influenced by a Provincial Advisor’s report that contains deeply troubling and demonstrably unfounded assertions. The report singles out ADRA—a volunteer, non-profit residents’ association—as a primary cause of housing challenges in West Vancouver, including claims that ADRA has contributed to a severe lack of affordable housing, unsustainable population trends, and increased traffic.

Critically, this report was prepared without any engagement with ADRA. At no point were ADRA representatives contacted, interviewed, or given an opportunity to respond to or correct these allegations. Instead, the report relies on unnamed and redacted sources, offering no transparency or accountability for the claims being made. This absence of basic procedural fairness is unacceptable. Assertions of this nature—unsupported, unattributed, and unverified—do not meet any reasonable standard of evidence. They undermine the credibility of the report and call into serious question the rigour, objectivity, and good faith of the process that produced it.

#### **Use of Generalized Narratives to Justify Intervention**

The framing of “NIMBY influence preventing growth” reduces complex planning realities to a simplistic and misleading narrative that is being used to justify top-down intervention. It dismisses legitimate concerns about scale, livability, and community character, and reframes good-faith civic

participation as obstruction. This framing reflects either a wilful disregard for local realities or a fundamental misunderstanding of them – and has been used to advance predetermined, ill-suited policy responses rather than evidence-based solutions.

### **Override of Local Planning and Erosion of Public Trust**

Provincial enforcement of the LAP would override both municipal authority and years of community engagement, setting a troubling precedent. Decisions based on flawed reports and imposed despite sustained public opposition would severely undermine confidence in both provincial and municipal planning processes. Residents have invested significant time and effort in consultations with the expectation that their input would matter; imposing the LAP in its current form would signal that this participation is ultimately inconsequential, eroding trust not only in this process, but in future planning initiatives.

### **One-Size-Fits-All Policy Application**

Ambleside is a unique waterfront village with a distinct history, scale, and identity. Applying broad provincial housing objectives without regard for local context risks irreparable harm. Planning must be responsive to place, not dictated by uniform metrics.

### **Compression of Due Process**

Mandating or accelerating the LAP would bypass the careful review and public deliberation such a consequential plan demands.

### **Undue Influence and the Assumption that Density Equals Affordability**

There is ample evidence that shows increasing density does not, on its own, deliver affordable housing. Instead, increased density often drives up land values, fuels speculation, and results primarily in market-rate or luxury units. The outcome has been rising housing costs alongside declining livability—through congestion, loss of green space, reduced sunlight and views, and added strain on infrastructure.

There is also concern that this direction has been unduly influenced by development industry interests and advocacy groups such as the Urban Development Institute and the Century Initiative, whose objectives do not necessarily align with those of local communities.

Affordability requires targeted, evidence-based solutions—not a singular reliance on density that risks undermining both housing outcomes and quality of life.

### **Infrastructure and Fiscal Disconnect**

The Province is mandating significant increases in residential density without providing the funding or tools needed to support the resulting strain on infrastructure and services (including first responders). Municipal planning is tied to financial capacity, yet local governments have limited taxation powers to meet these demands.

By effectively decoupling development from financial planning, the Province is creating foreseeable harms: overburdened infrastructure, erosion of public safety and community services, and serious financial strain on municipalities—raising concerns about long-term fiscal sustainability. This approach reflects a fundamental failure of coordinated governance and good faith.

In closing, ADRA strongly opposes Provincial enforcement of the current draft LAP. To proceed in this manner would not only entrench a flawed plan but would also legitimize a process built on inaccessible information, inadequate consultation, and reliance on a report that lacks transparency,

fairness, and credibility. We urge the Province to step back, reassess both the plan and the process, and engage in a transparent, evidence-based approach that respects the community and its elected representatives. Anything less would represent a serious failure of process and a profound disservice to Ambleside's residents and businesses.

Yours truly,

Melinda Slater, Vice President  
Ambleside and Dunderave Residents Association (ADRA)

---

**From:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 21, 2026 8:42 AM  
**To:** correspondence  
**Subject:** Submission Regarding the Proposed Ambleside Centre Local Area Plan

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

**Subject: Submission Regarding the Proposed Ambleside Centre Local Area Plan**

Dear Mayor and Council,

Ambleside does not need to be transformed into something new—it needs to be protected for what it already is. It is one of the last remaining areas in West Vancouver that still feels like a true village: walkable, human-scale, and community-oriented. The current proposal risks replacing that character with something far less distinctive and far less livable.

