

COUNCIL CORRESPONDENCE UPDATE TO JUNE 24, 2026 (8:30 a.m.)

Correspondence

- (1) 48 submissions, June 11-23, 2026 and undated, regarding Proposed: Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 4985, 2018, Amendment Bylaw No. 5460, 2026; Zoning Bylaw No. 4662, 2010, Amendment Bylaw No. 5461, 2026; Phased Development Agreement Authorization Bylaw No. 5462, 2026; and Development Permit 21-051 (Inglewood Care Centre) (Referred to the June 23, 2026 Public Hearing)**
 - (2) 8 submissions, June 13-20, 2026, regarding Batch Ambleside**
 - (3) 8 submissions, June 18-22, 2026, regarding Proposed Heritage Alteration Permit 24-090 (4798 The Highway) (Referred to the June 22, 2026 regular Council meeting)**
 - (4) 3 submissions, June 22-24, 2026, regarding Proposed: Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 4985, 2018, Amendment Bylaw No. 5465; Zoning Bylaw No. 4662, 2010, Amendment Bylaw No. 5466, 2026; and Development Permit 26-012 (1552 Esquimalt Avenue) (Referred to the June 29, 2026 Public Hearing)**
 - (5) 3 submissions, June 19-23, 2026, regarding North Shore Wastewater Treatment Plant Program**
 - (6) June 21, 2026, regarding “Bylaw enforcement on Spirit Trail?”**
 - (7) D. Marley, June 21, 2026, regarding “Council Remuneration and Expenses Policy - Item 11 on Monday’s Council Agenda”**
 - (8) June 22, 2026, regarding “Canyoning in Cypress Creek”**
 - (9) June 23, 2026, regarding “FORMAL STATEMENT OF GRIEVANCE AND CLARIFICATION”**
 - (10) June 24, 2026, regarding Sirens Installed by Lawson Creek**
 - (11) Memorial Library Board Meeting Minutes – April 15 and May 20, 2026**
- Correspondence from Other Governments and Government Agencies**

No items.

Responses to Correspondence

No items.

June 11, 2026

Mayor and Council, DWV

750 17th Street, West Vancouver BC V7V 3T3

Re: Support for Redevelopment of Inglewood Care Centre

Dear Mayor and Council,

My husband was born and raised on the North Shore and we have lived in West Van s.22(1) years. Due to s.22(1)

, but with severe after effects and not enough to live without care. I, s. 22(1), have been his care aide s.22(1) years and now he resides at Inglewood lodge.

The long waits to qualify for a bed on the North Shore and near my home were of huge significance to me because of my own health issues and the threat of my s. 22(1) being placed in the first available space which could have been far from my home. A multilevel care facility in West Van where couples can reside together even if they have vastly different care needs from independent to long term care such as is in our case.

Care needs on the North Shore are increasing while the care beds are not. I support the proposed redevelopment of Inglewood Care Centre.

Inglewood remains the only publicly funded long-term care community in West Vancouver. Inglewood Care Centre represents an important opportunity to help address this need. It will replace aging infrastructure with a modern, purpose-built community that better reflects today's standards of care. In addition to renewing existing long-term care capacity, the project will help restore some of the care capacity lost in West Vancouver while providing a range of housing and supportive living options designed to meet the diverse needs of seniors as they age.

I encourage Council to support this proposal and help ensure that seniors in West Vancouver have access to the care and housing they need, close to family, friends, and the community they know and love.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

s. 22(1)

Date: June 13, 2026

Mayor and Council
District of West Vancouver
750 17th Street
West Vancouver, BC V7V 3T3

Re: Support for the Redevelopment of Inglewood Care Centre

Dear Mayor and Council,

My connection to the North Shore, and the Inglewood community:

I am **s. 22(1)** have owned and lived in West Vancouver since the 1970's, raised a child who has gone to schools: **s. 22(1)** My child is **s. 22(1)** yrs. old, and works for **s. 22(1)**.

This project is important to me personally because:

*For the last years I have lived in a studio apt. in Ambleside and the rent is most of my pension! [without extra care/meals/social] I also know that it will not be long that I too will require some type of care.
This is extremely needed and there is not any place for us to go if we want to stay in the community we have contributed to and we love.*

This re-development is extremely important for people that are in my situation!

Comment [D1]:

I support the proposed redevelopment of Inglewood Care Centre. West Vancouver has experienced a significant loss of long-term care capacity over the last five years with the closure of West Vancouver Care Centre and Capilano Care Centre. At the same time, the number of older adults in our community continues to grow.

Today, Inglewood remains the only publicly funded long-term care community in West Vancouver and is reaching the end of its expected lifespan. This reality creates urgent and growing pressure on seniors, families, and the healthcare system as demand for long-term care continues to increase while local care capacity remains limited.

The redevelopment of Inglewood Care Centre represents an important opportunity to help address this need. It will replace aging infrastructure with a modern, purpose-built community that better reflects today's standards of care. In addition to renewing existing long-term care capacity, the project will help restore some of the care capacity lost in West Vancouver while providing a range of housing and supportive living options designed to meet the diverse needs of seniors as they age.

As West Vancouver plans for the future, it is essential that adequate housing and care options exist to support an aging population. Projects such as the redevelopment of Inglewood Care Centre are an important part of ensuring our community can meet these needs in the years ahead.

I encourage Council to support this proposal and help ensure that seniors in West Vancouver have access to the care and housing they need, close to family, friends, and the community they know and love.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Name: s. 22(1) _____

Community of Residence: Ambleside, West Vancouver, BC

Or/ Organization: s. 22(1) _____

Email or Tel: [REDACTED] _____

Signature: [REDACTED] _____

From: s. 22(1)
Sent: Sunday, June 14, 2026 3:06 PM
To: correspondence
Subject: Redevelopment - Baptist Housing Inglewood Care Centre

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.

I understand this proposed redevelopment is scheduled for Public Hearing in the near future. Although not a resident of West Vancouver, as a concerned BC senior I would like to express my support for this proposed project and in particular with its expanded capacity, and updating, for vital senior's housing.

s. 22(1) resided for almost five years in an independent living facility operated by Baptist Housing. Prior to applying s. 22(1) explored most all (over twenty) of the available local services; both profit and non-profit. Having ten years' experience, at the Board level s.22(1) combined with extensive (over forty years) career experience supervising/managing s.22(1)

Baptist Housing was, in our opinion, light years ahead of the local alternatives with their services and focus on senior independence. Their systems of safety, services and activities were well organized and, again in our opinion, the "leader" in the field. Facility design was very good and has survived well with the passage of time (this facility operating almost 20 years). As well maintenance and accommodation of various mobility needs is excellent. Resident input into operations is welcome and responded to in very prompt order. Being a non-profit operator monthly fees are considerably below their profit focused competition.

With respect to this project's proposed expansion of capacity, I trust Council is aware of BC's Seniors Advocate serious concerns regarding the lack of long-term care spaces for BC's growing seniors' population. As such this proposal will assist in addressing this startling issue and Baptist Housing should be complimented for, once again, stepping up to the plate to help. Additionally, the "campus of care" concept (apartments, independent living, long term care) is a bonus for those who have increasing care needs - as such this is more than nice, it is ideal.

Thank you for allowing me to comment on this unique and valuable proposal for redevelopment of the Inglewood Care Centre.

From: Kirsten Allenberg <kallenberg@baptisthousing.org>
Sent: Tuesday, June 16, 2026 10:49 AM
To: correspondence
Subject: Inglewood Care Center
Attachments: District of West Vancouver.zip

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the organization from email address kallenberg@baptisthousing.org. 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 find the attached letters sent in regarding Inglewood Care Center.

Warm regards,

Kirsten Allenberg
Vice President Marketing & Communications
Baptist Housing

BLOCKEDbaptisthousing[.]orgBLOCKED

Baptist Housing gratefully acknowledges that we serve and care for seniors in our communities located throughout the ancestral, traditional, and unceded territories of First Nations and Metis in the Okanagan Valley, Interior, Southern Vancouver Island, and the Lower Mainland.

This email is confidential and may be privileged. If you have received this email in error please delete it and inform the sender immediately. Unauthorized distribution or use is strictly prohibited and may result in penalties and/or damages.



Lynne Block, MLA
West Vancouver-Capilano

June 2, 2026

To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing in support of the proposed redevelopment of Inglewood Care Centre in West Vancouver.

Across the North Shore, the need for seniors housing and long-term care continues to grow as our population ages. Many older adults wish to remain in the communities where they have built their lives, close to family, friends, services, and support networks. Ensuring that appropriate housing and care options are available locally is therefore an increasingly important priority for our region.

West Vancouver in particular is home to a large and growing senior population. As housing needs evolve and care requirements become more complex, communities benefit from thoughtful investments that expand options for older adults at every stage of aging. Developments that bring together independent living, rental housing, and long-term care can help create a continuum of support that enables seniors to maintain independence while accessing additional services when needed.

The proposed renewal of the Inglewood site represents an opportunity to strengthen that continuum of care and housing on the North Shore. Modern, accessible facilities designed to meet today's standards can help ensure seniors receive high-quality care in environments that support dignity, well-being, and community connection. At the same time, additional housing options for older adults can help address a growing demand for age-friendly homes within the community.

Projects that increase housing choice for seniors also provide benefits that extend beyond older adults themselves. Families gain greater peace of mind knowing their loved ones can remain close to home, and communities are strengthened when residents are able to age in place and continue contributing to local life.

I appreciate Baptist Housing's longstanding commitment to serving seniors and their efforts to respond to the evolving needs of our communities. As we look ahead to the future of the North Shore, investments in seniors housing and care infrastructure will play an important role in supporting healthy, connected, and resilient communities.

Sincerely,

Lynne Block, MLA
West Vancouver–Capilano
Sincerely,



Lynne Block
MLA, West Vancouver-Capilano
Legislative Assembly of British Columbia
l.block@leg.bc.ca | 604.981.0050

June 4, 2026

Via Email

Mayor Mark Sager and Council
District of West Vancouver
750 17th Street
West Vancouver, BC. V7V 3T3

Dear Mayor Sager and Council,

Re: Development Proposal for Inglewood Care Centre

My name is [REDACTED] s. 22(1). I am a West Vancouver resident, a senior, and a [REDACTED] s. 22(1) professional who has spent more than a decade working [REDACTED] s. 22(1) across Canada.

I am not affiliated with Baptist Housing on this project. I am writing because I am deeply concerned about what is happening in our community and what will happen if we do not act.

You have already taken an important step by advancing this proposal to Public Hearing. Thank you.

Now I ask you to finish the job.

Because this is not simply a development decision. **This is a critical infrastructure decision.**

A demographic wave we cannot stop:

In 2021, West Vancouver had approximately **6,785 residents aged 75+.**

- By 2026: ~7,700
- By 2031: ~8,950
- Within a decade: **10,000+**
[Source: Stats Can]

That is nearly a **50% increase** in the population most likely to need care.

This is not gradual.

This is a demographic wave and we are already in it.

And yet, we are structurally unprepared.

Today, across the entire District of West Vancouver, we have:

- Approximately **1,489 total seniors housing and care units** - including market and non-market housing
- Of those, only **422 are actual care resources**:
 - 135 assisted living
 - 57 memory care
 - 230 long-term care

[Sources: Amica, Vancouver Coastal Health, District of West Vancouver]

So, let's be clear about what this means - even at the broadest level:

We have housing for only one in seven seniors.

$$\frac{10000}{1489} \approx 6.7$$

And when we focus on actual care:

That drops to just one care space for every twenty-four seniors.

$$\frac{10000}{422} \approx 23.7$$

Let that sink in.

One in seven can find a place to live.

Only one in twenty-four can access the care they will eventually need.

That is not a gap.

That is a system failure in plain sight.

And if you think people will simply be cared for at home - they won't:

Home care is already under pressure across British Columbia.

We are facing:

- workforce shortages
- limited care hours
- growing waitlists
- and increasing reliance on exhausted family caregivers

[Sources: Office of BC Seniors Advocate, BC Care Providers Association, Canadian Occupational Projection System]

And here is the reality:

Home care does not replace long-term care - it depends on it.

Without sufficient care beds in our community:

- seniors remain at home longer than is safe
- families burn out
- emergency calls increase
- hospital admissions rise
- and West Vancouver seniors will have to find care elsewhere

So, the idea that people can simply “age in place” at scale is not a plan. It is a hope and a dangerous one.

But this is not just about capacity, it is about quality of care

Long-term care is not simply a place to live. It is a care environment designed to support people safely and consistently.

In a long-term care residence:

- staff are on-site, coordinated, and available 24/7
- care is consistent and team-based
- residents benefit from continuity, monitoring, and immediate response

By contrast, aging at home often means:

- fragmented care
- multiple, changing caregivers
- gaps between visits
- and increasing isolation

So, this is not just about where care happens.

It is about **how care is delivered and whether it is safe, stable, and dignified.**

The system is already showing signs of failure:

Across British Columbia, delayed access to long-term care contributes to hospital capacity pressures as seniors who no longer require acute care remain in hospital awaiting more appropriate placements. This phenomenon, often referred to as Alternate Level of Care occupancy, is well documented across Canada's health-care system. The situation is also described as **blocked beds**, and when that happens:

- surgeries are delayed
- emergency care backs up
- the entire system strains – for all ages

This is already happening, and the pressure is only increasing.

According to British Columbia's Office of the Seniors Advocate, there is currently a 2,000-bed shortfall, and that **gap is projected to widen by over 700%**, reaching a projected demand of **16,000 long-term care beds by 2035/36**. Some industry professionals warn that this crisis will mount even faster - within 5-10 years.

That means competition for:

- funding
- staffing
- and delivery capacity

If we delay projects like Baptist Housing's application to redevelop the Inglewood Care Centre then understand that:

**We are not getting a better version later.
We risk losing this opportunity entirely.**

Moreover, recent suspension of funding for long term care projects by the Provincial Government must serve as a clarion call for Council to expedite the entitlement process for this project.

Traffic cannot outweigh care:

I have heard the concerns about traffic and parking.

I drive Taylor Way daily.

From both lived experience and professional data:

- staff shifts avoid peak hours
- most staff use transit [Approx. 80% of staff use transit per Amica Senior Lifestyles]
- residents rarely drive [Approx. 11% of Independent Living Residents on the Lower Mainland drive per Amica Senior Lifestyles]

Even the District's own analysis shows minimal impact:

- 1-2 additional vehicles per minute at peak
- and no material impact on intersection performance

So, let's be clear:

**This is not a traffic problem.
This is a care crisis.**

What this project delivers

- 364 long-term care beds
- 161 seniors rental homes
- 200 independent living units
- a full continuum of care

This is exactly what this community needs.

The decision before you:

The alternative is not neutral. It is:

- longer waitlists
- more blocked hospital beds
- more families in crisis
- and seniors going without care

The alarms have been sounding for years.

Council, this is your moment to secure a profound legacy.

You have the data.

You have the need.

You have the opportunity.

Please approve this project. Expedite it. Get it built.

Because delay is not harmless.

It has a human cost.

Respectfully,

s. 22(1)

West Vancouver, BC

s. 22(1)

Date: June 5, 2026 _____

Mayor and Council
District of West Vancouver
750 17th Street
West Vancouver, BC V7V 3T3

Re: Support for the Redevelopment of Inglewood Care Centre

Dear Mayor and Council,

My connection to the North Shore, and the Inglewood community:

I am writing for the second time to support the development of the Inglewood Site. I used to live on Sentinel Hill and know the site is remote from surrounding residential homes and is the perfect location for the project.

This project is important to me personally because:

It gives me great comfort that the Baptist Group have the experience to develop this site and the vision for the future need of our ageing population.

I support the proposed redevelopment of Inglewood Care Centre. West Vancouver has experienced a significant loss of long-term care capacity over the last five years with the closure of West Vancouver Care Centre and Capilano Care Centre. At the same time, the number of older adults in our community continues to grow.

Today, Inglewood remains the only publicly funded long-term care community in West Vancouver and is reaching the end of its expected lifespan. This reality creates urgent and

growing pressure on seniors, families, and the healthcare system as demand for long-term care continues to increase while local care capacity remains limited.

The redevelopment of Inglewood Care Centre represents an important opportunity to help address this need. It will replace aging infrastructure with a modern, purpose-built community that better reflects today's standards of care. In addition to renewing existing long-term care capacity, the project will help restore some of the care capacity lost in West Vancouver while providing a range of housing and supportive living options designed to meet the diverse needs of seniors as they age.

As West Vancouver plans for the future, it is essential that adequate housing and care options exist to support an aging population. Projects such as the redevelopment of Inglewood Care Centre are an important part of ensuring our community can meet these needs in the years ahead.

I encourage Council to support this proposal and help ensure that seniors in West Vancouver have access to the care and housing they need, close to family, friends, and the community they know and love.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Name: [redacted s. 22(1)]

Community of Residence: [redacted s. 22(1)] West Vancouver

Or/ Organization: [redacted s. 22(1)]

Email or Tel: [redacted s. 22(1)]

Signature: [redacted s. 22(1)]

Dear Mayor and Council.

I am writing again, to support the Development Proposal for Inglewood Lodge and enclose my previous letter of support.

I am a retired [REDACTED] s. 22(1) and had my own [REDACTED] s. 22(1) for more than 40 years. I have participated in the rezoning process across the lower mainland literally hundreds of times, including many West Vancouver, North Vancouver City and District rezonings.

I have seen many Councils (including predecessors to this one) wrestle with very difficult decisions as they balance the needs of the community with the changes to the community that these needs demand.

Luckily, this is not the case in this rezoning.

As my previous support letter pointed out, it is seldom that you get a significant rezoning application that has so little direct impact on the character and traffic patterns of a community.

I hope Council takes advantage of this opportunity to provide the North Shore with the much needed facilities outlined in the application.

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

West Vancouver, BC.

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

INGLEWOOD LODGE

Dear Mayor Booth and Members of Council

I am writing to strongly support the Development Proposal for Inglewood Lodge. As a practicing [REDACTED] s. 22(1) in multiple rezoning projects across the Lower Mainland and have seldom seen a development that fulfills so many community needs with such little impact on the area it serves.

[REDACTED] s. 22(1) approved many residential applications when [REDACTED] s. 22(1) [REDACTED] and have an awareness of the impact developments can have on our District residential areas.

I am sure Council recognize the need for a development mix of this kind and that others will address this in detail. I can only add my voice in support of the need for close in affordable employee housing in combination with desperately needed affordable senior care to replace the declining supply. When government funding and low parking needs are added to the equation, it only leaves the location of the project as an issue.

I lived on Sentinel Hill for almost [REDACTED] s.22(1) years and passed the proposed site on almost a daily basis. It would be difficult to find a more appropriate site for higher density than this corner of Taylor Way and the Trans-Canada Highway. The project will have minimal impact on the immediate residential area and even less impact on the rest of the Municipality. The height of the development is controlled; the highest buildings barely appear above the adjacent tree canopy. The traffic impact will be minimal, given the very limited driving needs of the residents. Seniors and local employees can be well served by existing public transportation.

It's not often a rezoning project comes along that offers the advantages of this particular application and I hope Council see fit to grant approval.

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

West Vancouver, BC

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

June 8, 2026

Mayor and Council
District of West Vancouver
750 17th Street
West Vancouver, BC V7V 3T3

Re: Support for the Redevelopment of Inglewood Care Centre at 725 Inglewood Avenue and 721, 725, 733, and 735 Burley Drive

BC Housing, through BC Builds, is pleased to express its support for the proposed redevelopment at 725 Inglewood Avenue and 721, 725, 733, and 735 Burley Drive in West Vancouver.