I am writing as a long-term resident and homeowner in Ambleside to provide feedback on the proposed Ambleside Centre Local Area Plan.

I have lived in this community for approximately ten years and chose to invest here because of its unique character—its human scale, walkability, and village-like atmosphere. My home, including its outlook, represents not only a significant financial investment but also an important part of my quality of life. The current proposal, particularly the introduction of multiple buildings up to 14 storeys, would fundamentally alter that experience in ways that are both personal and community-wide.

While I recognize that some level of revitalization along Marine Drive may be appropriate, the scale and approach proposed in this plan are not aligned with the character or needs of Ambleside.

**Loss of Community Character and Village Identity**

Ambleside remains one of the few areas in West Vancouver that retains a genuine village feel. The proposed level of densification risks transforming it into a high-rise environment more akin to large urban centres such as Metrotown, thereby eroding the distinct identity that makes this neighbourhood desirable and unique. Once this character is lost, it cannot be recovered.

A particularly significant concern is the potential loss of Village Square. This is not simply a collection of retail units—it is a valued community gathering place that supports local businesses and fosters social connection. Replacing it with new construction and higher rents will likely displace long-standing local businesses in favour of chain retailers, diminishing both the economic diversity and cultural fabric of the area.

**Impact on Local Businesses and Services**

The plan appears to underestimate the disruption to existing businesses during extended redevelopment. Years of construction will result in noise, dust, and reduced accessibility, likely forcing many small businesses to close permanently.

In addition, the proposed demolition of the area's primary supermarket raises serious concerns. Many residents—particularly seniors—rely on walkable access to essential services. The plan does not clearly address how these needs will be met during what could be a lengthy construction period.

### **Traffic, Parking, and Infrastructure Constraints**

Traffic congestion on Marine Drive is already a daily reality. Increased density without corresponding infrastructure improvements will exacerbate this significantly. Nearby streets, including Duchess Avenue and 14th Street, already experience pressure during school hours, particularly given the proximity of Hollyburn Elementary.

Parking is another major concern. Visitor parking is already limited, and many existing buildings have minimal on-site parking. Without a comprehensive and realistic parking strategy, increased density will result in further strain on surrounding residential streets.

This reflects a broader issue: density is being proposed in advance of the infrastructure required to support it. Transit, traffic management, and parking solutions should be clearly established before—not after—significant increases in population.

### **Mismatch Between Density and Local Context**

According to Statistics Canada, population growth in West Vancouver has been modest compared to the broader Metro Vancouver region. This raises the question of whether large-scale densification of this magnitude is proportionate or necessary.

Additionally, West Vancouver has a limited employment base, with relatively few major commercial or professional sectors. As a result, increasing residential density is likely to increase commuting rather than reduce it, placing further pressure on transportation infrastructure without delivering corresponding local economic benefits.

### **Impacts on Residents and Property Expectations**

Many residents made long-term decisions to purchase homes in Ambleside based on existing zoning, scale, and character. The proposed changes represent a significant shift that could impact property values, views, sunlight, and overall livability.

Beyond financial considerations, there is a human dimension: many residents, including myself, expected to remain in this community long-term and to enjoy it as a stable, livable environment. The proposed scale of development introduces uncertainty and disruption that is difficult to reconcile with those expectations.

### **Impacts on Seniors and Long-Term Residents**

Ambleside is home to many older residents who value its walkability, accessibility, and sense of familiarity. The plan risks displacing long-time renters and making the area less livable for aging residents, particularly if essential services become less accessible during redevelopment and more expensive afterward.

### **Environmental Considerations**

The plan relies heavily on demolition of existing, functioning buildings. This raises concerns about unnecessary waste and environmental impact. Greater consideration should be given to retaining and adapting viable structures rather than replacing them wholesale.

## **A More Balanced Approach**

I am not opposed to change or thoughtful revitalization. However, I would strongly encourage Council to consider a more balanced approach, including:

- Lower-rise development (e.g., mid-rise buildings) that respects the existing scale
- Retention and integration of key community assets such as Village Square
- A phased approach that minimizes disruption to businesses and residents
- Clear infrastructure planning—particularly transit, traffic, and parking—prior to increased density
- Protection of essential services, including accessible grocery options

In summary, the concern is not with revitalization itself, but with the scale and approach currently proposed. As it stands, the plan risks undermining the very qualities that make Ambleside a desirable and livable community.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on this important matter.

Sincerely,  
[Your Name]

Sincerely,

s. 22(1)

s. 22(1)

s. 22(1)

**From:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 21, 2026 9:09 AM  
**To:** correspondence  
**Subject:** Ambleside Centre Local Plan

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

Dear Mayor and Council,

Ambleside does not need to be transformed into something new—it needs to be protected for what it already is. It is one of the last remaining areas in West Vancouver that still feels like a true village: walkable, human-scale, and community-oriented. The current proposal risks replacing that character with something far less distinctive and far less livable.

I have lived in Ambleside for five years, and I own my home here. I chose this community deliberately—for its scale, its character, and its livability. My home, including its view, is a significant part of both my quality of life and my long-term investment. The introduction of multiple 14-storey buildings would fundamentally change that.

I want to be clear—I am not opposed to revitalization. Thoughtful, lower-rise development along Marine Drive could make sense. But the scale and approach proposed in this plan are not right for this community.

One of my biggest concerns is the loss of Village Square. This is not just retail space—it is a community hub. It's where people meet, connect, and support local businesses. Replacing it with new development will almost certainly displace those businesses, as they will not be able to afford higher rents. What we are likely to see instead are chain stores—and with that, a loss of the character that makes Ambleside special.

There is also the impact on essential services. The plan includes the demolition of the area's main supermarket. Many residents—especially seniors—rely on being able to walk there. What happens to them during what could be years of construction? This directly affects people's ability to live independently.

The disruption from construction itself cannot be overlooked. Years of noise, dust, and reduced accessibility will make it extremely difficult for existing businesses to survive. Many will close permanently, and there is no guarantee they will return.

Traffic and parking are already real issues. Marine Drive is frequently congested, and nearby streets, including Duchess and 14th, experience pressure during school hours, particularly with Hollyburn Elementary close by. Increasing density without addressing infrastructure first will only make these problems worse.

Parking is also a major concern. [REDACTED] s. 22(1) parking spaces and no parking on one side of the street due to the school. Visitor parking is already challenging. Without a realistic parking strategy, additional density will place even more strain on surrounding streets.

This leads to a broader issue: density is being proposed before the infrastructure needed to support it is in place. Transit, traffic management, and parking solutions should come first—not after.

There is also a mismatch between the level of density proposed and the local context. According to Statistics Canada, population growth in West Vancouver has been modest compared to the rest of Metro Vancouver. Growth pressure here is not as intense, which raises the question of whether this scale of densification is proportionate.

In addition, West Vancouver has a limited employment base. Most people who live here commute elsewhere for work. Increasing density without increasing local employment opportunities will likely result in more commuting and more traffic—not less.

There is also the question of fairness to existing residents. Many of us made long-term decisions to invest in this community based on its established scale and character. We expected to remain here and to enjoy it as a stable, livable environment. The proposed changes introduce significant impacts to views, sunlight, and overall livability.

Ambleside is also home to many older residents who rely on its walkability and familiarity. The plan risks displacing long-time renters and making the area less accessible and affordable for seniors, particularly if essential services are disrupted or replaced with more expensive alternatives.

From an environmental perspective, the widespread demolition of existing, functioning buildings raises concerns about unnecessary waste. Greater consideration should be given to retaining and adapting viable structures where possible.

Finally, there is the issue of scale. Developments of this height risk transforming Ambleside into something more comparable to Metrotown rather than preserving the village atmosphere that residents value.

In closing, my concern is not with change, but with the scale and approach of this plan. I would strongly encourage Council to consider a more balanced alternative—one that includes lower-rise development, protects key community spaces like Village Square, and ensures that infrastructure is in place before density is increased.