The proposed redevelopment represents an important opportunity to respond to the growing demand for seniors' care, housing, support services and middle-income rental and below market rental in West Vancouver and across British Columbia.

BC Housing and Baptist Housing have entered a Letter of Intent reflecting our shared commitment to advancing this project. Through BC Builds, BC Housing is working collaboratively with Baptist Housing to support the delivery of the proposed 161-unit purpose-built rental housing component within one of the phases of the overall development proposal and to advance the project through the BC Builds mandate. This mandate will not be achievable without a successful municipal approval for the proposed redevelopment that would facilitate BC Builds approval processes for financing and funding.

The seniors rental housing component aligns with the objectives of the BC Builds Rental Supply Program, which is designed to increase housing options for middle-income households. The project is anticipated and targeted to provide approximately 80% of units at market rents and 20% of the units at 20% below market rates.

BC Housing intends to seek approval through its applicable approval processes to assist with the project's financing and an equity contribution, currently estimated at up to \$34.8 million, alongside Baptist Housing's committed minimum equity contribution of up to \$24.4 million which is contingent on a redevelopment proposal that is feasible and supported by the municipality. The BC Builds program provides for an allocation of a provincial capital grant of up to \$225,000 per residential unit.

The project is currently progressing through the municipal rezoning process, which represents a critical milestone in enabling the project to advance to the next stage of provincial review and funding consideration as well as preliminary approval processes that are subject to approval by BC Builds approving authorities. As BC Builds overall \$950 Million grant funding is currently funded by the Province, for a 5-year period from 2024 to 2029, formal applications for funding under the BC Builds program must be approved and committed within the current funding window and made within 18 months of groundbreaking, which is currently estimated to be summer 2030. Otherwise, funding would need to be redeployed to other priority projects and there is no guarantee that additional equity funding will be received from the Province after the 5-year period should there be a delay.

BC Housing recognizes the importance of timely progress and believes this redevelopment has the potential to make a meaningful contribution to addressing housing and care needs in West Vancouver. We respectfully request Council to support the rezoning application and help advance this project that will provide significant long-term benefits for current and future residents of West Vancouver.

We look forward to continuing our collaboration with the District of West Vancouver, Baptist Housing and other project partners as the project advances through municipal and provincial approval processes.

Sincerely,

s. 22(1)

Raymond Kwong
Associate Vice President – BC Builds

Date: June 10, 2026

Mayor and Council
District of West Vancouver
750 17th Street
West Vancouver, BC V7V 3T3

Re: Support for the Redevelopment of Inglewood Care Centre

Dear Mayor and Council,

My connection to the North Shore, and the Inglewood community:

I have s. 22(1) at Inglewood.

This project is important to me personally because:

I fully support the updating of this very important Care Facility. This project will provide Facilities and therefore by extension care for more seniors. It will be built to the latest building codes including seismic and fire preventive technologies.

I support the proposed redevelopment of Inglewood Care Centre. West Vancouver has experienced a significant loss of long-term care capacity over the last five years with the closure of West Vancouver Care Centre and Capilano Care Centre. At the same time, the number of older adults in our community continues to grow.

Today, Inglewood remains the only publicly funded long-term care community in West Vancouver and is reaching the end of its expected lifespan. This reality creates urgent and growing pressure on seniors, families, and the healthcare system as demand for long-term care continues to increase while local care capacity remains limited.

The redevelopment of Inglewood Care Centre represents an important opportunity to help address this need. It will replace aging infrastructure with a modern, purpose-built community that better reflects today's standards of care. In addition to renewing existing long-term care capacity, the project will help restore some of the care capacity lost in West Vancouver while providing a range of housing and supportive living options designed to meet the diverse needs of seniors as they age.

As West Vancouver plans for the future, it is essential that adequate housing and care options exist to support an aging population. Projects such as the redevelopment of Inglewood Care Centre are an important part of ensuring our community can meet these needs in the years ahead.

I encourage Council to support this proposal and help ensure that seniors in West Vancouver have access to the care and housing they need, close to family, friends, and the community they know and love.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Name: s. 22(1) _____

Community of Residence: s. 22(1) _____

Or/ Organization: _____

Signature: s. 22(1) _____

June 16, 2026

Re: VCH Support for Proposed Inglewood Redevelopment

Dear Mayor and Council,

I am writing to you on behalf of Vancouver Coastal Health (“VCH”) to express strong support for Baptist Housing’s redevelopment proposal for 725 Inglewood Avenue, the site of the Inglewood Care Centre.

As a regional health authority, VCH promotes healthy lives in healthy communities and is committed to caring for everyone, including those who require long-term care services. On the North Shore, VCH currently funds 230 long-term care beds at Inglewood Care Centre that are owned and operated by Baptist Housing, a non-profit organization that has been providing quality seniors housing and care in British Columbia for more than 60 years. VCH, Ministry of Health, and Ministry of Housing and Municipal Affairs [supported the purchase](#) of this property by Baptist Housing in 2020.

The proposed redevelopment of the Inglewood Care Centre represents a significant opportunity to expand local long-term care capacity at a time when demand for these services is growing. According to the [Office of the Seniors Advocate](#), the number of people waiting to be admitted to long-term care in B.C. rose by 200 per cent over the last decade, and the number of seniors aged 75 and older in the province is projected to increase by 49 per cent by 2035.

VCH and Ministry of Health are committed to adding more long-term care capacity to the public health system. On the North Shore, we are supporting Baptist Housing’s proposal to redevelop the Inglewood Care Centre which will replace the existing 230 long-term care units and add an additional 134 units, for a total of 364 publicly subsidized units. While Baptist Housing is responsible for the cost of redeveloping the site, VCH and Ministry of Health have approved and committed funding that will subsidize the cost of operating the long-term care beds.

VCH deeply values its ongoing partnership with Baptist Housing and the District of West Vancouver. We appreciate Mayor and Council’s consideration of this redevelopment proposal, and the opportunity to advocate for this important health-care initiative.

Sincerely,

s. 22(1)

Sean Parr
Associate Vice President, Corporate Services
Vancouver Coastal Health

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Wednesday, June 17, 2026 10:28 AM
To: correspondence
Cc: Renew Inglewood
Subject: Support for Redevelopment of Inglewood Care Centre
Attachments: Support Letter Redevelopment of Inglewood Centre [REDACTED] s.22(1) 2026 June.docx

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,

Please refer to the attached Support Letter for the Redevelopment of Inglewood Care Centre in regard to the Public Hearing that is coming up on June 23.

Warm Regards,

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

June 16, 2026

Mayor and Council
District of West Vancouver
750 17th Street
West Vancouver, BC V7V 3T3

Support for the Redevelopment of Inglewood Care Centre

Dear Mayor and Council,

I am writing to express my strong support for the proposed redevelopment of Inglewood Care Centre.

As a longtime resident of West Vancouver and [REDACTED] s. 22(1) [REDACTED] firsthand knowledge of the important role this facility plays in caring for seniors and vulnerable members of our community.

I see everyday the need for modern, high quality and affordable long term care spaces.

At the same time, two long term care facilities have closed in recent years in West Vancouver (West Vancouver Care Centre and Capilano Care Centre) resulting in Inglewood Care Centre to becoming the only remaining publicly funded long term care centre in our community.

The redevelopment is a necessary investment in the future of West Vancouver community. It will provide a more dignified accommodations which will meet the modern standards of care.

The project is also personally important to me. As my father ages and [REDACTED] s. 22(1) [REDACTED] he will be in need of long-term care accommodation in the future.

He is an example of the many future seniors who could remain in the community they know and love in close proximity to their families.

I respectfully encourage Council to support this important project for the benefit of current and future residents, families and healthcare workers.

Inglewood employees who reside in West Vancouver, proudly work at the Inglewood because it allows [REDACTED] s. 22(1) own community while remaining close to [REDACTED] s. 22(1) and families.

Thank you for your service to our wonderful community, which we are very privileged to be able to live and work in. None of us knows what the future may bring. Our circumstances can change in an instant and one of us or our loved ones may one day need a room and care at Inglewood Care Centre.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Resident of West Vancouver

June 17, 2026

Mayor and Council
District of West Vancouver
750 17th Street
West Vancouver, BC V7V 3T3

Re: Support for the Redevelopment of Inglewood Care Centre

Dear Mayor and Council,

I grew up in West Vancouver and have returned to live here for s.22(1) years. I rarely weigh in on municipal issues formally. However, I'm inclined to write in support of the redevelopment at the Inglewood Care Centre.

I strongly believe that the proposed redevelopment is critically needed here. With the closure of West Vancouver Care Centre and Capilano Care Centre, there is already a lack of long-term care spaces in this community. Adding to the crisis, the population here will keep on aging and thus creating a greater demand. Moreover, Inglewood Care Centre – the only publicly funded long-term care community in West Vancouver – is reaching the end of its expected lifespan. So the council cannot not waste this opportunity to bring on a much-needed improvement that addresses an urgent crisis with dedicated senior care service.

Furthermore, there are few new affordable options for seniors looking for independent living with support services in West Vancouver. Combined with the high proportion of older adults living in this community. Those folks might not have the option to stay in this community. So, the Council's decision might, in effect, forcing seniors to leave the district.

Understandably, there are concerns about redevelopment. As someone who are regularly frustrated by traffic around Taylor Way and accessing either bridge crossings, I can appreciate the concern about how this development would impact traffic. Yet, this cannot be framed as a binary, redevelopment vs. traffic decision. Both issues need to be addressed. But this community cannot sacrifice an important solution for the sake of another critical priority.

The crisis of the moment and the opportunity to build something better demand us to support the redevelopment proposed for Inglewood Care Centre. This might not be an easy choice. But it's a necessary one. This project will help ensure that seniors in West Vancouver have access to the needed care and housing in the community they know and love. So I encourage Council to support this proposal and not be distracted by further distractions or digressions.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

s. 22(1)

s. 22(1) / Glenmore Neighbourhood, West Vancouver

s. 22(1)

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Thursday, June 18, 2026 7:33 AM
To: correspondence
Subject: Letter of support for Redevelopment of Inglewood Care Centre
Attachments: Letter of support for redevelopment of Inglewood Care Centre june 16, 26.docx

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,
Please see my letter of support which is attached.

Best regards,

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

Date: June 18,2026

Mayor and Council
District of West Vancouver
750 17th Street
West Vancouver, BC V7V 3T3

Re: Support for the Redevelopment of Inglewood Care Centre

Dear Mayor and Council,

My connection to the North Shore, and the Inglewood community:

Have been a resident of West Vancouver since [redacted] s. 22(1), after retiring and moving west from [redacted] s. 22(1). Currently living [redacted] s. 22(1) in Ambleside.

This project is important to me personally because:

I recognize the need to have more LTC beds in our community- to replace those lost from the closure of other facilities and to accommodate the growing number of seniors in our community. Not all seniors are going to need LTC beds, but we need to have facilities in our community for those who do.

My experience with LTC is with [redacted] s.22(1) who within a year of becoming a widow, required a move from her own home into a LTC home with supports necessary for a [redacted] s.22(1).

While I am fortunate to have children living in the Sea-to-Sky area who could help me if needed, I know that not all seniors are so fortunate.

At a time, when the provincial government, has paused funding on more LTC beds, I think we need to proceed with this project which has funding and before building costs increase even more.

We also need more housing options in West Vancouver and this project will provide those as well as the necessary LTC beds.

As West Vancouver plans for the future, it is essential that adequate housing and care options exist to support an aging population. Projects such as the redevelopment of Inglewood Care Centre are an important part of ensuring our community can meet these needs in the years ahead.

I encourage Council to support this proposal and help ensure that seniors in West Vancouver have access to the care and housing they need, close to family, friends, and the community they know and love.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Name: s. 22(1) _____

Community of Residence: West Vancouver _____

Email or Tel: s. 22(1) _____

Signature: _____

From: Roy Reichgeld <rreichgeld@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 18, 2026 12:07 PM
To: Peter Lambur; Christine Cassidy; Nora Gambioli; Linda Watt; Scott Snider; Mark Sager, Mayor; correspondence; Sharon Thompson
Cc: Roy Reichgeld
Subject: Inglewood Care Centre Redevelopment, June 23 Public Hearing

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

June 18, 2026

Attention: Mayor and Council

Re: Inglewood Care Centre Redevelopment, June 23 Public Hearing

I am writing requesting that the Mayor and Council reject the application for redevelopment of this property as submitted.

I am for the additional Long Term Care beds as there is a need for them.

I am against the large towers along Taylor Way. Taylor Way is already a traffic problem without adding that many residences.

I'm also concerned that they have requested the Development Permit be open for a period of 10 years. This leaves us not knowing what we will end up with on the site.

Please reject this application as submitted.

Regards

Roy Reichgeld
1058 Keith Road

Please do not redact

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Thursday, June 18, 2026 2:56 PM
To: correspondence
Cc: Mark Sager, Mayor; Nora Gambioli; Christine Cassidy; Peter Lambur; Scott Snider; Sharon Thompson; Linda Watt
Subject: Support letter for publicly funded seniors housing
Attachments: WestVan Letter_of_Support Seniors Care Centre.pdf

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 attaching my support letter for the development of the Inglewood Seniors Care Centre.

Regards,
[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

Date: 14 June 2026

Mayor and Council
District of West Vancouver
750 17th Street
West Vancouver, BC V7V 3T3

Re: Support for the Redevelopment of Inglewood Care Centre

Dear Mayor and Council,

My connection to the North Shore, and the Inglewood community:

We previously owned property in the Glenmore area and spent much time there. We think that there is a great need for these types of accommodation and that West Vancouver could set an example for other municipalities in providing for their aging population.

This project is important to me personally because:

If this project comes to fruition, we would seriously consider buying a unit in the complex for ourselves.

I support the proposed redevelopment of Inglewood Care Centre. West Vancouver has experienced a significant loss of long-term care capacity over the last five years with the closure of West Vancouver Care Centre and Capilano Care Centre. At the same time, the number of older adults in our community continues to grow.

Today, Inglewood remains the only publicly funded long-term care community in West Vancouver and is reaching the end of its expected lifespan. This reality creates urgent and growing pressure on seniors, families, and the healthcare system as demand for long-term care continues to increase while local care capacity remains limited.

The redevelopment of Inglewood Care Centre represents an important opportunity to help address this need. It will replace aging infrastructure with a modern, purpose-built community that better reflects today's standards of care. In addition to renewing existing long-term care capacity, the project will help restore some of the care capacity lost in West Vancouver while providing a range of housing and supportive living options designed to meet the diverse needs of seniors as they age.

As West Vancouver plans for the future, it is essential that adequate housing and care options exist to support an aging population. Projects such as the redevelopment of Inglewood Care Centre are an important part of ensuring our community can meet these needs in the years ahead.

I encourage Council to support this proposal and help ensure that seniors in West Vancouver have access to the care and housing they need, close to family, friends, and the community they know and love.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

s. 22(1)

Community of Residence:

Or/ Organization:

s. 22(1)

Email or Tel:

s. 22(1)

Signature:

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Thursday, June 18, 2026 4:50 PM
To: correspondence
Subject: Proposed rezoning of 725 Inglewood Avenue and 721, 725, 733, and 735 Burley Drive.

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

To: Mayor and Council of West Vancouver,

We believe it is essential for the rezoning to be approved by the West Vancouver Mayor and Council so that the proposed expansion of Inglewood Care Home can take place.

In West Vancouver the wait time, now for a place in an affordable Care Home, is unacceptable. And as our population continues to age, and the need for affordable institutional care increases, we think it is alarming that our West Vancouver Council, would block the ability for a new, expanded and updated Inglewood Care Home to be built.

Please approve the proposed rezoning now!

Your sincerely,

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

From: M Slater <melroy1058@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 18, 2026 10:17 PM
To: correspondence
Cc: Mark Sager, Mayor; Christine Cassidy; Nora Gambioli; Peter Lambur; Scott Snider; Sharon Thompson; Linda Watt
Subject: Inglewood Care Centre Redevelopment Proposal.
Attachments: Inglewood Priority Questions.docx; Inglewood Development Proposal Questions.docx

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the organization from email address melroy1058@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,

I am writing regarding the Inglewood Care Centre redevelopment proposal.

There are many unanswered questions about this project, a significant number are fundamental to understanding its scope, impacts, and justification. I have attached a concise set of priority questions for ease of review, along with a comprehensive list that provides context and detail.

These are not minor or technical points. They go directly to the heart of whether this proposal is appropriate, proportionate, and ready to proceed.

It is difficult to see how this proposal can be considered sufficiently complete, or sufficiently understood, to justify advancing when key information cannot, or has not, been provided. Given that Council is ultimately responsible for determining whether this proceeds, it is reasonable to expect that residents' substantive questions be addressed *prior* to the public hearing. If that standard cannot be met, it calls into question whether the proposal is ready to move forward at all.

Clarity on how any remaining gaps in information will be treated in the decision-making process is also necessary, including how unresolved issues will factor into Council's consideration of the proposal.

The proposal is being advanced in a form that does not allow for meaningful adjustment to its key elements. As a result, Council and residents are placed in an "all-or-nothing" position: accept the project in full, or reject it entirely, without the ability to resolve legitimate concerns in a constructive way. **Residents should not be forced to choose between "accept the entire project" and "lose the long-term care beds."**

To be clear, the real question is not whether long-term care is needed. The need is urgent and widely recognized, and I strongly support the expansion of publicly funded Long-Term Care (LTC). The real question is whether this particular proposal — with its

scale, density, traffic impacts, infrastructure demands, financial concessions, and the extent of ancillary housing — is the best way to deliver those beds.

The urgency of the need for long-term care (or the appeal of Provincial funding) should not be used as a reason to limit scrutiny of the broader proposal. Because long-term care is so important, it is essential that it be delivered in the best possible way. Supporting long-term care and asking critical questions about this proposal are not contradictory positions.

The principal public benefit is the replacement and expansion of LTC beds. But is approving 725 units to obtain a net increase of 134 long-term care beds a sound and proportionate decision?

It is entirely reasonable to support the care beds while also asking whether there is a better, less impactful, and more financially transparent way to achieve them. Indeed, several alternative approaches merit further consideration, including:

- Approving the publicly funded LTC component independently of the additional residential development;
- Reducing the scale of the non-care residential portions while still delivering the LTC beds;
- Requiring full transparency on the purpose, affordability, and necessity of the additional residential units;
- Exploring phased delivery of the LTC facility to accelerate care beds while allowing further review of remaining components; and
- **Directly assessing whether alternative configurations or additional public funding could deliver the same care outcomes with fewer impacts on traffic, infrastructure, and neighbourhood character.**

The need for long-term care is not in dispute. What remains in dispute is whether a 725-bed-and-unit development is the only — or best — way to deliver 364 publicly funded long-term care beds. Before Council approves a project of this magnitude, residents deserve a clear understanding of why the additional residential components are necessary, what affordability commitments they provide, and whether less intensive alternatives have been adequately explored.

Given the scale and long-term impact of this proposal, proceeding without resolving these issues risks undermining public confidence in the outcome.

Accordingly, I respectfully ask Council to:

- Clarify how the project's public benefits are being weighed against its impacts, trade-offs, and costs,
- ———Ensure that residents' substantive questions are addressed prior to the Public Hearing,
- Consider the extent of any unresolved issues or unanswered questions in determining whether the proposal is ready to proceed; and
- Evaluate whether separating or deferring the **non**-Long-Term Care components would allow for a more thorough and constructive review.

Thank you for your time and careful consideration of this matter.

Sincerely,

Melinda Slater
1058 Keith Road
West Vancouver

Please do not redact

Inglewood Care Centre Redevelopment Proposal

Priority Questions

1. Is the scale of the project truly necessary?

Is the scale justified by care needs or financing?