Ambleside is already a successful, livable community. Any changes should build on that success—not replace it.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely

s. 22(1)

---

**From:** s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 21, 2026 10:06 AM  
**To:** correspondence  
**Subject:** My submission to West Vancouver Council re: the Proposed Ambleside Centre Local Area Plan

**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 / My Fellow West Vancouverites,**

Ambleside does not need to be transformed into something new—it needs to be protected for what it already is. It is one of the last remaining areas in West Vancouver that still feels like a true village: walkable, human-scale, and community-oriented. The current proposal risks replacing that character with something far less distinctive and far less livable.

I have lived in Ambleside for ten years, and West Vancouver most all my life, I own my home here. I chose this community deliberately—for its scale, its character, and its livability. My home, including its view, is a significant part of both my quality of life and my long-term investment. The introduction of multiple 14-storey buildings would fundamentally ruin and change that.

I want to be clear—I am not opposed to revitalization. Thoughtful, lower-rise development along Marine Drive could make sense. But the scale and approach proposed in this plan are totally **WRONG** for our community.

One of my biggest concerns is the loss of Village Square. This is not just retail space—it is a community hub. It's where people meet, connect, and support local businesses. Replacing it with new development will almost certainly displace those businesses, as they will not be able to afford higher rents. What we are likely to see instead are chain stores—and with that, a loss of the character that makes Ambleside special.

There is also the impact on essential services. The plan includes the demolition of the area's main supermarket. Many residents—especially seniors—rely on being able to walk there. What happens to them during what could be years of construction? This directly affects people's ability to live independently.

The disruption from construction itself cannot be overlooked. Years of noise, dust, and reduced accessibility will make it extremely difficult for existing businesses to survive. Many will close permanently, and there is no guarantee they will return.

Traffic and parking are already **MAJOR** issues. Marine Drive is frequently congested, and nearby streets, including Duchess and 14th, experience pressure during school hours, particularly with Hollyburn Elementary close by. Increasing density without addressing infrastructure first will only make these problems worse.

Parking is also a major concern. s.22(1) parking spaces and no parking on one side of the street due to the school. Visitor parking is already challenging. Without a realistic parking strategy, additional density will place even more strain on surrounding streets.

This leads to a broader issue: density is being proposed before the infrastructure needed to support it is in place. Transit, traffic management, and parking solutions should come first—not after.

There is also a mismatch between the level of density proposed and the local context. According to Statistics Canada, population growth in West Vancouver has been modest compared to the rest of Metro Vancouver. Growth pressure here is not as intense, which raises the question of whether this scale of densification is proportionate.

In addition, West Vancouver has a limited employment base. Most people who live here commute elsewhere for work. Increasing density without increasing local employment opportunities will likely result in more commuting and more traffic—not less.

There is also the question of fairness to existing residents. Many of us made long-term decisions to invest in this community based on its established scale and character. We expected to remain here and to enjoy it as a stable, livable environment. The proposed changes introduce significant impacts to views, sunlight, and overall livability.

Ambleside is also home to many older residents who rely on its walkability and familiarity. The plan risks displacing long-time renters and making the area less accessible and affordable for seniors, particularly if essential services are disrupted or replaced with more expensive alternatives.

From an environmental perspective, the widespread demolition of existing, functioning buildings raises concerns about unnecessary waste. Greater consideration should be given to retaining and adapting viable structures where possible.

Finally, there is the issue of scale. Developments of this height risk transforming Ambleside into something more comparable to Metrotown rather than preserving the village atmosphere that residents value.

In closing, my concern is not with change, but with the scale and approach of this plan. I would strongly encourage Council to consider a more balanced alternative—one that includes lower-rise development, protects key community spaces like Village Square, and ensures that infrastructure is in place before density is increased.

Ambleside is already a successful, livable community. Any changes should build on that success—not replace it.

***Perhaps while we're at it, you could have the streetlights on Marine Drive synchronized . . . this would increase traffic flow by about 20% !!!***

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

s.  
22(1)

s. 22(1)

West Vancouver, BC

---

**From:** s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Friday, April 17, 2026 5:57 PM  
**To:** correspondence  
**Subject:** New Wall application on Esquimalt Street Development

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 Mayor and Council

I know of no one who lives in an apartment or condo in Ambleide who thinks this is a good idea.

The most obvious reason is congestion. Ambleside apartments are mainly occupied by older people. Older people often need help with housework, medical issues, not to mention having family and friends visit. There is never anywhere for these people to park now. If another 126 units with 200 more people show up, parking will still be a nightmare and a huge nightmare while construction which I was told at April 16 meeting by developer will take 5 to 10 years. I know the new building will have lots of parking, but it won't help those of us who already are there, with many guests and help having to park several blocks away. And it will generate more need for parking in spite of all their new spots. 126 units will wind up with some of their guests on the street, too.

s.22(1) the present Wall building. Between their garbage trucks and ours, moving trucks, deliveries of furniture, it is often not passable now for 10 or more minutes which always seem a lot longer when you are in a hurry. Lane congestion, tot. Also I've witnessed their present tenants using our building's garbage. Not sure why?

This area of Ambleside already has dense population — no one wants a Yaletown. or we'd live there. Even the Vancouver City Council votes down high rises in the Old West End (west of Denman) Most of the buildings in this part of Ambleside were built in the 60ies and 70ies. The infrastructure is designed for that era. Do you recognize that? It has an old character. Marine Drive does need spiffing up, but not the well kept old apartment buildings. Nice, old, well-kept neighbourhood—we don't want it ruined.

That aside, selfish reason like the noise and construction lasting for 5 - 10 years and-- some people losing their view (not me, but those with views paid for them) are factors that can't be ignored. The buildings on Esquimalat and Duchess, Westshore Place all are full of retired people who are home all day. Constant construction noise impacts health. People don't want to spend their last days listening to unnecessary construction.

There was a shortage of rentals in West Vancouver, though not at present, it could happen again Apartment construction should be closer to Park Royal, which has lots of nice new buildings and a different more trendy character.

Eby won't be around forever.

Please consider the residents of Ambleside and turn down the Wall application.

s. 22(1)

---

**From:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Friday, April 17, 2026 6:06 PM  
**To:** correspondence  
**Subject:** Freshslice Pizza daily pollution  
**Attachments:** freshslice5pmballoon.jpg; freshslice4pm.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.

Dear Mayor and Council,

Can you put a stop to Freshslice pizza in Horseshoe Bay and in Ambleside placing at least 4 balloons outside their store each day which consistently blow away and end polluting the nearby ocean.

The Ocean Conservation Society says that balloons are the number 1 cause of death to seabirds. Freshslice is being very irresponsible.

Here is a link to how balloons are bad for wildlife:

BLOCKEDoceanconservation[.]org/be-balloon-aware/BLOCKED

I am often in Horseshoe Bay and I regularly see the freshslice balloons blowing down the street. I have attached a photo of a loose balloon today that had blown across the street and was headed towards the beach. I picked up this balloon to throw it away and it also has a large plastic square attached to it to link it to their post in front of the store.

[REDACTED] s. 22(1) the balloons are outside all of their stores for kids to take, which means that they are replacing these balloons throughout the day and so many of these balloons are ending up in the ocean.

Can West Vancouver City Council please ban the use of balloons for business store fronts in West Vancouver. Freshslice has 200 stores in Canada so they are causing a lot of damage to our environment with their daily balloons at all of their stores.

Thank you for your help.

Best

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)



**From:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Sunday, April 19, 2026 3:07 PM  
**To:** correspondence  
**Subject:** Oil spill on BPP's Cypress Village construction site  
**Attachments:** 1. Oil spill on Mountain Path to Cypress Village - Apr 28 2026.jpeg; 3. Oil spill on Mountain Path to Cypress Village - Apr 28 2026.jpeg; 4. Oil spill on Mountain Path to Cypress Village - Apr 28 2026.jpeg; 5. Location identifying pics re oil spill on Mountain Path to Cypress Village - Apr 28 2026.PNG; 7. Location identifying pics re oil spill on Mountain Path to Cypress Village - Apr 28 2026.jpeg

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

Dear Mayor Sager and West Vancouver District Councillors,

On Saturday, April 18, 2026, [REDACTED] s. 22(1) were hiking the Mountain Path from The Shed Popup parking lot up through the Cypress Village construction zone, and we came across something that concerns us greatly. Just as we turned the first corner of the gravel road and began the steep rise to the paved pathway, we noticed on the west side of the road an oil slick that seemed to be oozing into the ditch from the area above, and seemingly trickling down into the creek that runs on the west side of the road, and from there presumably into the ocean!