1. Could the long-term care (LTC) beds be delivered with a smaller project or less market housing?
2. What is the primary driver of the scale—care need or financial requirements?
3. Were lower-height or lower-density alternatives evaluated, and if so, why rejected?

2. Is the financial case transparent and credible?

Is the project economically justified?

1. Has a financial feasibility analysis been provided and will it be made public?
2. Has a comparison been done of LTC-only vs. partial vs. full project—why were alternatives rejected?
3. What is the total project cost and how is it financed?

3. Are the seniors' housing units needed?

Does the project include unnecessary components?

1. What evidence supports the need for 161 seniors rental units?
2. Were vacancy rates, waitlists, and comparable projects analyzed?
3. Are these units driven by demand or by financial viability?

4. What is the total public subsidy—and is it fair?

1. What is the total value of all subsidies (DCC and CAC waivers, tax exemptions, etc.)?
2. Who benefits vs. who pays (including non-local residents)?
3. Why is this project receiving exemptions when others do not?

5. Is provincial funding conditional on approving the full project?

1. Will LTC funding be lost if only the care component is approved?
2. Is there documented proof of this condition?
3. Has full funding for all phases been secured?

6. What happens if later phases fail?

1. Is the project financially structured in phases, and do later phases fund earlier ones?
2. What happens if Phase 2 is delayed or never built?

3. What safeguards prevent land resale after rezoning?

7. Will the continuum of care actually work?

Does the “campus of care” concept work in practice, or is it theoretical?

1. Are there guaranteed transitions between independent living, assisted living, and LTC?
2. Will on-site residents get priority access to LTC beds?
3. What happens if no bed is available?

8. What are the long-term financial and infrastructure impacts?

Will this project create long-term fiscal strain?

1. Will DCC waivers reduce infrastructure funding or delay projects?
2. Can water/sewer systems handle this **and future growth**?
3. Will tax revenues offset the subsidies over time?

9. Why is Council being asked to decide without information?

Decisions should not be made with incomplete or withheld information.

1. Why is parking not finalized before approval?
2. Why hasn't the Transportation Impact Assessment been released?
3. Why were public concerns and assumptions not included in reports?

Inglewood Care Centre Redevelopment Proposal

1. Project Need and Justification

1. What level of development is required to achieve the stated care objectives?
 - a. Could the principal public benefit (long-term care beds) be delivered through a smaller-scale project?
 - b. Could the care objectives be achieved with a reduced amount of market housing?
2. Which components of the proposal are essential to achieving the stated care objectives, and which are primarily intended to support the project's financial model?
3. What is the primary driver of the proposed scale—identified care needs or financial requirements?
4. Which components of the proposal are essential to achieving the stated care objectives, and which are primarily intended to support the project's financial model?
 - a. Is the inclusion of 161 seniors' rental units supported by demonstrated housing need, or are these units primarily required to make the project financially viable?
5. Has Council been provided with a financial feasibility analysis demonstrating why the proposed density, height, and market-housing components are necessary to deliver the long-term care expansion?
 - a. If so, will this analysis be made publicly available?
6. Can Baptist Housing provide a financial feasibility comparison between:
 - a LTC-only redevelopment;
 - a LTC + reduced housing redevelopment; and
 - the proposed full project?
 - If those alternatives were evaluated, why were they rejected?
7. Were lower-height or lower-density alternatives evaluated?
 - a. What specific options were considered, and why were they rejected?
8. What evidence supports the need for 161 additional seniors rental units?
 - a. Why was this number selected instead of alternatives (e.g., 50, 75, or 100 units)?
9. Has demand for the 161 seniors rental units been validated using empirical data from comparable developments?
 - a. Were occupancy rates, vacancy levels, and wait-list data analyzed for North Shore providers (e.g., Kiwanis Housing, Capilano Lions Housing, other non-profits)?
 - b. Will this data be made publicly available?
10. What is the anticipated geographic distribution of residents?
 - a. How many are expected to come from West Vancouver versus elsewhere on the North Shore or in Metro Vancouver?
11. Why is a 10-year Phased Development Agreement (PDA) needed for the later phases, and what assurances exist that the later phases will proceed as proposed?
12. If Phase 1 is completed, does the PDA permit Phase 2 to be delayed for many years while retaining the approved zoning and density?
13. Were alternative community-serving uses for the site evaluated by the District?
 - a. For example, urgent care or other health services versus seniors rental housing?
 - b. How do these alternatives compare in meeting identified community needs?

14. What plans are in place for the redevelopment or reuse of the former Capilano Care Centre site and the former West Vancouver Care Centre on 27th Street?
 - a. To what extent are these sites being considered to accommodate new or expanded seniors' care or housing?
15. Has the District looked at how Creekstone Care in North Van was built and financed and how it compares to Baptist's proposal?

2. Financing and Public Subsidies

1. What is the total estimated cost of the redevelopment, and how will it be financed?
2. What is the estimated construction for the proposed 200 rental housing units considering recent increases in construction costs?
3. What safeguards or commitments are in place to ensure that the Phase 2 property will not be sold after rezoning, given the potential increase in land value?
4. What funding commitments have been secured to date, and from whom (e.g., Baptist Housing, Vancouver Coastal Health, Province of BC, BC Housing, debt financing sources)?
5. Is the \$4 million in waived Community Amenity Contributions (CAC) for Phase 1 or for the entire project?
6. What is the estimated dollar value of the Metro Vancouver and TransLink Development Cost Charge (DCC) waivers being sought?
7. What is the total value of all DCC waivers and exemptions being requested from Metro Vancouver, TransLink, and the District of West Vancouver combined?
8. If those waivers are granted, who ultimately bears the cost of the infrastructure that those DCCs would otherwise fund?
9. Will Phase 2 (Assisted Living and Seniors Rental Housing) be given permissive tax exemptions similar to the long-term care component?
10. What is the dollar value of the total public subsidy being provided to the project through fee waivers, tax exemptions, grants, and publicly funded infrastructure?
11. Is the project financially structured in phases?
 - a. Will later phases be required to fund earlier phases?
 - b. What are the risks if future phases are delayed or not completed?
12. What will Baptist do with the property if the project is rejected?
13. How does the public funding and subsidy package proposed for Inglewood compare with the public funding model used for Creekstone and other recently approved long-term care facilities?

3. Provincial Funding

1. Is there evidence that Provincial funding is contingent on approval of the entire development (including the seniors' rental and independent living components) and will this be made public?

2. Has funding been secured for both Phase 1 and Phase 2, or only for the LTC component? (Has Phase 1 been fully funded independently?)
3. If the LTC component alone were approved, would Provincial funding for the 364 LTC beds be withdrawn? If so, please provide the documentation supporting that position.
4. Has Vancouver Coastal Health and the Ministry of Health formally committed to funding and operating all 364 proposed LTC beds, and will that commitment be made public?
5. Has Council been provided with a finalized capital funding agreement, provincial commitment letter, published dollar amount of provincial funding, or a detailed breakdown of who pays for what portion of the care facility?

4. Community Impact of Public Subsidies

4.1 Who Benefits vs. Who Pays

1. Who are the primary beneficiaries of the public subsidies (e.g., residents, operator, private partners), and how is this benefit quantified?
2. To what extent do West Vancouver taxpayers subsidize residents who may come from outside the municipality?
3. How does the level of subsidy compare to comparable projects elsewhere in Metro Vancouver?

4.2 Impact on Local Services and Infrastructure

1. What is the financial impact on District services and infrastructure budgets resulting from foregone Development Cost Charge (DCC) revenues?
2. Will the loss of DCC revenue delay or reduce planned infrastructure investments (e.g., transportation, utilities, parks)?
3. Are there any service-level impacts (e.g., capacity, maintenance timelines) associated with these foregone revenues?

4.3 Equity and Fairness

1. How does this subsidy align with the District's equity objectives, particularly given varying income levels among residents?
2. Why is this project being granted exemptions when other developments are required to pay full DCCs and taxes?
3. What criteria were used to determine that this project merits public subsidy over other potential community priorities?

4.4 Opportunity Cost

1. What alternative uses of these funds or forgone revenues were considered, and what are the trade-offs?

2. Could the same level of public investment deliver greater community benefit if allocated differently (e.g., affordable housing, infrastructure, community amenities)?

4.5 Housing Affordability Outcomes

1. How do the subsidies translate into measurable affordability outcomes for residents (e.g., reduced rents, increased accessibility)?
2. Is there any requirement or mechanism to ensure that public subsidies result in long-term affordability commitments?

4.6 Accountability and Conditions

1. What conditions or performance requirements are attached to the subsidies (e.g., affordability levels, service provision)?
2. Are there clawback provisions if the project does not deliver the anticipated public benefits?
3. How will the District monitor and report on whether the subsidized benefits are actually achieved over time?

4.7 Long-Term Financial Implications

1. What are the long-term fiscal impacts (positive or negative) of the subsidies on the District's finances?
2. Will the project generate sufficient future tax revenues or economic benefits to offset the initial subsidies?

5. Utility Servicing

1. Will the utility modelling analysis be made public?
2. What assumptions regarding occupancy, water demand, and future growth were used in the model?
3. Did the analysis account for future growth anticipated under Provincial housing directives, the Taylor Way corridor, and Park Royal redevelopment?
4. Did the analysis include climate-change and drought scenarios?
5. Can the District's water system accommodate this project and anticipated future growth without requiring significant future infrastructure upgrades?
6. What off-site sewer upgrades are required, what is their cost, and who will pay for them?
7. Are any future water-system upgrades expected as a result of cumulative growth in the area, even if none are required for this project alone?

6. Staffing and Operations

1. Have Vancouver Coastal Health or the Ministry of Health confirmed that sufficient nurses, care aides, and support staff will be available to operate all 364 long-term care beds?

2. Has a staffing needs assessment been completed?
 - a. Will it be made publicly available?
 - b. Does it identify any risks related to staffing availability?

7. Continuum of Care

1. Does the proposal provide a complete and integrated continuum of care, or are there identifiable gaps between independent living, assisted living, and long-term care?
2. Will residents of the Independent Living and Seniors Rental Housing components receive priority or preferential access to publicly funded LTC beds, or will they join the standard Vancouver Coastal Health wait list?
3. What formal agreements exist with Vancouver Coastal Health regarding transitions between housing and care levels within the proposed Campus of Care?
4. If no LTC bed is available on-site when a resident requires care, what happens to that resident?
5. Can the applicant provide verifiable evidence from comparable campuses demonstrating that residents successfully transition through the continuum of care as described?
 - a. What proportion of residents follow this pathway in practice?
6. What percentage of future LTC residents are anticipated to originate from the on-site housing components versus external referrals?
7. What happens if a resident can no longer afford the Independent Living or Seniors Rental Housing component?
 - a. Does the model provide any mechanism to maintain continuity of residence?

8. Traffic and Parking

1. Why is Council being asked to approve the project before parking allocations among residents, staff, and visitors have been finalized?
2. Will the full Transportation Impact Assessment (TIA) and supporting parking analysis be made publicly available?
 - a. Will these materials be released prior to any approval decision?
3. What assumptions underpin the transportation and parking analysis?
 - a. Vehicle ownership rates
 - b. Visitor parking demand
 - c. Staff parking demand
 - d. Service and delivery traffic
4. Does the TIA account for cumulative growth in the surrounding area?
 - a. Taylor Way corridor
 - b. Park Royal redevelopment
 - c. Provincial housing initiatives
5. What contingency measures are in place if actual parking demand exceeds projections?
 - a. Where would overflow parking be accommodated?

9. Construction Impacts

1. How many years is each phase of construction expected to last?
2. When is Phase 2 expected to be completed?
3. What impacts are anticipated for neighbouring residents during construction?
 - a. Noise, dust, vibration
 - b. Traffic disruption and access
 - c. Impacts to adjacent long-term care residents
4. Will a Construction Management Plan be prepared and made publicly available prior to approval?

10. Planning and Neighbourhood Character

1. Why was the Inglewood site not included in the Taylor Way Local Area Plan process?
2. How does this proposal align with the long-term planning vision for the Taylor Way corridor and surrounding neighbourhoods?
3. What precedent could approval of this project establish for future building height and density in the area?
4. What are the anticipated built-form impacts?
 - a. Shadowing
 - b. Privacy and overlook
 - c. Transition to adjacent residential areas
 - d. Overall neighbourhood character

11. Public Engagement and Transparency

1. What changes were made to the proposal in response to feedback from the December 9, 2025 Public Information Meeting?
 - a. Please identify specific revisions tied to key concerns (e.g., traffic, parking, project scale, pedestrian safety, construction impacts, process transparency)
2. What was the rationale for not conducting District-led public engagement and instead relying on applicant-led engagement and who made that decision?
3. How has the District assessed the completeness and objectivity of applicant-led engagement?
4. What methods were used to inform residents who did not attend the December 9, 2025 meeting of subsequent revisions to the proposal, and how was the effectiveness of those methods evaluated?
5. Why were responses to public concerns not included in the Council report?
6. Why were detailed parking demand assumptions not included in the Council report?
7. Why was the Transportation Impact Assessment not included in the publicly available materials?

8. Will the District release the full consultation record?
 - a. Including feedback submissions, questions raised, applicant responses, and any “What We Heard” summary

12. Seniors Advocate

1. Was the BC Office of the Seniors Advocate consulted during the development or review of this proposal?
 - a. If so, what recommendations, concerns, or feedback were provided?
2. If the Office of the Seniors Advocate has not reviewed this proposal, does the District intend to seek their assessment?
 - a. Including potential impacts of prolonged adjacent construction on long-term care residents.

From: Kirsten Allenberg <kallenberg@baptisthousing.org>
Sent: Friday, June 19, 2026 9:08 AM
To: correspondence
Subject: Inglewood Care Center
Attachments: 2026.06.13 Letter of Support s.22(1).pdf; 2026.06.16 Letter of Support s.22(1).pdf

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the organization from email address kallenberg@baptisthousing.org. 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 find the attached letters for Inglewood Care Center.

Kirsten Allenberg
Vice President Marketing & Communications
Baptist Housing

BLOCKEDbaptisthousing[.]orgBLOCKED

Baptist Housing gratefully acknowledges that we serve and care for seniors in our communities located throughout the ancestral, traditional, and unceded territories of First Nations and Metis in the Okanagan Valley, Interior, Southern Vancouver Island, and the Lower Mainland.

This email is confidential and may be privileged. If you have received this email in error please delete it and inform the sender immediately. Unauthorized distribution or use is strictly prohibited and may result in penalties and/or damages.

June 13,2026

Mayor and Council
District of West Vancouver
750 17th Street
West Vancouver, BC V7V 3T3

Re: Support for the Redevelopment of Inglewood Care Centre

Dear Mayor and Council,

My connection to the North Shore, and the Inglewood community:

As a North Shore resident and full time [REDACTED] s. 22(1) for [REDACTED] s. 22(1) years, I have had witness firsthand the care, dedication, compassion and professionalism [REDACTED] s.22(1) resident in care.

Inglewood plays a vital role in providing a person-centered care to [REDACTED] s.22(1) and individuals who requires complex support in a respectful and dignified environment. Through collaboration of the multidisciplinary team [REDACTED] s.22(1) achieve the best care possible and enhances their community life.

Beyond supporting seniors in their daily routines, [REDACTED] s.22(1) committed to advocating for their independence and preserving their dignity.

This project is important to me personally because:

I support this redevelopment of Inglewood Care Center so that [REDACTED] s.22(1) community I deeply care about.

Many of these seniors have spent their entire life here. This is their home- where they built relationship, raised family and connected to the people, culture and surrounding that defines their identity. They deserve to age in a place that is familiar, supportive and safe.

I urge decision makers to approve this redevelopment of Inglewood Care Centre to act now to ensure that those who have contributed so much to the North Shore can continue to live with care, respect and dignity they deserve right here at home

I support the proposed redevelopment of Inglewood Care Centre. West Vancouver has experienced a significant loss of long-term care capacity over the last five years with the closure of West Vancouver Care Centre and Capilano Care Centre. At the same time, the number of older adults in our community continues to grow.

Today, Inglewood remains the only publicly funded long-term care community in West Vancouver and is reaching the end of its expected lifespan. This reality creates urgent and growing pressure on seniors, families, and the healthcare system as demand for long-term care continues to increase while local care capacity remains limited.

The redevelopment of Inglewood Care Centre represents an important opportunity to help address this need. It will replace aging infrastructure with a modern, purpose-built community that better reflects today's standards of care. In addition to renewing existing long-term care capacity, the project will help restore some of the care capacity lost in West Vancouver while providing a range of housing and supportive living options designed to meet the diverse needs of seniors as they age.

As West Vancouver plans for the future, it is essential that adequate housing and care options exist to support an aging population. Projects such as the redevelopment of Inglewood Care Centre are an important part of ensuring our community can meet these needs in the years ahead.

I encourage Council to support this proposal and help ensure that seniors in West Vancouver have access to the care and housing they need, close to family, friends, and the community they know and love.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

s. 22(1)

June 16, 2026

Mayor and Council
District of West Vancouver
750 17th Street
West Vancouver, BC V7V 3T3

Support for the Redevelopment of Inglewood Care Centre

Dear Mayor and Council,

I am writing to express my strong support for the proposed redevelopment of Inglewood Care Centre.

As a longtime resident of West Vancouver and [REDACTED] s.22(1), I have firsthand knowledge of the important role this facility plays in caring for seniors and vulnerable members of our community.

I see everyday the need for modern, high quality and affordable long term care spaces.

At the same time, two long term care facilities have closed in recent years in West Vancouver (West Vancouver Care Centre and Capilano Care Centre) resulting in Inglewood Care Centre to becoming the only remaining publicly funded long term care centre in our community.

The redevelopment is a necessary investment in the future of West Vancouver community. It will provide a more dignified accommodations which will meet the modern standards of care.

The project is also personally important to me. As my father ages [REDACTED] s.22(1) [REDACTED] he will be in need of long-term care accommodation in the future.

He is an example of the many future seniors who could remain in the community they know and love in close proximity to their families.

I respectfully encourage Council to support this important project for the benefit of current and future residents, families and healthcare workers.

Inglewood employees who reside in West Vancouver, proudly work at the Inglewood because it allows s.22(1) community while remaining close to s.22(1) families.

Thank you for your service to our wonderful community, which we are very privileged to be able to live and work in. None of us knows what the future may bring. Our circumstances can change in an instant and one of us or our loved ones may one day need a room and care at Inglewood Care Centre.

Sincerely,

s. 22(1)

Resident of West Vancouver

From: s. 22(1)
Sent: Friday, June 19, 2026 11:10 AM
To: correspondence
Subject: Letter in support of the redevelopment of the Inglewood Care Centre

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 have been a resident of West Vancouver s.22(1) years, and I am writing you to express my support for the redevelopment of the Inglewood Care Centre.

The Inglewood Care Centre has become a very important community for my family, s.22(1) was a resident from s. 22(1), and s. 22(1) became a resident in s. 22(1) and will likely be there for the remainder of her life.

I recently spoke with an intake nurse from Vancouver Coastal Health related to my elderly mother, who is presently able to live in the community with assistance. She told me that the current wait for accessing Assisted Living or Long Term Care beds in West Vancouver is 4 to 5 years, which she said is twice as long as the waitlist in some other municipalities in Greater Vancouver. It is clear that West Vancouver is drastically short of Long Term Beds with the closure of the Capilano Care Centre and the West Vancouver Care Centre.

I have visited my loved ones at Inglewood s.22(1) for the past s.22(1). I have experience working in extended care as an s. 22(1), and when Baptist Housing took over the management of Inglewood, I saw a visible improvement in organization, communication, care, and in the development of a caring community within the staff, and extending out to include the residents and their families.