[REDACTED] s. 22(1) and we are sincerely hoping that they will check on this situation immediately and take steps to mitigate the damage. We're also hoping that you will have someone follow up this concern on behalf of all us North Shore citizens.

I have attached photos of the slick and the surrounding area to help locate it.

Sincerely

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



Virus-free [www.avast.com](http://www.avast.com)









**WEST VANCOUVER MEMORIAL LIBRARY BOARD**

**MINUTES**

**February 18, 2026, 7:00 p.m.**

**Welsh Hall**

**Present:** A. Krawczyk [Chair], A. Basco, S. Dennis, A. Donovan (virtual), B. Hafizi (virtual), H. Kaart, P. Morris, A. Nimmons, S. Sanajou, D. Taylor, S. Thompson, T. Wachmann

**Regrets:** E. He

**Staff:** S. Hall, S. Barton-Bridges, S. Gill, S. Dale

**1. Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order at 7:15 p.m.

**2. Land Acknowledgement**

**3. Approval of Agenda**

Moved by: P. Morris  
Seconded by: H. Kaart

THAT the Agenda be approved.

CARRIED

**4. Approval of Consent Agenda**

Moved by: A. Basco  
Seconded by: T. Wachmann

THAT the Consent Agenda be approved.

CARRIED

**5. Business Arising from Minutes**

None.

## 6. Chair Update

### A. Krawczyk provided the following updates:

- Reminded trustees to submit their longer bios to S. Dale at their earliest convenience.
- Mentioned that the social gathering with the Foundation, Board, and Senior Team previously scheduled for Thursday, February 19, 2026, will be rescheduled, likely before the April AGM.
- Spoke to the process of the Director's evaluation. The HR Committee will meet with S. Hall to discuss.
- Reminded trustees of Steph's February 23, 2026 presentation to Council and encouraged their attendance in support.

## 7. Director

### a) Update

Please see report attached report from the Director.

### b) Operating Stats

S. Hall provided an update to the Board on user statistics and highlighted the following:

- The physical circulations stats seem back on track after the re-opening of the Mezzanine, though we do just have one month of data.
- Adult attendance is expected to decline this year, following a one-time increase in 2025 driven by the Robin Wall Kimmerer event.
- Staff are monitoring bot traffic and think a seeming jump in virtual visits could be related.

### c) Provincial Libraries Grant Report 2025

S. Hall advised that the annual grant report is a required element for receiving provincial funding. Provincial funding is important to the library, both operational and one-time, so it's important to provide accountability. Provincial staff have asked us not to send supplemental materials.

Moved by: D. Taylor  
Seconded by: H. Kaart

THAT the Board approve the grant report for submission.

CARRIED

8. Governance

None.

9. Strategy

a) DRAFT 2026 Business Plan

S. Hall provided an overview of the Draft Business Plan and outlined the goals for 2026. She advised that she will report on the progress of these goals throughout the year once the plan has been finalized and approved.

Moved by: S. Sanajou

Seconded by: S. Thompson

THAT the 2026 Business Plan be approved.

CARRIED

10. Finance

a) Proposed Revised 2026 Operating and Capital Budget Submission

S. Gill highlighted that after the November 2025 Board meeting, the salary budget figures have been slightly updated based on the most recent 2026 labour model provided by District Finance. The total salary changed from \$5,255,587 to \$5,255,709 resulting in an adjustment to the District's contribution.

Moved by: B. Hafizi

Seconded by: A. Nimmons

To approve the proposed revised 2026 Operating Budget in principle, 2026 One-Time Initiatives, 2026 Capital Budget along with rankings, and the 2027-2036 Capital Forecast for submission to the District.

CARRIED

11. Infrastructure Committee

D. Taylor reported on the following projects:

**1. Heating System Upgrade**

New electric boilers have been ordered, and radiators are currently being

[4]

evaluated. Equipment lead times are not yet available; however, the contractor has advised that replacement of all radiators with high efficiency versions and replacement of the existing gas boilers with electric boilers will be completed by summer 2026.

**2. Concrete Work on Rooftop**

We have received a quote to replace the pavers on the rooftop parking lot with poured concrete and are awaiting structural engineer review and approval. The work will likely occur in spring 2026.

**3. Youth Area Design**

The concept layout for the Youth area has been completed and MGA has provided a feasibility report as well as an updated cost estimate and renderings. These documents have been reviewed with the Infrastructure Committee and have been shared with the Board.

**4. Skylight Replacement**

The tender for the library skylight replacement was posted on February 6th and closes March 3rd. Site visits have commenced with interested contractors. Once a contractor is selected, the work is expected to commence in late spring/summer 2026.

**12. InterLINK**

No report.

**13. BCLTA**

No report.

**14. Arts & Culture Advisory Committee**

A. Krawczyk mentioned that the District of West Vancouver has launched a Community Space Database as part of its Arts & Culture Strategy (2025-2029) to make finding, viewing, and booking local spaces for arts, culture, and community events more transparent and accessible. This initiative serves as a central, online, and interactive database where users can identify available venues across the municipality. The development of this database aligns with the District's broader efforts to improve the infrastructure and availability of spaces for the arts and culture community. The library's spaces are listed.

**15. Engagement Committee**

[5]

T. Wachmann thanked Trustees for their involvement in preparing and engaging in the coffee meetings with Councillors. She asked that they email a brief update on their meetings to her and common themes will be recorded.

#### 16. Council Update

S. Thompson reported on the following on behalf of S. Thompson:

- Pay parking is proving controversial and will be discussed at Monday's Council meeting. Concerns were raised about limiting it to Ambleside, with a need for a comprehensive plan from Ambleside to Dundarave. A workshop is scheduled for tomorrow to further discuss.
- Evolve E-Bikes has expanded to West Van, with 16 parking stations now across the municipality. Some of those spots include popular areas like Ambleside Park, the West Vancouver Aquatic Centre and Dundarave.
- A federal infrastructure grant is expected to open shortly.
- An update on the Horseshoe Bay Boat House is expected shortly.
- The Provincial budget includes two major components affecting the District: a 50% increase to the Additional School Tax (AST) and the removal of the lower-interest property tax deferral rate, which many seniors rely on to remain in their homes.

#### 17. New Business

None.

#### 18. Date of Next Meeting

Wednesday, April 15, 2026, 7 p.m.

#### 19. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:57 p.m.

All documents distributed at the meeting are available for perusal upon request.

s. 22(1)

Andy Krawczyk  
Chair, West Vancouver Memorial Library Board

---

**From:** Engineering Department  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 16, 2026 12:09 PM  
**To:** s. 22(1)  
**Cc:** Engineering Department; correspondence  
**Subject:** District of West Vancouver Engineering Enquiry s. 22(1) - - Clarification to Water Utility Rates Report to Council (Response)

Hello s. 22(1)

Thank you for your feedback. The Engineering Department has begun work on utility rate setting for the 2027 year. Apologies for the delayed response; however, I wanted to ensure you had this information in advance of the 2027 rate-generation process being presented to the public.

There are two distinct methodologies by which year over year increases and the impacts to rate payers is expressed, and the differences stem primarily from the billing structures and consumption patterns associated with the two land-use types.

The methodology used to calculate the figures referenced is outlined in the Council report titled "*Water Utility Update and Proposed 2026 Rates*," available at the link below, see section 7.1, page 11.

### [Report](#)

As described in the report, the **average** multi-family amount is calculated by dividing the total estimated 2026 revenues from multi-family buildings by the total number of multi-family units.

For single-family households, the figures represent the **median** estimated charge. The median reflects the midpoint of all single-family bills—meaning half of households will see an increase above this amount and half will see an increase below it. The median is used for single-family homes because a small number of very large properties have exceptionally high water use, which can skew the average and make it less representative of a typical household.

Please reach out if additional clarification would be helpful.

Regards,

Fatemeh Mansoori, Senior Manager, Engineering Utilities Planning, Design, and Project Delivery  
Engineering and Transportation Services | District of West Vancouver  
[engineeringdept@westvancouver.ca](mailto:engineeringdept@westvancouver.ca) | 604-925-7020

**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)

---

**From:** Kevin Woodhouse  
**Sent:** Monday, April 20, 2026 9:40 AM  
**To:** s. 22(1)  
**Cc:** correspondence  
**Subject:** Lawson Park Ladies Washroom

Dear s. 22(1)

Thank you for bringing your concerns regarding the condition of the John Lawson Park washroom to our attention.