Baptist Housing, from what my loved ones and I have experienced, is a high calibre non profit organization, which genuinely has the care and support of West Vancouver seniors at the heart of its priorities.

I believe the District of West Vancouver is incredibly fortunate to have Baptist Housing put forward this comprehensive redevelopment plan, and I hope that you and the Council will endorse it, for the betterment of seniors in West Vancouver.

Sincerely,

s. 22(1)

I also have an elderly Mother living in the community who will need to access a care facility in the future.

From: s. 22(1)
Sent: Friday, June 19, 2026 4:31 PM
To: correspondence
Cc: Mark Sager, Mayor; Christine Cassidy; Nora Gambioli; Peter Lambur; Scott Snider; Sharon Thompson; Linda Watt
Subject: s. 22(1) Support for Baptist Housing Inglewood Redevelopment
Attachments: Inglewood project Letter of Support by s. 22(1) 6-20-26.pdf

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:

Attached letter is for your consideration, as my support for the Baptist Housing Inglewood Redevelopment in West Vancouver that is coming up for public consultation at next week's council meeting.

I would appreciate your including this in the council meeting public record regarding the Inglewood redevelopment proposal. Thank you.

Sincerely,

s. 22(1)

s. 22(1)

West Vancouver, BC s. 22(1)

“Leadership is about making others better as a result of your presence and making sure that impact lasts in your absence.” --Sheryl Sandberg

June 18, 2026

Mayor Mark Sager and Council
District of West Vancouver

Re: Support for the Baptist Housing Inglewood Redevelopment

Dear Mayor Sager and Members of Council,

I am s. 22(1)-year-old senior, resident of West Vancouver for the past 40 years, and a 20+ year volunteer supporter of great work done by the s. 22(1) and the s. 22(1). I strongly support the proposed redevelopment of Baptist Housing's Inglewood campus. This project is an important investment in our community's future. It will help seniors continue to age in West Vancouver, close to family, friends, and the community connections they have built over their recent lifetime.

I know firsthand how important it is for seniors to stay close to their loved ones. After my parents died in s. 22(1), I had to bring and place s. 22(1) in a long-term care home in s. 22(1) because of s. 22(1) caused by a severe s. 22(1). She is now s.22(1). I travel from West Vancouver to visit her every 2-3 weeks to support and care for her needs. Although I am grateful that she is receiving the care she needs in a private facility, I wish she could be closer to me so I would not need to drive 2 hours or more every time I visit her. Her income is less than s. 22(1) per month, with me covering rest of the s. 22(1) cost. I can't afford to place her in one of 2 WV Amica care centers. Families facing s. 22(1) and other age-related conditions should not have to leave their communities because appropriate, reasonably priced care is unavailable locally.

Through my volunteer and fundraising work with the s. 22(1) I have met many West Vancouver families living with the realities of s. 22(1). I have seen the emotional and practical challenges they face. These families need access to care and support, and they also want their loved ones to remain in the community they know and love. The Inglewood redevelopment will help make that possible. It is a thoughtful, community-focused project that will benefit both current and future generations.

I urge Council to support the Inglewood redevelopment and help ensure that West Vancouver remains a community where seniors are welcome regardless of their care needs. Thank you in advance for your unanimous consent to this redevelopment proposal.

Sincerely,

s. 22(1)

s. 22(1)

West Vancouver, BC s. 22(1)

"Leadership is about making others better as a result of your presence and making sure that impact lasts in your absence." --Sheryl Sandberg

From: Barbara Chaworth-Musters <barbara@chaworth-musters.ca>
Sent: Saturday, June 20, 2026 3:21 PM
To: correspondence
Cc: Mark Sager, Mayor; Christine Cassidy; Linda Watt; Sharon Thompson; Nora Gambioli; Peter Lambur; Scott Snider
Subject: Baptist Housing for Inglewood Campus of Care

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

Dear Mayor Sager, Councillors Cassidy, Gambioli, Lambur, Snider, Thompson, and Watt

Five years ago, when Baptist first introduced their planned Inglewood project, in my correspondence to Mayor and Council, I voiced concern for the residents of Inglewood Care Centre living on a construction site.

Now, in 2026, I continue my quest as a voice for the residents of Inglewood during the construction of new facilities. Not only should the residents be considered, but also the staff. Baptist Housing have advised that residents of the Inglewood Care Centre will remain on the construction site. Before approval of this project can be given, the following questions need answering:

How will residents be protected from construction noise, vibration, dust, and disruption?

- How will quality of life be maintained for residents, particularly those living with frailty, mobility limitations, or dementia?
- What mitigation measures will be in place and how will they be monitored?
- Have alternative phasing or temporary relocation options been considered?
- How will residents and families be consulted throughout the redevelopment process?

Please refer to the following as suggested by Mei Lan Fang, Assistant Professor, Simon Fraser University - Urban Studies and Department of Gerontology, Director of the Science and Technology for Aging Research Institute Email of 17 June, 2026 regarding Baptist/Inglewood project:

:

1. BC Seniors Advocate – Growing Demand for Long-Term Care Beds in B.C.

This report highlights the urgent need for additional long-term care capacity in the province. While it supports the need for redevelopment, it also reinforces the importance of ensuring that vulnerable seniors receive appropriate care and quality of life throughout these transitions.

BLOCKEDseniorsadvocatebc[.]ca/osa-reports/from-shortfall-to-crisis-growing-demand-for-long-term-care-beds-in-b-c/BLOCKED

2. BC Seniors Advocate – Monitoring Seniors Services

This report provides data on growing waitlists and pressures on the long-term care system, helping to explain why redevelopment is being pursued.

BLOCKEDseniorsadvocatebc[.]ca/monitoring-seniors-services/BLOCKED

3. Health Canada – Guidance for Evaluating Human Health Impacts of Noise

Health Canada recognizes that prolonged noise exposure can affect health and well-being and provides guidance on assessing impacts from major infrastructure and construction projects. Of particular relevance are concerns related to sleep disruption, communication difficulties, stress, and quality of life.

<https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/publications/healthy-living/guidance-evaluating-human-health-impacts-noise.html>

4. National Collaborating Centre for Environmental Health – Environmental Noise

This summary reviews evidence linking environmental noise to health and well-being and provides links to Canadian guidance documents.

[BLOKEDncceh\[.\]ca/resources/subject-guides/environmental-noiseBLOKED](#)

5. National Collaborating Centre for Environmental Health – Listening to Canadians About Environmental Noise

This report discusses the health burden associated with noise exposure and residents' experiences of noise annoyance, which is increasingly recognized as a public health concern.

[BLOKEDncceh\[.\]ca/resources/evidence-briefs/listening-canadians-about-environmental-noiseBLOKED](#)

Ms. Fang wrote regarding the Inglewood/Baptist project: “there is a strong evidence-based case for examining how redevelopment is implemented and whether adequate protections are in place for current residents during what may be a lengthy construction process.”

During the construction of Grosvenor, businesses and residents living more than a block away, monitored noise levels finding the construction noise beyond what is acceptable by DWV bylaws. The infractions were reported to DWV Bylaw Dept, yet nothing was done.

It is alarming to me that Baptist Housing, with their stated expertise on the care of seniors in the last phase of their lives, are not aware of the information in the above reports and have considered this information in the Inglewood redevelopment plan. The words of Marc Kinna and Lorry Wasylik must be applied in practice to the seniors of Inglewood Care Centre.

Marc Kinna stated at the DWV meeting on May 27th: “the environment hat our elders deserve...we support in the last 12-18 months of their lives. These are precious moments in which the environment must be most supportive and most conducive to what we expect for our closest loved ones. Our team share a care giving spirit that is a shared and deeply personal commitment to how senior’s live with dignity, purpose and belonging...we care about the lives of elders and the desire to serve them.

2024-2025 Baptist Housing Annual Report:

"This work is deeply rewarding, but it is important to acknowledge that we do it not for those who have loved us, and not because we owe a personal debt. We do it for strangers. We do it for people we are meeting for the first time as they move in. We do it because of the caregiver’s heart and because we are

inspired by the values of Jesus. We do it because our elders, each and every one of them, are worth it. God loves them, and so we love them and serve them every day."

Marc Kinna Lorry Wasylik
President and CEO Board Chair

Mayor and Council must consider the factual information in the above listed reports, require that the posed questions are answered, and ensure that residents of Inglewood are treated from an ethical, moral, and caring position.

With regards and hope for the future,

Barbara Chaworth-Musters
408 Inglewood Avenue
West Vancouver, B.C. V7% 1X1

Please do not redact.

From: M Slater <melroy1058@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, June 20, 2026 10:43 PM
To: Scott Snider; correspondence
Cc: Mark Sager, Mayor; Christine Cassidy; Nora Gambioli; Peter Lambur; Sharon Thompson; Linda Watt
Subject: Re: Baptist Housing redevelopment proposal for Inglewood Care Centre.
Attachments: Inglewood Development Proposal Questions.docx; Inglewood Priority Questions.docx

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the organization from email address melroy1058@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.

Hi Scott,

Thank you for meeting with members of ADRA and the British Properties Area Homeowners Association to discuss the proposed Inglewood “Campus of Care” redevelopment. While I appreciated the opportunity to participate in that broader discussion, it did not directly address the specific questions I raised in my prior correspondence to you, despite your response suggesting that it did. Given the importance of these issues, I have copied Mayor and Council and submitted this to Council Correspondence for the public record.

As my questions remain unanswered, I am at a loss as to how our discussion could be considered responsive to the concerns I raised; if anything, it reinforced them. In its current form, I do not believe this application can be credibly approved, and I urge you to withhold support unless these issues are clearly resolved.

I support the need for long-term care in West Vancouver. However, that does not justify approving a proposal of this magnitude without clear answers to fundamental questions. Residents should not be asked to accept **725 units to achieve a net increase of 134 long-term care beds**, particularly without an explanation of why a smaller or phased approach is not viable. If long-term care is the priority, **Council should be pressing whether the Phase 1 care component can proceed independently of the larger residential development.**

If this proposal is being advanced due to potential loss of provincial funding, Council should clearly state what funding is at risk and whether it depends on approving the full package.

A previous proposal for this site was found unsuitable, demonstrating that urgency does not make every proposal acceptable.

Residents were told there would be four weeks between Council’s referral to Public Hearing and the hearing itself to ask questions and receive answers, and that this timeline was sufficient. That has not been my experience. My substantive questions remain unanswered. Yesterday you indicated that not all questions may be answered before the hearing closed, with some potentially being answered by Baptist Housing “before or at” the hearing.

Proceeding to Public Hearing while key questions remain unanswered leaves the public without the information required to provide informed comment. Allowing answers to emerge at the hearing—or leaving the hearing open—is not a substitute for providing that information in advance. If information

only emerges during the hearing, residents may not have the opportunity to review it, ask follow-up questions, or respond before it closes.

A number of outstanding questions are for District staff and Council. Issues around process, public benefit, infrastructure, alternatives, and financial transparency go directly to the basis on which Council is being asked to approve this rezoning and must be addressed by the District.

You noted that the District does not conduct engagement on privately owned properties, but this is not a typical private development. It involves rezoning, a publicly funded LTC component, and potential public concessions. It carries clear public implications and warrants a higher standard of engagement and transparency.

Relying on proponent-led community consultation is problematic, mainly because it is not impartial. Concerns with this inherently flawed approach have been raised with both this Council and previous Councils. In the interest of brevity, I will not repeat them here, but the shortcomings require urgent attention.

I will be out of town immediately following the June 23 Public Hearing. While the process is not organized around individual schedules, Council emphasized that residents would have sufficient time to ask questions and receive answers **before** the hearing. If key information emerges only during or after the hearing, that assurance has not been met.

It is also concerning that Council has not, as a group, had a full discussion of this proposal prior to sending it to Public Hearing. This reinforces the impression that a significant project is advancing without the level of scrutiny the public expects.

More broadly, West Vancouver has known for years about the precarious state of long-term care. Yet the District appears to have relied largely on proponent-led proposals rather than establishing a public strategy. Council should be able answer a simple question: ***what steps were taken to secure replacement LTC capacity, explore alternative sites or operators, or pursue solutions not tied to large-scale residential development?***

At this stage, the question is whether Council is prepared to approve a major rezoning **knowing** that key questions remain unanswered and **knowing** that the public may be asked to comment without a meaningful opportunity to assess the proposal. Approving the application under those circumstances would be a conscious decision to proceed on an incomplete record.

For that reason, I urge you not to approve this unless the outstanding questions—particularly around phasing, financial transparency, public concessions, completion risk, and the necessity of the non-care residential components—are clearly resolved **before** the Public Hearing concludes.

A related question: ***to what extent are the density, height, and non-care residential components driven by land costs, financing, and project economics, rather than the cost of delivering long-term care itself?***

I would appreciate a clear response as to:

- whether all substantive questions will be answered before or, at the latest, before the conclusion of the Public Hearing;
- which questions will be addressed by District staff and Council, and which by Baptist Housing;
- when those answers will be provided; and
- what opportunity residents will have to review and respond to any new information provided after the Public Hearing begins.

For clarity, I have attached my previously submitted comprehensive list of questions, along with a shorter summary of priority items, all of which remain outstanding.

The easier course may be to approve this application and suggest there is no alternative. But the easier course is not necessarily the right one. Council should insist on clear answers, refuse to proceed on an incomplete record, and ensure the best possible outcome—not only for seniors who need care, but for the community that will live with the consequences of this decision for decades.

If Council chooses to approve this proposal, it will do so with full knowledge that key questions remain unresolved and that the public was asked to participate without sufficient information.

Sincerely,

Melinda Slater
1058 Keith Road
West Vancouver

Attachments (2)

Please do not redact

On Jun 20, 2026, at 4:47 PM, Scott Snider <ssnider@westvancouver.ca> wrote:

Good afternoon Melinda,

Thank you for your time on Friday. I trust that our discussion will suffice as my response to your concerns below.

thank you again for your engagement.

Regards,

Councillor Scott Snider

District of West Vancouver
604-612-2228

From: M Slater <melroy1058@gmail.com>

Date: Monday, June 15, 2026 at 10:37 PM

To: Scott Snider <ssnider@westvancouver.ca>

Subject: Baptist Housing redevelopment proposal for Inglewood Care Centre.

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the organization from email address melroy1058@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.

Hi Scott,

I am writing to follow up on the Inglewood Care Centre development proposal. As outlined in my previous correspondence, I believe it was advanced to a Public Hearing prematurely. While I understand that the Public Hearing is now scheduled and may not be able to be revisited procedurally, I want to clearly set out the concerns with the current process and timeline.

I missed the December information meeting and was unaware until recently that a revised proposal was moving forward. At the May 27 Council meeting, it was stated that residents had four weeks to review the proposal and ask questions before the public hearing. For a project of this scale and complexity, this timeframe is not sufficient.

In my own experience, it has taken several weeks of sustained effort to work through the approximately 200-page report, understand the evolution of the proposal, consult with neighbours and residents' groups, and prepare informed questions. Most residents cannot reasonably be expected to commit this level of time, yet meaningful participation depends on it.

As a result, there is now insufficient time for questions to be properly addressed in advance of the Public Hearing—particularly where responses may lead to further, necessary discussion.

Advancing this proposal under these conditions effectively forces Council into “all-or-nothing” decision. At the Public Hearing, Council is effectively limited to an “approve or reject” decision, without the ability to direct substantive changes to key elements such as height or density. This restricts Council's ability to respond constructively to legitimate concerns.

The recent Horseshoe Bay hotel proposal illustrates the consequences of this approach, where earlier opportunity for refinement could have avoided the current “all-or-nothing” outcome and produced a result that satisfied everyone.

This process is unnecessarily adversarial and risks dividing residents, despite broad support for the publicly funded Long-Term Care bed component. A reasonable approach would be to proceed with the LTC while deferring the remainder of the proposal until outstanding questions and community concerns have been properly addressed.

Given the scale of this project and the significant impact it will have on our community, proceeding under these conditions undermines both the quality of review and public confidence in the process.

Council needs to acknowledge these shortcomings as it considers this proposal and ensure that the impediments of the current process are fully taken into account in its decision-making.

I urge Council to revisit how projects are advanced, so that sufficient time for engagement and refinement is provided before reaching a Public Hearing stage.

Council's ability—or inability—to address the attached questions in advance of the Public Hearing will provide a clear indication of level of familiarity with the proposal and whether it is sufficiently understood to proceed.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. I would appreciate a response prior to the June 23 Public Hearing.

Sincerely,

Melinda Slater
1058 Keith Road
West Vancouver
(604) 926-1999

Inglewood Care Centre Redevelopment Proposal

1. Project Need and Justification

1. What level of development is required to achieve the stated care objectives?
 - a. Could the principal public benefit (long-term care beds) be delivered through a smaller-scale project?
 - b. Could the care objectives be achieved with a reduced amount of market housing?
2. Which components of the proposal are essential to achieving the stated care objectives, and which are primarily intended to support the project's financial model?
3. What is the primary driver of the proposed scale—identified care needs or financial requirements?
4. Which components of the proposal are essential to achieving the stated care objectives, and which are primarily intended to support the project's financial model?
 - a. Is the inclusion of 161 seniors' rental units supported by demonstrated housing need, or are these units primarily required to make the project financially viable?
5. Has Council been provided with a financial feasibility analysis demonstrating why the proposed density, height, and market-housing components are necessary to deliver the long-term care expansion?
 - a. If so, will this analysis be made publicly available?
6. Can Baptist Housing provide a financial feasibility comparison between:
 - a LTC-only redevelopment;
 - a LTC + reduced housing redevelopment; and
 - the proposed full project?
 - If those alternatives were evaluated, why were they rejected?
7. Were lower-height or lower-density alternatives evaluated?
 - a. What specific options were considered, and why were they rejected?
8. What evidence supports the need for 161 additional seniors rental units?
 - a. Why was this number selected instead of alternatives (e.g., 50, 75, or 100 units)?
9. Has demand for the 161 seniors rental units been validated using empirical data from comparable developments?
 - a. Were occupancy rates, vacancy levels, and wait-list data analyzed for North Shore providers (e.g., Kiwanis Housing, Capilano Lions Housing, other non-profits)?
 - b. Will this data be made publicly available?
10. What is the anticipated geographic distribution of residents?
 - a. How many are expected to come from West Vancouver versus elsewhere on the North Shore or in Metro Vancouver?
11. Why is a 10-year Phased Development Agreement (PDA) needed for the later phases, and what assurances exist that the later phases will proceed as proposed?
12. If Phase 1 is completed, does the PDA permit Phase 2 to be delayed for many years while retaining the approved zoning and density?
13. Were alternative community-serving uses for the site evaluated by the District?
 - a. For example, urgent care or other health services versus seniors rental housing?
 - b. How do these alternatives compare in meeting identified community needs?

14. What plans are in place for the redevelopment or reuse of the former Capilano Care Centre site and the former West Vancouver Care Centre on 27th Street?
 - a. To what extent are these sites being considered to accommodate new or expanded seniors' care or housing?
15. Has the District looked at how Creekstone Care in North Van was built and financed and how it compares to Baptist's proposal?