The District treats reports of this nature seriously and appreciates being made aware of issues affecting public facilities. The washrooms are serviced by a contracted cleaning provider, and staff have followed up directly with the contractor in response to your correspondence. A deep cleaning was completed last week.

In addition, due to increased park usage associated with the early arrival of spring weather, the John Lawson Park washrooms will transition to the high-season service schedule earlier than originally planned to ensure service levels align with demand.

Thank you again for taking the time to contact the District.

Sincerely,

**Kevin Woodhouse**  
Parks Maintenance Manager  
Parks, Culture, and Community Services | District of West Vancouver  
t: 604-925-7137 | c: 604-314-9719 | [westvancouver.ca](http://westvancouver.ca)



We acknowledge that we are on the traditional, ancestral, and unceded territory of the [Sḵwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw](#) (Squamish Nation), [səl̓ílwətaʔ](#) (Tseil-Waututh Nation) and [xʷməθkʷəy̓əm](#) (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:** Wednesday, April 8, 2026 1:26 PM  
**To:** correspondence  
**Subject:** Lawson Park Ladies Washroom

**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.

**Complaint:**

The toilet floor was flooded and filthy, toilets not flushed, the whole ceiling covered in cobwebs and the skylight was also covered in grime. It needs a crew in to refresh cosmetically. Put me in mind of a third world country! Please visit this facility, as soon as? And someone should be fired. Thank you.

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

**From:** Alisha Rafi  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 21, 2026 2:44 PM  
**To:** s. 22(1)  
**Cc:** correspondence  
**Subject:** Fresh slice Pizza Daily Pollution- Response

Good afternoon,

I am the receipt of your correspondence and will respond in my capacity as Bylaw and Licensing Services Supervisor. Thank you for taking the time to bring your concerns forward. Please note The District of West Vancouver Sign Bylaw states:

Section 7.2: Without restricting or limiting the generality of the foregoing, the following signs are specifically prohibited:

*7.2.2: "Banners, pennants, bunting, flags (other than patriotic flags), balloons, or other inflatable devices, other than Temporary Service Event Signs."*

As balloons are prohibited under this bylaw, a file has been created and assigned to a Bylaw Officer for investigation.

If you have any further questions or inquiries, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Regards,

**Alisha Rafi**  
Supervisor, Bylaw and Licensing Services  
District of West Vancouver  
t: 604-921-3410 | [westvancouver.ca](http://westvancouver.ca)



We acknowledge that we are on the traditional, ancestral, and unceded territory of the [Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw \(Squamish Nation\)](#), [səlilwətał \(Tsleil-Waututh Nation\)](#) & [xʷməθkʷəyəm \(Musqueam Nation\)](#). We recognize and respect them as nations in this territory, as well as their historic connection to the lands and waters around us since time immemorial. *Learn more about each of these Nations; click each name to visit their official website*

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

**From:** [REDACTED] s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Friday, April 17, 2026 6:06 PM  
**To:** correspondence  
**Subject:** Freshslice Pizza daily pollution  
**Attachments:** freshslice5pmballoon.jpg; freshslice4pm.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.

Dear Mayor and Council,

Can you put a stop to Freshslice pizza in Horseshoe Bay and in Ambleside placing at least 4 balloons outside their store each day which consistently blow away and end polluting the nearby ocean.

The Ocean Conservation Society says that balloons are the number 1 cause of death to seabirds. Freshslice is being very irresponsible.

Here is a link to how balloons are bad for wildlife:

BLOCKEDoceanconservation[.]org/be-balloon-aware/BLOCKED

I am often in Horseshoe Bay and I regularly see the freshslice balloons blowing down the street. I have attached a photo of a loose balloon today that had blown across the street and was headed towards the beach. I picked up this balloon to throw it away and it also has a large plastic square attached to it to link it to their post in front of the store.

[REDACTED] s.22(1) the balloons are outside all of their stores for kids to take, which means that they are replacing these balloons throughout the day and so many of these balloons are ending up in the ocean.

Can West Vancouver City Council please ban the use of balloons for business store fronts in West Vancouver. Freshslice has 200 stores in Canada so they are causing a lot of damage to our environment with their daily balloons at all of their stores.

Thank you for your help.

Best

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