2. Financing and Public Subsidies

1. What is the total estimated cost of the redevelopment, and how will it be financed?
2. What is the estimated construction for the proposed 200 rental housing units considering recent increases in construction costs?
3. What safeguards or commitments are in place to ensure that the Phase 2 property will not be sold after rezoning, given the potential increase in land value?
4. What funding commitments have been secured to date, and from whom (e.g., Baptist Housing, Vancouver Coastal Health, Province of BC, BC Housing, debt financing sources)?
5. Is the \$4 million in waived Community Amenity Contributions (CAC) for Phase 1 or for the entire project?
6. What is the estimated dollar value of the Metro Vancouver and TransLink Development Cost Charge (DCC) waivers being sought?
7. What is the total value of all DCC waivers and exemptions being requested from Metro Vancouver, TransLink, and the District of West Vancouver combined?
8. If those waivers are granted, who ultimately bears the cost of the infrastructure that those DCCs would otherwise fund?
9. Will Phase 2 (Assisted Living and Seniors Rental Housing) be given permissive tax exemptions similar to the long-term care component?
10. What is the dollar value of the total public subsidy being provided to the project through fee waivers, tax exemptions, grants, and publicly funded infrastructure?
11. Is the project financially structured in phases?
 - a. Will later phases be required to fund earlier phases?
 - b. What are the risks if future phases are delayed or not completed?
12. What will Baptist do with the property if the project is rejected?
13. How does the public funding and subsidy package proposed for Inglewood compare with the public funding model used for Creekstone and other recently approved long-term care facilities?

3. Provincial Funding

1. Is there evidence that Provincial funding is contingent on approval of the entire development (including the seniors' rental and independent living components) and will this be made public?

2. Has funding been secured for both Phase 1 and Phase 2, or only for the LTC component? (Has Phase 1 been fully funded independently?)
3. If the LTC component alone were approved, would Provincial funding for the 364 LTC beds be withdrawn? If so, please provide the documentation supporting that position.
4. Has Vancouver Coastal Health and the Ministry of Health formally committed to funding and operating all 364 proposed LTC beds, and will that commitment be made public?
5. Has Council been provided with a finalized capital funding agreement, provincial commitment letter, published dollar amount of provincial funding, or a detailed breakdown of who pays for what portion of the care facility?

4. Community Impact of Public Subsidies

4.1 Who Benefits vs. Who Pays

1. Who are the primary beneficiaries of the public subsidies (e.g., residents, operator, private partners), and how is this benefit quantified?
2. To what extent do West Vancouver taxpayers subsidize residents who may come from outside the municipality?
3. How does the level of subsidy compare to comparable projects elsewhere in Metro Vancouver?

4.2 Impact on Local Services and Infrastructure

1. What is the financial impact on District services and infrastructure budgets resulting from foregone Development Cost Charge (DCC) revenues?
2. Will the loss of DCC revenue delay or reduce planned infrastructure investments (e.g., transportation, utilities, parks)?
3. Are there any service-level impacts (e.g., capacity, maintenance timelines) associated with these foregone revenues?

4.3 Equity and Fairness

1. How does this subsidy align with the District's equity objectives, particularly given varying income levels among residents?
2. Why is this project being granted exemptions when other developments are required to pay full DCCs and taxes?
3. What criteria were used to determine that this project merits public subsidy over other potential community priorities?

4.4 Opportunity Cost

1. What alternative uses of these funds or forgone revenues were considered, and what are the trade-offs?

2. Could the same level of public investment deliver greater community benefit if allocated differently (e.g., affordable housing, infrastructure, community amenities)?

4.5 Housing Affordability Outcomes

1. How do the subsidies translate into measurable affordability outcomes for residents (e.g., reduced rents, increased accessibility)?
2. Is there any requirement or mechanism to ensure that public subsidies result in long-term affordability commitments?

4.6 Accountability and Conditions

1. What conditions or performance requirements are attached to the subsidies (e.g., affordability levels, service provision)?
2. Are there clawback provisions if the project does not deliver the anticipated public benefits?
3. How will the District monitor and report on whether the subsidized benefits are actually achieved over time?

4.7 Long-Term Financial Implications

1. What are the long-term fiscal impacts (positive or negative) of the subsidies on the District's finances?
2. Will the project generate sufficient future tax revenues or economic benefits to offset the initial subsidies?

5. Utility Servicing

1. Will the utility modelling analysis be made public?
2. What assumptions regarding occupancy, water demand, and future growth were used in the model?
3. Did the analysis account for future growth anticipated under Provincial housing directives, the Taylor Way corridor, and Park Royal redevelopment?
4. Did the analysis include climate-change and drought scenarios?
5. Can the District's water system accommodate this project and anticipated future growth without requiring significant future infrastructure upgrades?
6. What off-site sewer upgrades are required, what is their cost, and who will pay for them?
7. Are any future water-system upgrades expected as a result of cumulative growth in the area, even if none are required for this project alone?

6. Staffing and Operations

1. Have Vancouver Coastal Health or the Ministry of Health confirmed that sufficient nurses, care aides, and support staff will be available to operate all 364 long-term care beds?

2. Has a staffing needs assessment been completed?
 - a. Will it be made publicly available?
 - b. Does it identify any risks related to staffing availability?

7. Continuum of Care

1. Does the proposal provide a complete and integrated continuum of care, or are there identifiable gaps between independent living, assisted living, and long-term care?
2. Will residents of the Independent Living and Seniors Rental Housing components receive priority or preferential access to publicly funded LTC beds, or will they join the standard Vancouver Coastal Health wait list?
3. What formal agreements exist with Vancouver Coastal Health regarding transitions between housing and care levels within the proposed Campus of Care?
4. If no LTC bed is available on-site when a resident requires care, what happens to that resident?
5. Can the applicant provide verifiable evidence from comparable campuses demonstrating that residents successfully transition through the continuum of care as described?
 - a. What proportion of residents follow this pathway in practice?
6. What percentage of future LTC residents are anticipated to originate from the on-site housing components versus external referrals?
7. What happens if a resident can no longer afford the Independent Living or Seniors Rental Housing component?
 - a. Does the model provide any mechanism to maintain continuity of residence?

8. Traffic and Parking

1. Why is Council being asked to approve the project before parking allocations among residents, staff, and visitors have been finalized?
2. Will the full Transportation Impact Assessment (TIA) and supporting parking analysis be made publicly available?
 - a. Will these materials be released prior to any approval decision?
3. What assumptions underpin the transportation and parking analysis?
 - a. Vehicle ownership rates
 - b. Visitor parking demand
 - c. Staff parking demand
 - d. Service and delivery traffic
4. Does the TIA account for cumulative growth in the surrounding area?
 - a. Taylor Way corridor
 - b. Park Royal redevelopment
 - c. Provincial housing initiatives
5. What contingency measures are in place if actual parking demand exceeds projections?
 - a. Where would overflow parking be accommodated?

9. Construction Impacts

1. How many years is each phase of construction expected to last?
2. When is Phase 2 expected to be completed?
3. What impacts are anticipated for neighbouring residents during construction?
 - a. Noise, dust, vibration
 - b. Traffic disruption and access
 - c. Impacts to adjacent long-term care residents
4. Will a Construction Management Plan be prepared and made publicly available prior to approval?

10. Planning and Neighbourhood Character

1. Why was the Inglewood site not included in the Taylor Way Local Area Plan process?
2. How does this proposal align with the long-term planning vision for the Taylor Way corridor and surrounding neighbourhoods?
3. What precedent could approval of this project establish for future building height and density in the area?
4. What are the anticipated built-form impacts?
 - a. Shadowing
 - b. Privacy and overlook
 - c. Transition to adjacent residential areas
 - d. Overall neighbourhood character

11. Public Engagement and Transparency

1. What changes were made to the proposal in response to feedback from the December 9, 2025 Public Information Meeting?
 - a. Please identify specific revisions tied to key concerns (e.g., traffic, parking, project scale, pedestrian safety, construction impacts, process transparency)
2. What was the rationale for not conducting District-led public engagement and instead relying on applicant-led engagement and who made that decision?
3. How has the District assessed the completeness and objectivity of applicant-led engagement?
4. What methods were used to inform residents who did not attend the December 9, 2025 meeting of subsequent revisions to the proposal, and how was the effectiveness of those methods evaluated?
5. Why were responses to public concerns not included in the Council report?
6. Why were detailed parking demand assumptions not included in the Council report?
7. Why was the Transportation Impact Assessment not included in the publicly available materials?

8. Will the District release the full consultation record?
 - a. Including feedback submissions, questions raised, applicant responses, and any “What We Heard” summary

12. Seniors Advocate

1. Was the BC Office of the Seniors Advocate consulted during the development or review of this proposal?
 - a. If so, what recommendations, concerns, or feedback were provided?
2. If the Office of the Seniors Advocate has not reviewed this proposal, does the District intend to seek their assessment?
 - a. Including potential impacts of prolonged adjacent construction on long-term care residents.

Inglewood Care Centre Redevelopment Proposal

Priority Questions

1. Is the scale of the project truly necessary?

Is the scale justified by care needs or financing?

1. Could the long-term care (LTC) beds be delivered with a smaller project or less market housing?
2. What is the primary driver of the scale—care need or financial requirements?
3. Were lower-height or lower-density alternatives evaluated, and if so, why rejected?

2. Is the financial case transparent and credible?

Is the project economically justified?

1. Has a financial feasibility analysis been provided and will it be made public?
2. Has a comparison been done of LTC-only vs. partial vs. full project—why were alternatives rejected?
3. What is the total project cost and how is it financed?

3. Are the seniors' housing units needed?

Does the project include unnecessary components?

1. What evidence supports the need for 161 seniors rental units?
2. Were vacancy rates, waitlists, and comparable projects analyzed?
3. Are these units driven by demand or by financial viability?

4. What is the total public subsidy—and is it fair?

1. What is the total value of all subsidies (DCC and CAC waivers, tax exemptions, etc.)?
2. Who benefits vs. who pays (including non-local residents)?
3. Why is this project receiving exemptions when others do not?

5. Is provincial funding conditional on approving the full project?

1. Will LTC funding be lost if only the care component is approved?
2. Is there documented proof of this condition?
3. Has full funding for all phases been secured?

6. What happens if later phases fail?

1. Is the project financially structured in phases, and do later phases fund earlier ones?
2. What happens if Phase 2 is delayed or never built?

3. What safeguards prevent land resale after rezoning?

7. Will the continuum of care actually work?

Does the “campus of care” concept work in practice, or is it theoretical?

1. Are there guaranteed transitions between independent living, assisted living, and LTC?
2. Will on-site residents get priority access to LTC beds?
3. What happens if no bed is available?

8. What are the long-term financial and infrastructure impacts?

Will this project create long-term fiscal strain?

1. Will DCC waivers reduce infrastructure funding or delay projects?
2. Can water/sewer systems handle this **and future growth**?
3. Will tax revenues offset the subsidies over time?

9. Why is Council being asked to decide without information?

Decisions should not be made with incomplete or withheld information.

1. Why is parking not finalized before approval?
2. Why hasn't the Transportation Impact Assessment been released?
3. Why were public concerns and assumptions not included in reports?

From: Barbara Chaworth-Musters [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Sunday, June 21, 2026 1:01 PM
To: correspondence
Cc: Mark Sager, Mayor; Linda Watt; Sharon Thompson; Scott Snider; Peter Lambur; Nora Gambioli; Christine Cassidy
Subject: Baptist Housing for Inglewood Campus of Care
Attachments: Inglewood Campus of CareBaptist Housing.docx

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 Councillors Cassidy, Gambioli, Lambur, Snider, thompson, and Watt,

I am very confused by the messages received from Correspondence regarding my email of June 20/Baptist Housing - Inglewood Campus of Care. Because of the confusion regarding the links in my email, and a response showing the links are blocked, I am sending you the contents of my email as a Word docx.

Thank you.

Barbara Chaworth-Musters
[REDACTED] s. 22(1)
West Vancouver, B.C. [REDACTED] s. 22(1)

Please do not redact my name.

20 June, 2026

Dear Mayor Sager, Councillors Cassidy, Gambioi, Lambur, Snider, Thompson, and Watt

Five years ago, when Baptist first introduced their planned Inglewood project, in my correspondence to Mayor and Council, I voiced concern for the residents of Inglewood Care Centre living on a construction site.

Now, in 2026, I continue my quest as a voice for the residents of Inglewood during the construction of new facilities. Not only should the residents be considered, but also the staff. Baptist Housing have advised that residents of the Inglewood Care Centre will remain on the construction site. Before approval of this project can be given, the following questions need answering:

How will residents be protected from construction noise, vibration, dust, and disruption?

- How will quality of life be maintained for residents, particularly those living with frailty, mobility limitations, or dementia?
- What mitigation measures will be in place and how will they be monitored?
- Have alternative phasing or temporary relocation options been considered?
- How will residents and families be consulted throughout the redevelopment process?

Please refer to the following as suggested by Mei Lan Fang, Assistant Professor, Simon Fraser University - Urban Studies and Department of Gerontology, Director of the Science and Technology for Aging Research Institute Email of 17 June, 2026 regarding Baptist/Inglewood project:

:

1. BC Seniors Advocate – Growing Demand for Long-Term Care Beds in B.C.

This report highlights the urgent need for additional long-term care capacity in the province. While it supports the need for redevelopment, it also reinforces the importance of ensuring that vulnerable seniors receive appropriate care and quality of life throughout these transitions.

<https://www.seniorsadvocatebc.ca/osa-reports/from-shortfall-to-crisis-growing-demand-for-long-term-care-beds-in-b-c/>

2. BC Seniors Advocate – Monitoring Seniors Services

This report provides data on growing waitlists and pressures on the long-term care system, helping to explain why redevelopment is being pursued.

<https://www.seniorsadvocatebc.ca/monitoring-seniors-services/>

3. Health Canada – Guidance for Evaluating Human Health Impacts of Noise
Health Canada recognizes that prolonged noise exposure can affect health and well-being and provides guidance on assessing impacts from major infrastructure and construction projects. Of particular relevance are concerns related to sleep disruption, communication difficulties, stress, and quality of life.

<https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/publications/healthy-living/guidance-evaluating-human-health-impacts-noise.html>

4. National Collaborating Centre for Environmental Health – Environmental Noise
This summary reviews evidence linking environmental noise to health and well-being and provides links to Canadian guidance documents.

<https://ncceh.ca/resources/subject-guides/environmental-noise>

5. National Collaborating Centre for Environmental Health – Listening to Canadians About Environmental Noise

This report discusses the health burden associated with noise exposure and residents' experiences of noise annoyance, which is increasingly recognized as a public health concern.

<https://ncceh.ca/resources/evidence-briefs/listening-canadians-about-environmental-noise>

Ms. Fang wrote regarding the Inglewood/Baptist project: “there is a strong evidence-based case for examining how redevelopment is implemented and whether adequate protections are in place for current residents during what may be a lengthy construction process.”

During the construction of Grosvenor, businesses and residents living more than a block away, monitored noise levels finding the construction noise beyond what is acceptable by DWV bylaws. The infractions were reported to DWV Bylaw Dept, yet nothing was done.

It is alarming to me that Baptist Housing, with their stated expertise on the care of seniors in the last phase of their lives, are not aware of the information in the above reports and have considered this information in the Inglewood redevelopment plan.

The words of Marc Kinna and Lorry Wasylik must be applied in practice to the seniors of Inglewood Care Centre.

Marc Kinna stated at the DWV meeting on May 27th: "the environment hat our elders deserve...we support in the last 12-18 months of their lives. These are precious moments in which the environment must be most supportive and most conducive to what we expect for our closest loved ones. Our team share a care giving spirit that is a shared and deeply personal commitment to how senior's live with dignity, purpose and belonging...we care about the lives of elders and the desire to serve them.

2024-2025 Baptist Housing Annual Report:

"This work is deeply rewarding, but it is important to acknowledge that we do it not for those who have loved us, and not because we owe a personal debt. We do it for strangers. We do it for people we are meeting for the first time as they move in. We do it because of the caregiver's heart and because we are inspired by the values of Jesus. We do it because our elders, each and every one of them, are worth it. God loves them, and so we love them and serve them every day."

Marc Kinna Lorry Wasylik
President and CEO Board Chair

Mayor and Council must consider the factual information in the above listed reports, require that the posed questions are answered, and ensure that residents of Inglewood are treated from an ethical, moral, and caring position.

With regards and hope for the future,

Barbara Chaworth-Musters

s. 22(1)

West Vancouver, B.C.

s. 22(1)

Please do not redact.

From: s. 22(1)
Sent: Sunday, June 21, 2026 2:00 PM
To: correspondence
Subject: Inglewood Care Centre

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,

Being a long time resident of West Vancouver the ability to age in place and in our community means more than staying in a house, it means staying in the community they have been rooted in. With the updated and increased services, the new Inglewood campus would support that dignity by offering fundamental required care as needs change over time. The addition of 161 new seniors' rental housing units further strengthens the proposal, creating more options for older adults at different stages of life, as will the additional 200 independent living apartments.

With our population aging, the need for publicly funded continuing care beds has become more urgent. This project would increase long-term care capacity from 230 to 364 beds, allowing more seniors to receive the support they need close to home, family, friends, and familiar surroundings. As you are aware, there has been no increase in the availability of continuing care beds in our community for over 50 years. We also lost the care home that was in Dundarave on 27th that was there for decades and the one on Clyde by Capilano River.

West Vancouver is at a defining moment in how we care for our seniors. The proposed renewal of the Inglewood Care Center by Baptists Housing is not simply the replacement of an aging facility; it is an essential investment for the future of our community, for each one of us.

This is a good use of the land, and forward-looking project. It responds to a real and growing need while adding much-needed seniors' housing.

My family supports the Inglewood renewal so West Vancouver can better care for its seniors today and for generations to come.

Sincerely,

s. 22(1)

West Vancouver BC

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Sunday, June 21, 2026 7:58 PM
To: Mark Sager, Mayor <mark@westvancouver.ca>; Christine Cassidy <ccassidy@westvancouver.ca>; Nora Gambioli <ngambioli@westvancouver.ca>; Peter Lambur <plambur@westvancouver.ca>; Scott Snider <ssnider@westvancouver.ca>; Sharon Thompson <sthompson@westvancouver.ca>; Linda Watt <lwatt@westvancouver.ca>
Subject: FW: Inglewood--Baptist Housing proposal

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.

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: June 21, 2026 7:48 PM
To: 'mayorandcouncil@westvancouver.ca' <mayorandcouncil@westvancouver.ca>
Subject: Inglewood--Baptist Housing proposal

Mayor and Council:

In view of the advanced age of the Inglewood Care Facility and the growing seniors' population in West Vancouver, I wish to urge Council to support the Baptist Housing redevelopment proposal of the site for additional long term care beds, seniors rental housing and independent living accommodation .

The immediate need for this new, larger facility on the North Shore is widely recognized and the current Baptist proposal represents a unique opportunity to provide a modern campus of care in West Vancouver.

Your prompt consideration and support of this proposal is encouraged.

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

From: Mary Gamel [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Sunday, June 21, 2026 8:30 PM
To: correspondence
Subject: Inglewood Care Centre by Baptist Housing

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 urge you to support the publicly funded renewal of the Inglewood Care Centre by Baptist Housing.

Caring for children, the vulnerable, and older adults is a defining hallmark of a thriving and caring community.

West Vancouver has the opportunity to show how it values it's elderly residents, allowing them to remain in the community where they have lived, remain close to family and friends and enhance their quality of life as their need for care changes as they age.

With kind regards,

Mary Gamel

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

Please do not redact my name.

From: s. 22(1)
Sent: Sunday, June 21, 2026 10:12 PM
To: correspondence
Subject: Inglewood redevelopment- letter of Support
Attachments: Inglewood redevelopment_Letter of Support .pdf

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 Sir or Madam:

Attached is my letter of support for the Inglewood Redevelopment project.
Please consider at the upcoming public meeting.

Sincerely yours,

s. 22(1)

Date: 21 June 2026

Mayor and Council
District of West Vancouver
750 17th Street
West Vancouver, BC V7V 3T3

Re: Support for the Redevelopment of Inglewood Care Centre

Dear Mayor and Council,

My connection to the North Shore, and the Inglewood community:

I have been a resident of North Vancouver District s. 22(1) years. s. 22(1) was admitted to Inglewood Care Centre in s. 22(1) after waiting several months in hospital. We feel fortunate to gain a place at Inglewood.

This project is important to me personally because:

There is a shortage of long-term care beds on the North Shore and often placements are made in neighbouring communities (e.g., Vancouver), which can make it difficult for families to visit that have to rely on public transport. This will become more acute as the population ages. This put more pressures on families to support their loved-one at home whilst waiting for placement. I think this project is long overdue and will be a asset to the North Shore community.

I support the proposed redevelopment of Inglewood Care Centre. West Vancouver has experienced a significant loss of long-term care capacity over the last five years with the closure of West Vancouver Care Centre and Capilano Care Centre. At the same time, the number of older adults in our community continues to grow.

Today, Inglewood remains the only publicly funded long-term care community in West Vancouver and is reaching the end of its expected lifespan. This reality creates urgent and growing pressure on seniors, families, and the healthcare system as demand for long-term care continues to increase while local care capacity remains limited.

The redevelopment of Inglewood Care Centre represents an important opportunity to help address this need. It will replace aging infrastructure with a modern, purpose-built community that better reflects today's standards of care. In addition to renewing existing long-term care capacity, the project will help restore some of the care capacity lost in West Vancouver while

From: Ambleside Tenants Association <amblesidetenantsassociation@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, June 21, 2026 11:04 PM
To: correspondence
Subject: Fwd: Inglewood Care Centre Renewal

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

Hello Correspondence team,

I am requesting that this message be included in the documents that you publish. I have sent this message to the Mayor and Council to be included as a submission for the Public Hearing on this topic that is scheduled for Monday, June 22, 2026.

Thank you,
Rick

Rick Wagner
Chair, Ambleside Tenants Association

FYI:
Home address - [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Email - [REDACTED] s. 22(1)

*Ambleside Tenants Association ...
Tenants are a vital segment of our Ambleside Community.*

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

From: Ambleside Tenants Association <amblesidetenantsassociation@gmail.com>
Date: Sun, Jun 21, 2026 at 4:12 PM
Subject: Inglewood Care Centre Renewal
To: Mark Sager <mark@westvancouver.ca>, <plambur@westvancouver.ca>, <ccassidy@westvancouver.ca>, Sharon Thompson <sthompson@westvancouver.ca>, Nora Gambioli <ngambioli@westvancouver.ca>, Linda Watt <lwatt@westvancouver.ca>, <ssnider@westvancouver.ca>
CC: correspondence <correspondence@westvancouver.ca>, Rick Wagner [REDACTED] s. 22(1)

Dear Mayor and Council,

Our Association strongly supports proceeding with all of the aspects of the Inglewood Care Centre Renewal Project. We concur with the overall rationale of support that has been submitted by the West Vancouver "Positive Voices" organization.

Of particular note from the perspective of the ATA, is the proposed addition of 161 new seniors' rental housing units with 20% made available at below market rates.

The current vacancy rate for purpose built rental buildings in West Vancouver is approximately 1.6 %, which is considerably lower than the 3.7% rate in Metro Vancouver.

The average rent for a 1 bedroom unit in West Vancouver is \$2538 per month; the average for a 1 bedroom in Metro Vancouver is \$2090.

In West Vancouver approximately 27% of seniors (aged 65+) rent their homes; seniors make up approximately 28.5% of West Vancouver's population.

Many of our seniors are on fixed incomes, and are at a higher probability of living with a disability now or in future.

The above mentioned CMHC statistics clearly reinforce the argument that West Vancouver needs more purpose built rental units, and is also in dire need of more affordable units.

The Inglewood Renewal provides a perfect opportunity to help mitigate some key housing issues in our community. It is a practical and compassionate project that will demonstrate West Vancouver's leadership on housing and comprehensive care for seniors.

The Ambleside Tenants Association urges you to support the Inglewood Care Centre Renewal Project.

Sincerely,

Rick Wagner
Chair, Ambleside Tenants Association

*Ambleside Tenants Association ...
Tenants are a vital segment of our Ambleside Community.*

From: Barbara Chaworth-Musters [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Monday, June 22, 2026 7:52 AM
To: Peter Lambur; correspondence
Cc: Mark Sager, Mayor; Linda Watt; Sharon Thompson; Scott Snider; Nora Gambioli; Christine Cassidy
Subject: Re: Baptist Housing for Inglewood Campus of Care

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.

Thank you, Peter, for your thoughtful response regarding my concern for the residents of Inglewood during the construction of a new facility.

I agree with your comments. I know that it is necessary and support a the immediate need of a new LTC facility. I believe that DWV Mayor and Councillors share my ethical, moral, and caring point of view. I have written and raised this issue because I believe it must be addressed, not just accepted that nothing can/will be done. A discussion on the issue must be forced and ideas presented on the possibilities, not just accept that the residents stay in place with no thought given, or measures taken. As Ms. Fang wrote: “....long-term care residents are among the most vulnerable members of our community and deserve an environment that supports dignity, comfort, and well-being throughout any redevelopment process.”

Repeated thanks,

Barbara Chaworth-Musters

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

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

On Jun 21, 2026, at 7:14 PM, Peter Lambur <plambur@westvancouver.ca> wrote:

Hello Barbara -

Construction impact on the quality of life experience for current residents at Inglewood Care Centre was raised early on with the Baptist team and although acknowledged by them, I have seen no substantive response to this issue. If, as you point out, Baptist is committed to providing a supportive environment for our elders in the last months of their lives, then they need to be compelled to 'walk the talk'.

The simple fact of the matter is that the new LTC facility will be built a few metres apart from the existing care centre and there is no plausible way the construction impacts can be effectively mitigated for some / many of the current residents. As an architect with experience in the health care field I know this and to imagine otherwise is wishful thinking. In other similar situations, the solution has been to gradually empty the facility to be replaced through attrition. But the problem with this is the temporary loss of LTC beds during the renewal process and the attendant loss of revenue to the facility operator during

that period. Yet to allow residents to continue to occupy a substandard facility made arguably unliveable by construction impacts is untenable.

I urge you to attend the Public Hearing and make your views - on behalf of the current and future residents of Inglewood Care Centre - known. Thank you for your advocacy on their behalf.

And for the record, the views and comments offered above are expressly my own and are not representative of those of Mayor and Council.

Peter Lambur

From: Barbara Chaworth-Musters [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: June 21, 2026 1:00 PM
To: correspondence <correspondence@westvancouver.ca>
Cc: Mark Sager, Mayor <mark@westvancouver.ca>; Linda Watt <lwatt@westvancouver.ca>; Sharon Thompson <sthompson@westvancouver.ca>; Scott Snider <ssnider@westvancouver.ca>; Peter Lambur <plambur@westvancouver.ca>; Nora Gambioli <ngambioli@westvancouver.ca>; Christine Cassidy <ccassidy@westvancouver.ca>
Subject: Baptist Housing for Inglewood Campus of Care

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 Councillors Cassidy, Gambioli, Lambur, Snider, thompson, and Watt,

I am very confused by the messages received from Correspondence regarding my email of June 20/Baptist Housing - Inglewood Campus of Care. Because of the confusion regarding the links in my email, and a response showing the links are blocked, I am sending you the contents of my email as a Word docx.

Thank you.

Barbara Chaworth-Musters
[REDACTED] s. 22(1)
West Vancouver, B.C. [REDACTED] s. 22(1)

Please do not redact my name.

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Monday, June 22, 2026 10:19 AM
To: correspondence
Cc: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Subject: Support of Baptist Senior's Housing Project

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

I am writing in support of the Baptist Senior's Housing Project as West Vancouver badly needs more housing options for seniors.

The project location on Inglewood and Taylor Way is an ideal location for this larger senior's housing project.

Thank you.

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

West Vancouver, B.C.

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

From: Kirsten Allenberg <kallenberg@baptisthousing.org>
Sent: Monday, June 22, 2026 10:32 AM
To: correspondence
Cc: s.22(1)
Subject: Fwd: Letter of Support Inglewood Care Center
Attachments: Inglewood redevelopment_Letter of Support .pdf

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the organization from email address kallenberg@baptisthousing.org. 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 the attached letter regarding Inglewood Care Center.

Thank you,

Kirsten Allenberg
VP Marketing and Communications
Baptist Housing

Date: 21 June 2026

Mayor and Council
District of West Vancouver
750 17th Street
West Vancouver, BC V7V 3T3

Re: Support for the Redevelopment of Inglewood Care Centre

Dear Mayor and Council,

My connection to the North Shore, and the Inglewood community:

I have been a resident of North Vancouver District s. 22(1) years. s. 22(1) was admitted to Inglewood Care Centre in s. 22(1) after waiting several months in hospital. We feel fortunate to gain a place at Inglewood.

This project is important to me personally because:

There is a shortage of long-term care beds on the North Shore and often placements are made in neighbouring communities (e.g., Vancouver), which can make it difficult for families to visit that have to rely on public transport. This will become more acute as the population ages. This put more pressures on families to support their loved-one at home whilst waiting for placement. I think this project is long overdue and will be a asset to the North Shore community.

I support the proposed redevelopment of Inglewood Care Centre. West Vancouver has experienced a significant loss of long-term care capacity over the last five years with the closure of West Vancouver Care Centre and Capilano Care Centre. At the same time, the number of older adults in our community continues to grow.

Today, Inglewood remains the only publicly funded long-term care community in West Vancouver and is reaching the end of its expected lifespan. This reality creates urgent and growing pressure on seniors, families, and the healthcare system as demand for long-term care continues to increase while local care capacity remains limited.

The redevelopment of Inglewood Care Centre represents an important opportunity to help address this need. It will replace aging infrastructure with a modern, purpose-built community that better reflects today's standards of care. In addition to renewing existing long-term care capacity, the project will help restore some of the care capacity lost in West Vancouver while

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Monday, June 22, 2026 12:02 PM
To: correspondence
Subject: Inglewood Long Term Care Facility

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.

Attention: Mayor and Council

I am writing to strongly support the full scope of this project. We need a modern facility for our seniors (for me) and I am shocked that given our aging demographic (especially in West Vancouver) that there is any push back to proceeding with this project. My sense is that there are a small minority blocking this project despite the undeniable need for such a facility.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

West Vancouver BC

From: Nicholas Smith <Nicholas.Smith@nscr.ca>
Sent: Monday, June 22, 2026 1:28 PM
To: correspondence; Planning Department
Subject: CHAC Letter of Support for Baptist Housing Society – Inglewood Renewal Project
Attachments: 2026.06.22 CHAC Inglewood letter of support.pdf

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

Dear District of West Vancouver,

Please find attached a letter of support for Baptist Housing Society’s proposed Inglewood Renewal Project on behalf of the Community Housing Action Committee.

Thank you for your consideration of this letter and of this project.

Kind regards,

Nick

Nicholas Smith (He/Him)
Legal Advocate
604-982-3310
nicholas.smith@nscr.ca



www.nscr.ca  

North Shore Community Resources acknowledges and honours that we live and work on the unceded territories of the Coastal Salish peoples, including the Skwxwú7mesh (Squamish), xʷməθkʷəyʹəm (Musqueam) and səl' ilwətaʔɪ (Tsleil-Waututh) Nations.

This email may be privileged and confidential. Any use or redistribution of this email by an unintended recipient is prohibited. If you receive this email in error please contact us by email.



Mayor and Council / Planning & Development Services
District of West Vancouver
750 17th Street
West Vancouver, BC V7V 3T3

VIA EMAIL

Subject: Letter of Support for Baptist Housing Society – Inglewood Renewal Project

Mayor and Council,

The North Shore Community Housing Action Committee (CHAC) supports Baptist Housing Society's application to redevelop the Inglewood Care Centre into a phased seniors' campus of care in West Vancouver. This proposal aligns with CHAC's focus on inclusive, affordable, community-based housing by expanding the range of seniors' housing and care options and enabling older residents to remain in their community as their needs change.

Council's approval is urgent. West Vancouver's 75-plus population is rising quickly and is projected to exceed 10,000 within the next decade, yet the community currently has only about 1,489 seniors housing and care units in total and about 422 actual care spaces, including 230 long-term care beds. The gap between need and capacity is already significant, and delay will only widen it.

This project is a practical response to that challenge. It would deliver 364 long-term care beds, 161 seniors' rental homes, 200 independent living units, and a full continuum of care on one site. That means more local seniors can age in place safely, families can stay connected, and pressure on home care and hospitals can be reduced.

Broader system conditions make timely approval even more important. Home care in British Columbia is already strained by workforce shortages, limited hours, waitlists, and growing reliance on family caregivers, while delayed access to long-term care contributes to hospital congestion and blocked beds. Provincial data point to a current long-term care shortfall of about 2,000 beds, with demand projected to reach 16,000 beds by 2035/36.

Concerns about provincial fiscal uncertainty should not distract from the merits of the application. The information before Council indicates that the project is supported by a multi-partner funding structure that includes Baptist Housing's own equity as well as support from Vancouver Coastal Health, BC Housing, and anticipated federal funding. Council approval is therefore essential: without rezoning, none of these funding arrangements can move forward.



The proposal also advances important public-interest objectives beyond bed numbers alone. It replaces an aging care residence with modern facilities designed to current long-term care standards, including smaller household groupings and updated infection-control measures, while also adding affordable options for seniors and team members. This is a solutions-oriented project that responds to demographic reality with needed housing, care, and community infrastructure.

For these reasons, CHAC respectfully urges Council to approve the Inglewood redevelopment application and help secure urgently needed seniors' housing and care capacity for West Vancouver.

Sincerely,

s. 22(1)

Nicholas Smith
Interim Chair
Community Housing Action Committee

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Monday, June 22, 2026 2:15 PM
To: correspondence
Subject: Proposed Rezoning of 725 Inglewood and 721, 725, 733 and 735 Burley Drive

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.

I'm writing to share my support for the proposed rezoning of 725 Inglewood Ave and 721, 725, 733 and 735 Burley Drive. I live in the neighbourhood and drive past these addresses at least once a day. I think that an expanded care home on this site is a fantastic idea. There is so much need for elderly care in West Vancouver. The proximity to transit on Taylor Way gives staff and visitors an excellent option besides driving to access the new care home. The plan which allows residents to stay in their current unit until the new building is complete allows the elderly residents to have more dignity and less stress in their lives. I look forward to seeing an improved use of these lots.

Thank you.

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

West Vancouver

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Monday, June 22, 2026 2:17 PM
To: correspondence; hmjohnson@baptisthousing.org
Subject: Feedback on the Inglewood Care Expansion Proposal

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,

I am writing to you with concerns about the proposed Inglewood Care Centre extension and to share some questions and comments.

Whilst I do understand the need for seniors housing and LTC beds, as a Sentinel Hill resident, I don't think this is the best location for such a large expansion. I'm also disappointed that the local residents, who will be DIRECTLY impacted, were not consulted, nor even notified by mail.

If I am to understand correctly, the current care options are for LTC only, with 230 beds and 230 residents.

There are currently no Independent Living or Seniors Rental Housing units at Inglewood, and the proposal is for 361 new *units*, which could mean more than 500+ new residents. Seniors in both IL and Rental Housing could easily have cars and, indeed, would likely need them, as there are no on-site amenities (groceries for rental housing tenants, diagnostic services, a drug store, banking, exercise facilities, etc).

The location is more suited for LTC beds, as the area is not ideal for active seniors. There is nowhere to walk safely and easily, and no amenities to walk to. Burely Drive is dangerously icy in the winter months, and there are no parks close by. I do understand that a bus service is proposed, but it's difficult to run errands and get groceries while relying on bus pickups—whether public transit or dedicated buses. Locations for active seniors would be more ideally suited on Marine Drive, close to the seawall, the Seniors' Centre, the library, shopping, banking, pharmacies, Lifelabs and diagnostic services.

Concerns:

- **Traffic.** Taylor Way is the main artery for access to the highway and BC Ferries. Locally, it is used to access Ecole Cedardale and St. Anthony's which have students from all over the North Shore. In addition, the Har El congregation has a preschool as well as religious events—parking on holidays overflows into the neighbourhood. The bus service up and down Taylor Way would likely need to be increased, which will add to the traffic burden. Delivery and pickup via the Taylor Way entrance by Har El will only be accessible by heading south, which means a turnaround in the British Properties—another residential neighbourhood.
- **Density.** The towers will be taller than any other building on Taylor Way once they leave the commercial centre of Park Royal. Amica is six stories and does not have a huge traffic burden. This is not in character for a residential neighbourhood.
- **Bike Lane on Burley and bike parking.** This is not useful as the terrain is not bike-friendly. I'm not entirely sure who this bike lane is for. It would not be suitable for kids/teens living in the area, as biking on Taylor Way is unsafe; residents are unlikely to bike; and it's not practical for staff to bike

up a hill in inclement weather to work long shifts. The space would be better used for a sidewalk and a wider road.

- Size of the project. This is a residential neighbourhood. The current care home fits well into the neighbourhood's character. Adding additional LTC beds in lower-rise buildings would be a better fit for this location; however, an additional 495-650+ residents, a good number with cars, is not suitable for the site.
- Construction. This is a long-term project and would be disruptive to the neighbourhood for years.
- Benefit. The benefit is that our seniors will be housed, but there is no benefit for local residents except increased noise, travel time and traffic. There are no communal amenities available for residents (or neighbours) such as a gym, sauna, groceries, drug store, or diagnostic services.

Questions:

- Will the developer consider adding amenities for residents, such as a grocery store, a drug store, banking and laboratory services?
- Who is the planned demographic for the bike lane and parking spots?
- For the IL and rental housing, what is the expected number of residents?
- Will there be dedicated physicians and nurse practitioners for the residents?

Again, I do understand the need for senior care (and I'm almost a senior myself); however, I think the Inglewood location is best suited for LOWER-rise towers focusing on LTC and perhaps Assisted Living, but not for IL and seniors' housing, as the location is not convenient for active seniors. And again, the fact that local residents were not consulted or informed before the project reached this stage is poorly handled.

Sincerely,

s. 22(1)

From: Keith Turner [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Monday, June 22, 2026 2:29 PM
To: correspondence
Subject: Fwd: Inglewood Redevelopment Proposal

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: Keith Turner [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Date: Sun, Jun 21, 2026 at 8:11 PM
Subject: Inglewood Redevelopment Proposal
To: Mark Sager <mark@westvancouver.ca>, Nora Gambioli <ngambioli@westvancouver.ca>, Linda Watt <lwatt@westvancouver.ca>, Scott Snider <ssnider@westvancouver.ca>, Peter Lambur <plambur@westvancouver.ca>, Christine Cassidy <ccassidy@westvancouver.ca>, Sharon Thompson <sthompson@westvancouver.ca>
Cc: correspondence <correspondence@westvancouver.ca>

Dear Mayor and Councillors,

The revised Baptist House Redevelopment proposal meets a critical need for housing and for care. Many of the concerns previously raised have been addressed in this revised proposal.

No doubt there will be people raising concerns regarding additional traffic and that it will impact the property values of residents in the immediate area. The additional traffic will be minimal, and the key issue here is traffic coming down Taylor Way from the highway routing through to Vancouver, not additional traffic from Inglewood. Some may even deem it an unnecessary expansion since they are able to afford their own in-house care. However, many residents will likely need some level of care in the later stages of their lives. Staying in the community where they have lived is without doubt the most beneficial aspect for families in West Vancouver. As important as the concerns raised by some individuals are, they pale in comparison to the benefits arising to the overall community.

This is a unique opportunity for you to support a critical need in the community. Therefore I encourage you to support this revised proposal.

With thanks.

Regards,

Keith Turner
[REDACTED] s. 22(1)
West Vancouver

Please do not redact my name.

From: M Slater <melroy1058@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 22, 2026 4:37 PM
To: correspondence
Cc: Mark Sager, Mayor; Christine Cassidy; Nora Gambioli; Peter Lambur; Scott Snider; Sharon Thompson; Linda Watt
Subject: Inglewood Redevelopment – Additional Comments on LTC Resident Well-Being
Attachments: Inglewood LTC Construction Impact.pdf

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the organization from email address melroy1058@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,

Further to my previous submission regarding the Inglewood redevelopment proposal, I am writing to provide additional comments focused specifically on the well-being of long-term care residents during construction.

This perspective raises a fundamental question: how vulnerable residents can be expected to live safely and comfortably within a multi-year construction environment, and whether more humane alternatives have been fully considered.

I have attached a short supplemental document outlining these concerns in more detail. In particular, I respectfully ask that Council:

- Require a clear, publicly available plan demonstrating how resident safety, comfort, and quality of life will be protected throughout all phases of construction, prior to any project approval; and
- Confirm whether viable alternatives — including temporary relocation of residents — have been fully evaluated and made public before a decision is made.

Given what is at stake for current and future residents, I believe these considerations are essential to an informed and responsible decision.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Melinda Slater
1058 Keith Road
West Vancouver

Attachment: Inglewood LTC Construction Impact – Supplemental Submission.pdf

Please do not redact

Inglewood Redevelopment Construction Impact & Resident Well-Being

Supplemental Submission

June 22, 2026

Further to my previous submission, I would like to add additional comments and questions specifically regarding the well-being of long-term care residents during construction.

Another issue that deserves far more serious consideration is the impact of this proposal on the people it is supposed to serve — **long-term care residents themselves.**

There has been concern raised about requiring residents to live in an active construction environment during their final years. That concern should not be minimized or treated lightly.

I have heard — indirectly — that this has been addressed with the suggestion that seniors may “enjoy the activity” of a construction site. With respect, that is not a serious response.

I am a senior. I lived through two years of demolition and construction next to my home — and that was for a single-family house. It was disruptive, stressful, and negatively impacted my quality of life and my ability to enjoy my home and garden. I can say with certainty: **living in a construction zone is not something anyone would choose — and certainly not in the later stages of life.**

This raises a very basic and unavoidable question: **How, in practical terms, is it acceptable to expect vulnerable long-term care residents to live safely and comfortably in the middle of a major, multi-year construction project?**

Baptist Housing’s website states: *“We believe our Christian heritage and faith helps us compassionately meet the needs of those living in our communities.”*

If that principle is to have real meaning, it must be reflected not only in words, but in decisions — especially in situations like this, where residents’ comfort, dignity, and well-being are directly at stake.

It is difficult to reconcile that stated commitment to compassionate care with a plan that would require frail seniors to spend their final years surrounded by noise, disruption, and construction activity.

I also understand that a key driver of this proposal is a requirement to keep existing beds operating throughout construction. That goal is understandable — but it cannot simply be asserted without a credible, humane, and workable plan for *how* it will actually be achieved.

Right now, that question remains unanswered. This highlights a broader problem. Too often, decisions like this are made at a bureaucratic level — without fully considering the real-world consequences for residents, families, neighbourhoods and the surrounding community.

Surely there are alternatives that deserve to be explored.

For example, could Vancouver Coastal Health partner with Baptist Housing to rebuild another facility — such as Capilano Care Centre — and temporarily relocate residents so that Inglewood can be rebuilt properly?

That approach could allow this site to be redeveloped in a way that truly centres the care environment: a purpose-built facility set within its full site, properly planned, surrounded by gardens and green space — rather than being constrained into a portion of the property simply to accommodate ongoing operations during construction.

In other words, instead of forcing care to adapt to construction, we could design construction around care.

That is a fundamentally different — and far more compassionate — approach. Because what is at stake here is not just efficiency, or project logistics, or even timelines. It is the lived experience of people in long-term care in what may be the final years of their lives.

If we are being asked to support this project on the basis that it serves seniors, then we should be insisting that it does so in a way that genuinely prioritizes their well-being, dignity, and quality of life.

At the very least, that means asking: **Have reasonable, humane alternatives been seriously explored — or are we simply accepting the constraints of this proposal as fixed?**

Requests for Council Consideration

Given the seriousness of these concerns, I respectfully ask that Council:

1. **Require a clear, detailed, and publicly available plan** outlining how resident safety, comfort, noise mitigation, air quality, and overall quality of life will be protected throughout all phases of construction — **prior to any project approval.**
2. **Confirm whether viable alternatives have been fully evaluated,** including the potential for temporary relocation of residents during construction, and ensure that this analysis is made public before a decision is made.

If we truly care about long-term care residents, then we should not settle for a solution that asks them to live through a construction site when there may be better, more humane options available.

Melinda Slater
1058 Keith Road
West Vancouver

Please do not redact

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Monday, June 22, 2026 11:28 PM
To: correspondence
Subject: Public Hearing Submission – 725 Inglewood Avenue Redevelopment (Bylaw Nos. 5460, 5461, 5462 and Development Permit 21-051) – [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 Booth and Members of Council,

Please accept this email as my written submission for the June 23, 2026 Public Hearing regarding the proposed redevelopment of 725 Inglewood Avenue.

I am the owner and resident of [REDACTED] s.22(1) the proposed development site. [REDACTED] s.22(1) affected by this application, I would like to express my concerns regarding both the scale of the proposal and the planning process under which it is being considered.

I recognize and support the need for additional long-term care and seniors housing in West Vancouver. My concern is not with the provision of these important services, but with the magnitude of the proposed redevelopment and its impact on the surrounding neighbourhood.

The proposed development introduces multiple large buildings of up to eight and nine storeys immediately adjacent to an established low-density residential area. As a homeowner [REDACTED] s.22(1) significant impacts on privacy, outlook, neighbourhood character, and overall livability. Upper-floor residential units will overlook existing homes and private outdoor spaces along Inglewood Avenue, fundamentally changing the relationship between the development and the surrounding residential community.

I am also concerned about the transportation impacts associated with a development of this scale.

While the proposal is intended primarily for seniors housing and long-term care, the project will generate substantial daily activity from staff, healthcare workers, visitors, family members, deliveries, service vehicles, waste collection, and emergency services. The proposal itself includes loading areas, fire truck staging areas, service access routes, and multiple vehicle access points, demonstrating the significant operational activity expected on the site.

Taylor Way is already one of the busiest transportation corridors in West Vancouver, and traffic congestion in the Taylor Way / Inglewood Avenue area is a regular concern for residents. I am not convinced that the cumulative transportation impacts of this project, together with future growth anticipated in the broader Taylor Way area, have been adequately addressed.

My primary concern, however, relates to planning fairness and consistency.

This redevelopment will have a profound effect on properties along Inglewood Avenue, [REDACTED] s. 22(1) [REDACTED]. Yet the homes that will bear the most direct impacts of this rezoning are currently outside the Taylor Way / Park Royal Local Area Plan boundary and are therefore excluded from the broader discussion regarding future land use, neighbourhood transition, density, and redevelopment opportunities.

If Council believes that this location is appropriate for development of this scale and density, then the residential properties that will be directly affected should also be included in the planning process. It is difficult to understand how a major rezoning proposal can proceed while the surrounding properties most impacted by the project remain outside the planning framework and outside the conversation regarding the future of the area.

I respectfully request that Council carefully consider whether it is appropriate to approve a rezoning of this magnitude before the planning boundary is expanded to include the surrounding affected residential properties, allowing a more comprehensive and equitable evaluation of future land use in the neighbourhood.

Thank you for your consideration. I respectfully request that this correspondence be included in the public record for the June 23, 2026 Public Hearing.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

Owner and Resident

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

West Vancouver, BC

From: s. 22(1)
Sent: Tuesday, June 23, 2026 8:29 AM
To: correspondence
Subject: Proposal for the Redevelopment of Inglewood Care Centre

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.

June 23, 2026

Mayor and Council
District of West Vancouver
750 17th Street
West Vancouver, BC. V7V 3T3

Re: Proposal for the Redevelopment of Inglewood Care Centre

Dear Mayor and Council,

I live s. 22(1) from the proposed Inglewood redevelopment site. As a resident at this address s. 22(1) years, I've driven past the Care Centre daily. When I noticed the signs indicating redevelopment, I was pleased to think that a long overdue replacement was in the works. Ten days ago, I walked up to the signs, and became aware of the magnitude of the project, and that the proposal had reached the Public Hearing stage. Of the many neighbours I asked, no one knew that the plan required residential rezoning to accommodate the construction of 725 new units over a ten year period. We all assumed it was a much needed revamp and probable extension of the Long Term Care facility.

After pouring over all the public records starting from the 2020 public information meetings on the original proposal, to the last written submission included in the online Public Hearing binder, I feel compelled to register my deep concerns about the proposal advancing in its current form. I strongly support the expansion of a long term care centre and the development of affordable graduated housing for seniors. However, this proposal does not actually reflect the "Continuum of Care" scenario it promises.

In comments submitted in the public consultation reports, and in the written submissions for the PH, the focus in each case is on housing that meets the care needs of seniors. The urgency of providing more LTC beds is a constant. That we are in a "care crises" is a theme expressed time and again in other comments and reports. Letter C-6 p253 offers some harsh statistics:

“Today, across the entire District of West Vancouver, we have:

- Approximately 1,489 total seniors housing and care units - including market and non-market housing
- Of those, only 422 are actual care resources:
 - o 135 assisted living
 - o 57 memory care
 - o 230 long-term care

[Sources: Amica, Vancouver Coastal Health, District of West Vancouver]”

The Baptist Housing Development Proposal addresses this crisis with a net increase of 134 funded long term care beds in Phase 1 of the project. In Phase 2, the Seniors Rental units and the Independent Living units do not provide additional care. There is no assisted living, no memory care, and no long term care planned. In addition, Phase 2 housing(161 SR, 200 IL) is rented at market value except for 32 subsidized rental units.

In much of the public input, there is the perception that seniors housing, and therefore, this development, will be affordable. In addition to paying market value rent, the housing options in Phase 2 increase in expense with a move from rental housing to independent living. If more care becomes necessary, residents may bring in private care providers. (Having experienced this situation with s. 22(1) at Amica West Vancouver, this is another exceedingly high cost.)

In letter C-14 p275, a supporter of the project writes: “We have seen the gradual disappearance of financially accessible senior care homes in West Vancouver, and we are therefore grateful that there is a viable plan to provide a modern and beautiful facility for so many residents...”

And in letter C-13 p272:

“Our resources are limited and the situation within West Vancouver is bleak... (we) believe that the development of additional affordable beds within our home community is imperative. As I am sure Council is aware, not every West Vancouver resident is wealthy, but that should not preclude our right to remain in the community we grew up in...”

There seems to be a disconnect between the way the proposal is framed and what the proposal delivers. It skilfully highlights what we want to hear when we think of seniors housing, and underplays the scale of the project that is neither about specialized care nor about affordability. I strongly support housing for West Vancouver seniors that is driven by priority-based needs, and is evident in Phase 1 of the proposed development. I do not support the size and purpose of the second phase of the proposal in that the two large-scale rental options fail to deliver the comprehensive “Continuum of Care” that senior residents so urgently require now and in the future.

Thank you for considering my submission in your deliberations.

Sincerely,

s. 22(1)

West Vancouver

s. 22(1)

Sent from my iPad

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Tuesday, June 23, 2026 8:35 AM
To: correspondence
Subject: Meeting tonight on Inglewood
Attachments: Letter_of_Support.docx

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.

Date: June 13, 2026

Mayor and Council
District of West Vancouver
750 17th Street
West Vancouver, BC V7V 3T3

Re: Support for the Redevelopment of Inglewood Care Centre

Dear Mayor and Council,

My connection to the North Shore, and the Inglewood community:

I'm a senior who has lived in West Vancouver ten years. I'm single and need to find a care home for myself.

This project is important to me personally because:

I attended an early presentation on the Inglewood Care Center. I've been interested in the Care Center as a resource I may need in the future.

I support the proposed redevelopment of Inglewood Care Centre. West Vancouver has experienced a significant loss of long-term care capacity over the last five years with the closure of West Vancouver Care Centre and Capilano Care Centre. At the same time, the number of older adults in our community continues to grow.

Today, Inglewood remains the only publicly funded long-term care community in West Vancouver and is reaching the end of its expected lifespan. This reality creates urgent and growing pressure on seniors, families, and the healthcare system as demand for long-term care continues to increase while local care capacity remains limited.

The redevelopment of Inglewood Care Centre represents an important opportunity to help address this need. It will replace aging infrastructure with a modern, purpose-built community that better reflects today's standards of care. In addition to renewing existing long-term care capacity, the project will help restore some of the care capacity lost in West Vancouver while providing a range of housing and supportive living options designed to meet the diverse needs of seniors as they age.

As West Vancouver plans for the future, it is essential that adequate housing and care options exist to support an aging population. Projects such as the redevelopment of Inglewood Care Centre are an important part of ensuring our community can meet these needs in the years ahead.

I encourage Council to support this proposal and help ensure that seniors in West Vancouver have access to the care and housing they need, close to family, friends, and the community they know and love.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Name:

s. 22(1)

Community of Residence: Ambleside

Or/ Organization:

Email or Tel:

s. 22(1)

Signature:

s.22(1)

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Tuesday, June 23, 2026 10:33 AM
To: correspondence
Subject: Inglewood Care Centre redevelopment
Attachments: inglewood care centre.pages

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.

Sent from my iPad

s. 22(1)

West.vancouver BC s. 22(1)

Subject: Inglewood Care Centre Redevelopment – June 23 Public Hearing

Dear Mayor and Members of Council,

I am very much in support of the expansion of publicly funded long-term care (LTC) and recognize the importance of delivering the proposed 364 LTC beds at the Inglewood Care Centre site for our community. However, I urge Council to **reject this application as currently proposed.**

This project represents a significant increase in scale, density, and height that does not align with the surrounding neighbourhood. Further, key information—particularly regarding traffic impacts, parking, financial assumptions, and overall project viability—has not been clearly disclosed.

As a member of this community, I do not support a major, long-term redevelopment without sufficient transparency or meaningful public engagement. Important questions remain unanswered, including how much of the proposed density is actually required to deliver the LTC component and why approval is being sought for a multi-phase project spanning many years.

Approving a proposal of this magnitude without complete information would be premature and could set an unintended precedent for future development in the area.

A more appropriate path forward would be to advance the urgently needed publicly funded LTC beds, while requiring a revised proposal that is appropriately scaled, transparent, and developed with meaningful community input.

For these reasons, I respectfully ask that Council reject the current proposal.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

s. 22(1)

West Vancouver, BC s. 22(1)

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Tuesday, June 23, 2026 11:04 AM
To: correspondence

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 Members of Council,

I am a property owner on (WV) , I write on behalf of myself to formally object to this application on three grounds.

1. THE PROJECT HAS NOT MEANINGFULLY IMPROVED — THE SCALE AND APPEARANCE REMAIN UNACCEPTABLE

Throughout the community consultation process, residents consistently and repeatedly asked for two things: reduce the height, and reduce the density. The revised proposal before Council tonight does not reflect that feedback.

The project still proposes 725 beds and units across four buildings reaching up to nine storeys — an unprecedented scale for this low-rise residential neighbourhood. In some respects, the revised buildings are taller than earlier iterations. The massing and visual impact of this development is incompatible with the established character of West Vancouver. No amount of landscaping or design refinement changes the fundamental reality: nine-storey towers do not belong to WV, and they are not what this community asked for, accepted, or approved.

This is not a development West Vancouver should accept — not today, and not as a precedent for the future.

2. THIS APPLICATION BYPASSES THE TAYLOR WAY LOCAL AREA PLAN — IN DIRECT CONTRADICTION OF COUNCIL'S OWN 2021 RULING

The subject properties at 725 Inglewood Avenue fall within the Taylor Way Local Area Plan boundary, as defined in OCP Map 7. This is the District's own designation.

In 2021, Council refused to advance a proposal for 52 townhouses at 695 Burley Drive — on this same street, within this same planning boundary — specifically because the Taylor Way Local Area Plan had not yet been completed. Council determined that no development should proceed before that plan was finished.

The Taylor Way Local Area Plan is still not finished.

Tonight's application is for 725 units — fourteen times the scale of the proposal Council turned away in 2021. We ask Council to explain, on the record, why the standard applied in 2021 does

not apply tonight. The Local Area Plan exists precisely to determine the appropriate scale, height, and density for this corridor. Approving this application before that plan is complete does not just affect 725 Inglewood Avenue — it sets a precedent for every subsequent application along the Taylor Way corridor, and it undermines the planning framework this community depends on.

We ask Council to defer adoption of Bylaws No. 5460 and 5461 until the Taylor Way Local Area Plan is complete.

3. TRAFFIC AND NOISE IMPACTS ARE CATASTROPHIC — AND THERE IS NO CREDIBLE MITIGATION PLAN

A facility of 725 beds and units will generate hundreds of daily vehicle movements — staff shift changes, resident services, medical deliveries, and visitor traffic — concentrated at the Inglewood Avenue and Taylor Way intersection, one of the most heavily congested points in West Vancouver.

We have not been provided with an independent traffic impact assessment. We have not been given enforceable, written commitments on construction noise management across what will be a multi-year, two-phase build. The assurances we have received are general and unverifiable.

We are not opposed to senior care. We are opposed to a project of this scale, in this location, under this process — a process that asks Council to change its own rules, override its own 2021 precedent, and approve a development that the community has clearly and repeatedly said it does not accept in this form.

We urge Council to defer this application until the Taylor Way Local Area Plan is complete, and to hold this project to the same standard it applied to every other development in this planning boundary.

Sincerely,
s. 22(1)

West Vancouver

s. 22(1)

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Tuesday, June 23, 2026 11:10 AM
To: correspondence
Subject: Object Inglewood 725

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 Members of Council,

I am a property owner on (WV), I write on behalf of myself to formally object to this application on three grounds.

1. THE PROJECT HAS NOT MEANINGFULLY IMPROVED — THE SCALE AND APPEARANCE REMAIN UNACCEPTABLE

Throughout the community consultation process, residents consistently and repeatedly asked for two things: reduce the height, and reduce the density. The revised proposal before Council tonight does not reflect that feedback.

The project still proposes 725 beds and units across four buildings reaching up to nine storeys — an unprecedented scale for this low-rise residential neighbourhood. In some respects, the revised buildings are taller than earlier iterations. The massing and visual impact of this development is incompatible with the established character of West Vancouver. No amount of landscaping or design refinement changes the fundamental reality: nine-storey towers do not belong to WV, and they are not what this community asked for, accepted, or approved.

This is not a development West Vancouver should accept — not today, and not as a precedent for the future.

2. THIS APPLICATION BYPASSES THE TAYLOR WAY LOCAL AREA PLAN — IN DIRECT CONTRADICTION OF COUNCIL'S OWN 2021 RULING

The subject properties at 725 Inglewood Avenue fall within the Taylor Way Local Area Plan boundary, as defined in OCP Map 7. This is the District's own designation.

In 2021, Council refused to advance a proposal for 52 townhouses at 695 Burley Drive — on this same street, within this same planning boundary — specifically because the Taylor Way Local Area Plan had not yet been completed. Council determined that no development should proceed before that plan was finished.

The Taylor Way Local Area Plan is still not finished.

Tonight's application is for 725 units — fourteen times the scale of the proposal Council turned away in 2021. We ask Council to explain, on the record, why the standard applied in 2021 does not apply tonight. The Local Area Plan exists precisely to determine the appropriate scale, height, and density for this corridor. Approving this application before that plan is complete does not just affect 725 Inglewood Avenue — it sets a precedent for every subsequent application along the Taylor Way corridor, and it undermines the planning framework this community depends on.

We ask Council to defer adoption of Bylaws No. 5460 and 5461 until the Taylor Way Local Area Plan is complete.

3. TRAFFIC AND NOISE IMPACTS ARE CATASTROPHIC — AND THERE IS NO CREDIBLE MITIGATION PLAN

A facility of 725 beds and units will generate hundreds of daily vehicle movements — staff shift changes, resident services, medical deliveries, and visitor traffic — concentrated at the Inglewood Avenue and Taylor Way intersection, one of the most heavily congested points in West Vancouver.

We have not been provided with an independent traffic impact assessment. We have not been given enforceable, written commitments on construction noise management across what will be a multi-year, two-phase build. The assurances we have received are general and unverifiable.

We are not opposed to senior care. We are opposed to a project of this scale, in this location, under this process — a process that asks Council to change its own rules, override its own 2021 precedent, and approve a development that the community has clearly and repeatedly said it does not accept in this form.

We urge Council to defer this application until the Taylor Way Local Area Plan is complete, and to hold this project to the same standard it applied to every other development in this planning boundary.

Sincerely,

s. 22(1)

West Vancouver

From: s. 22(1)
Sent: Tuesday, June 23, 2026 11:14 AM
To: correspondence
Subject: Object Inglewood 725

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 Sager and Members of Council,

I am a property owner on (WV), I write on behalf of myself to formally object to this application on three grounds.

1. THE PROJECT HAS NOT MEANINGFULLY IMPROVED — THE SCALE AND APPEARANCE REMAIN UNACCEPTABLE

Throughout the community consultation process, residents consistently and repeatedly asked for two things: reduce the height, and reduce the density. The revised proposal before Council tonight does not reflect that feedback.

The project still proposes 725 beds and units across four buildings reaching up to nine storeys — an unprecedented scale for this low-rise residential neighbourhood. In some respects, the revised buildings are taller than earlier iterations. The massing and visual impact of this development is incompatible with the established character of West Vancouver. No amount of landscaping or design refinement changes the fundamental reality: nine-storey towers do not belong to WV, and they are not what this community asked for, accepted, or approved.

This is not a development West Vancouver should accept — not today, and not as a precedent for the future.

2. THIS APPLICATION BYPASSES THE TAYLOR WAY LOCAL AREA PLAN — IN DIRECT CONTRADICTION OF COUNCIL'S OWN 2021 RULING

The subject properties at 725 Inglewood Avenue fall within the Taylor Way Local Area Plan boundary, as defined in OCP Map 7. This is the District's own designation.

In 2021, Council refused to advance a proposal for 52 townhouses at 695 Burley Drive — on this same street, within this same planning boundary — specifically because the Taylor Way Local Area Plan had not yet been completed. Council determined that no development should proceed before that plan was finished.

The Taylor Way Local Area Plan is still not finished.

Tonight's application is for 725 units — fourteen times the scale of the proposal Council turned away in 2021. We ask Council to explain, on the record, why the standard applied in 2021 does not apply tonight. The Local Area Plan exists precisely to determine the appropriate scale, height, and density for this corridor. Approving this application before that plan is complete does not just affect 725 Inglewood Avenue — it sets a precedent for every subsequent application along the Taylor Way corridor, and it undermines the planning framework this community depends on.

We ask Council to defer adoption of Bylaws No. 5460 and 5461 until the Taylor Way Local Area Plan is complete.

3. TRAFFIC AND NOISE IMPACTS ARE CATASTROPHIC — AND THERE IS NO CREDIBLE MITIGATION PLAN

A facility of 725 beds and units will generate hundreds of daily vehicle movements — staff shift changes, resident services, medical deliveries, and visitor traffic — concentrated at the Inglewood Avenue and Taylor Way intersection, one of the most heavily congested points in West Vancouver.

We have not been provided with an independent traffic impact assessment. We have not been given enforceable, written commitments on construction noise management across what will be a multi-year, two-phase build. The assurances we have received are general and unverifiable.

We are not opposed to senior care. We are opposed to a project of this scale, in this location, under this process — a process that asks Council to change its own rules, override its own 2021 precedent, and approve a development that the community has clearly and repeatedly said it does not accept in this form.

We urge Council to defer this application until the Taylor Way Local Area Plan is complete, and to hold this project to the same standard it applied to every other development in this planning boundary.

Sincerely,
s. 22(1)

West Vancouver

s. 22(1)

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Tuesday, June 23, 2026 11:17 AM
To: correspondence
Cc: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Subject: Redevelopment of Inglewood Care Centre

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,

We support the need for a Campus of Care to be developed by Baptist Housing.

You are fully aware of the need for more seniors' range of housing , supportive living options and long term care.

We request that you support this proposal.

Thank-you,

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

From: Sidhu, Jatinder <Jatinder.Sidhu@leg.bc.ca>
Sent: Tuesday, June 23, 2026 11:20 AM
To: Mark Sager, Mayor; Linda Watt; Peter Lambur; Sharon Thompson; Scott Snider; Christine Cassidy; Nora Gambioli
Cc: correspondence
Subject: Letter from MLA re Inglewood
Attachments: DWV BH Inglewood letter.pdf

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

Dear Mayor & Council,

Please find attached a letter from Jeremy Valeriotte MLA on the proposed Inglewood redevelopment.

Best,

J

-

Jatinder Sidhu (he, him)
Constituency Lead,
Jeremy Valeriotte MLA - West Vancouver-Sea To Sky,
Office: 778 655 5768
Mobile: 672 922 0974



Tuesday, June 23, 2026

Mayor & Council
District of West Vancouver

Via email: correspondence@westvancouver.ca

Dear Mayor Sager and members of West Vancouver council,

Re: **Baptist Housing/ Inglewood Care Centre**

As the elected provincial representative for the riding of West Vancouver–Sea to Sky I am writing to support Baptist Housing’s proposed Inglewood Care Centre redevelopment project.

The provincial funding context for new Long Term Care (LTC) facilities is bleak. The BC government’s decision in February to delay the construction of seven planned care home takes us ‘[From Shortfall to Crisis](#)’, in the words of the BC Seniors’ Advocate.

Meanwhile Baptist Housing is providing all the capital investment for the LTC facility, with BC Housing contributing to the rental homes in the redevelopment. This secured funding gives West Vancouver an opportunity to renew an end-of-life facility, and add capacity for a total of 364 LTC beds by 2030. This is a rare opportunity that should not be missed.

On the broader issue of Highway 99 traffic impact on West Vancouver, it is important to point out that pressure added by growth outside the North Shore can be partly mitigated by solutions like the long-promised public Sea to Sky regional public transit, which would decrease traffic to and from Vancouver to Squamish, Whistler and Mount Currie. Other contributions include better transit across the North Shore and beyond, such as Bus Rapid Transit (BRT).

With the closure of two LTC facilities in recent years, West Vancouver already faces a significant shortfall in available LTC beds. Add to that a growing population of seniors for whom home support care will no longer meet their needs, and the demand for publicly-funded LTC beds will inevitably grow.

Thank you for your consideration of this looming seniors’ housing crisis as you contemplate this decision and trust you will make the right decision.

Sincerely,

Jeremy Valeriote, MLA
West Vancouver – Sea to Sky.

West Vancouver–Sea to Sky Constituency Office

Box #106, Squamish Adventure Centre,
38551 Loggers Lane, Squamish, B.C., V8B 0H2
☎ 778-655-5768 or 1-888-424-1658 (Toll-Free)
Jeremy.Valeriote.MLA@leg.bc.ca

Legislative Office

Parliament Buildings
Victoria, B.C., V8V 1X4
☎ 250-387-8347
greencaucus@leg.bc.ca

From: s. 22(1)
Sent: Tuesday, June 23, 2026 1:19 PM
To: correspondence
Subject: Re: Inglewood Care Centre Redevelopment — Formal Written Objection From s. 22(1)
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.

To: Mayor Sager and Members of Council District of West Vancouver Public Hearing — June 23, 2026

Dear Mayor Sager and Members of Council,

I am a property owner s. 22(1) proposed Inglewood Care Centre redevelopment. I write on behalf of myself and my neighbours s. 22(1) to formally object to Bylaw No. 5460, 5461, 5462 and Development Permit 21-051 on four grounds.

1. Provincial legislation does not justify bypassing the Taylor Way Local Area Plan.

On December 1, 2025, Council adopted OCP Amendment Bylaw No. 5406 — the provincially-mandated housing policy update required under Bill 44, completed before the December 31 deadline. The District has fulfilled its provincial obligations under that legislation.

Tonight's Bylaw No. 5460 is a separate, site-specific amendment to change the land use designation of a single property from Community and Public Assembly to high-density mixed residential use. This is not what Bill 44 requires. Provincial housing targets mandate holistic community planning — which is precisely what the Taylor Way Local Area Plan is designed to deliver. Using provincial legislation to justify bypassing the LAP inverts the logic of that legislation entirely.

2. This Council established that the LAP must come first — and applied that standard on this street.

The subject properties fall within the Taylor Way Local Area Plan boundary as defined in OCP Map 7. In 2021, Council explicitly refused to advance a proposal for 52 townhouses at 695 Burley Drive — on this same street, within this same boundary — because the Taylor Way Local Area Plan was not yet complete.

The Taylor Way Local Area Plan is still not complete.

Tonight's application is for 725 units — fourteen times the scale of the 2021 proposal. The residents of s. 22(1) did not organize larger opposition between 2021 and 2026 because we trusted that the LAP process would protect us. Proceeding tonight, without explanation, violates the legitimate expectation this Council created for this community.

3. This is not a healthcare project. Half of it is commercial residential development.

Of 725 proposed units, only 364 beds are publicly funded long-term care. The remaining 361 units — 200 independent living suites and 161 rental units — are commercial residential products operated by Baptist Housing for revenue. Baptist Housing's own website describes independent living as an "all-inclusive lifestyle" offering private market-rate suites. The rental building is 80% market rate.

Fifty percent of this application is commercial housing, packaged with a healthcare component to justify an OCP amendment that would not otherwise be approved at this scale, height, or location. The District's own OCP amendment process — requiring a public hearing — confirms this project is inconsistent with current land use rules.

4. Community feedback was disregarded. Directly affected residents have no protections.

Neighbours consistently requested reduced height and density throughout consultation. Earlier proposals included explicit commitments to lower building heights along Burley Drive. The final design reaches eight to nine storeys on the Burley Drive frontage — taller than earlier iterations.

Baptist Housing acquired residential lots on one side of Burley Drive. Residents on the opposite side — at 720 to 770 Inglewood Avenue — were not purchased out, not compensated, and have no buffer. No independent shadow study has been provided. No independent traffic assessment exists for the Inglewood Avenue and Taylor Way intersection under full facility operation. No binding noise mitigation plan covers the multi-year, two-phase construction period.

Request:

We ask Council to defer adoption of Bylaws No. 5460 and 5461 until the Taylor Way Local Area Plan is complete, and to apply the same standard to this application that it applied to 695 Burley Drive in 2021.

Respectfully submitted,

s. 22(1), West Vancouver

From: s. 22(1)
Sent: Tuesday, June 23, 2026 1:28 PM
To: correspondence
Subject: Inglewood care centre

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 Sager and Members of Council,

I am a property owner of s. 22(1) West Vancouver. I write on behalf of myself to formally object to this application on three grounds.

1. THE PROJECT HAS NOT MEANINGFULLY IMPROVED — THE SCALE AND APPEARANCE REMAIN UNACCEPTABLE

Throughout the community consultation process, residents consistently and repeatedly asked for two things: reduce the height, and reduce the density. The revised proposal before Council tonight does not reflect that feedback.

The project still proposes 725 beds and units across four buildings reaching up to nine storeys — an unprecedented scale for this low-rise residential neighbourhood. In some respects, the revised buildings are taller than earlier iterations. The massing and visual impact of this development is incompatible with the established character of West Vancouver. No amount of landscaping or design refinement changes the fundamental reality: nine-storey towers do not belong to WV, and they are not what this community asked for, accepted, or approved.

This is not a development West Vancouver should accept — not today, and not as a precedent for the future.

2. THIS APPLICATION BYPASSES THE TAYLOR WAY LOCAL AREA PLAN — IN DIRECT CONTRADICTION OF COUNCIL'S OWN 2021 RULING

The subject properties at 725 Inglewood Avenue fall within the Taylor Way Local Area Plan boundary, as defined in OCP Map 7. This is the District's own designation.

In 2021, Council refused to advance a proposal for 52 townhouses at 695 Burley Drive — on this same street, within this same planning boundary — specifically because the Taylor Way Local Area Plan had not yet been completed. Council determined that no development should proceed before that plan was finished.

The Taylor Way Local Area Plan is still not finished.

Tonight's application is for 725 units — fourteen times the scale of the proposal Council turned away in 2021. We ask Council to explain, on the record, why the standard applied in 2021 does

not apply tonight. The Local Area Plan exists precisely to determine the appropriate scale, height, and density for this corridor. Approving this application before that plan is complete does not just affect 725 Inglewood Avenue — it sets a precedent for every subsequent application along the Taylor Way corridor, and it undermines the planning framework this community depends on.

We ask Council to defer adoption of Bylaws No. 5460 and 5461 until the Taylor Way Local Area Plan is complete.

3. TRAFFIC AND NOISE IMPACTS ARE CATASTROPHIC — AND THERE IS NO CREDIBLE MITIGATION PLAN

A facility of 725 beds and units will generate hundreds of daily vehicle movements — staff shift changes, resident services, medical deliveries, and visitor traffic — concentrated at the Inglewood Avenue and Taylor Way intersection, one of the most heavily congested points in West Vancouver.

We have not been provided with an independent traffic impact assessment. We have not been given enforceable, written commitments on construction noise management across what will be a multi-year, two-phase build. The assurances we have received are general and unverifiable.

We are not opposed to senior care. We are opposed to a project of this scale, in this location, under this process — a process that asks Council to change its own rules, override its own 2021 precedent, and approve a development that the community has clearly and repeatedly said it does not accept in this form.

We urge Council to defer this application until the Taylor Way Local Area Plan is complete, and to hold this project to the same standard it applied to every other development in this planning boundary.

Sincerely

s. 22(1)

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Tuesday, June 23, 2026 2:37 PM
To: correspondence
Cc: Mark Sager, Mayor; Christine Cassidy; Peter Lambur; Nora Gambioli; Scott Snider; Sharon Thompson; Linda Watt
Subject: Final Version- all prior drafts void: Inglewood Care Centre – Formal Written Submission Bylaw No. 5460 & 5461

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 Members of Council,

I am a property owner [REDACTED] s. 22(1) proposed Inglewood Care Centre redevelopment at 725 Inglewood Avenue. I submit this written statement for the record of the Public Hearing of June 23, 2026.

1. PROCESS FAIRNESS: THE TAYLOR WAY LAP MUST COME FIRST

In 2021, this Council refused to advance 52 townhouses at 695 Burley Drive — same street, same Taylor Way Local Area Plan boundary — because the LAP was not yet complete. That plan is still not complete. Tonight's application is for 725 beds and units: fourteen times that scale.

Tonight's OCP amendment is not required by provincial legislation. The District fulfilled its provincial obligations under Bill 44 when it adopted OCP Amendment Bylaw No. 5406 on December 1, 2025. Tonight's Bylaw No. 5460 is a separate, site-specific amendment for a single project — not a provincial requirement. There is no legal obligation to proceed before the LAP exists.

Consistency matters. Residents of this corridor trusted the commitment this Council made in 2021. That commitment has not been explained away or withdrawn. It should be honoured.

Our ask: defer adoption of Bylaws No. 5460 and 5461 until the Taylor Way Local Area Plan is complete.

And given the genuine urgency of seniors care on the North Shore — which we fully acknowledge — we urge Council to direct staff to accelerate completion of the Taylor Way LAP as an urgent priority. The faster the LAP is finished, the faster this project can proceed on a proper foundation. Completing the LAP is not an obstacle to seniors housing. It is the path to approving it fairly.

2. INDEPENDENT STUDIES: THREE QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD

Before any adoption proceeds, we ask staff to confirm on the record:

Has an independent shadow study been completed for residential properties at 720–770 Inglewood Avenue — the homes that will permanently face eight and nine-storey buildings across Burley Drive? Not a developer analysis. An independent study.

Has an independent traffic assessment been conducted for the Inglewood Avenue and Taylor Way intersection under full facility operation — 725 residents, staff, deliveries, and visitors combined? Not a developer submission. An independent assessment.

Is there a binding, enforceable construction noise mitigation plan in writing — covering the full duration of a multi-year, two-phase build?

If these exist, make them public before adoption. If they do not, require them before third reading. Residents who will live permanently beside this development deserve the same information Council has.

3. ON THE MERITS: 364 CARE BEDS YES — 361 ADDITIONAL UNITS, THE URGENCY IS UNDEMONSTRATED

Nearly one in three West Vancouver residents is over 65. Two care facilities have closed in five years. The need for 364 publicly funded long-term care beds is real, urgent, and documented. We support them.

The remaining 361 units — 161 rental apartments and 200 independent living homes — may well be needed. But has Council seen evidence they are so urgently needed they cannot wait for the LAP? That they must be approved tonight, at nine storeys, before the corridor is planned?

The urgency of 364 care beds does not automatically apply to 361 additional units. These are two separate questions. Only one has been clearly answered.

IN SUMMARY

We are not opposed to this project. We are not opposed to seniors housing. We are asking for two things:

One — defer adoption until the Taylor Way LAP is complete, consistent with the 2021 standard, and accelerate that LAP as an urgent priority so this project can proceed properly and quickly.

Two — require and publicly release independent shadow, traffic, and noise studies before any adoption.

Fair process does not delay good projects. It protects them.

Respectfully submitted,

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Tuesday, June 23, 2026 2:55 PM
To: correspondence
Cc: Lisa Berg
Subject: Support for Inglewood Campus of Care proposal

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 would like to voice my strong support for the Inglewood Campus of Care proposal. This project represents an important opportunity to expand long-term care, independent living, and rental housing in West Vancouver.

As well, I would like to make some suggestions to reduce off-street parking supply and construction costs, improve safety for those walking and cycling, and reduce traffic congestion.

1. Optimize off-street parking (reduce excess parking supply)

The current proposal outlines 349 parking stalls (with a zoning amendment minimum of 345), which exceeds both the District's zoning bylaws and the likely demand. Given that the vast majority of residents in Long-Term Care (LTC) and Independent Living will not be driving, this allocation is significantly over-built. High parking minimums unnecessarily drive up construction costs, a financial burden that is ultimately passed on to the housing and care operations.

Before moving forward with construction of 128 stalls for LTC, 110 for rental, and 111 for independent living, a study of current vehicle use by staff and residents should be required to gauge off-street parking demand. In addition, the District should require a targeted parking study of a few comparable modern care facilities in Metro Vancouver to establish actual vehicle usage. Reducing the number of parking spaces would greatly reduce unnecessary underground parkade construction costs and reduce GHG emissions from construction.

2. Active Transportation, Pedestrian and Transit Priority, and School Safety

While the proposal highlights a renewed frontage on Inglewood Avenue and Taylor Way, the cycling and pedestrian infrastructure must be elevated to protect vulnerable road users, including local children. [REDACTED] s.22(1) attends nearby École Cedardale, where many students walk and bike to school, and ensuring safe routes to school is a priority for area families. Shifting of the bus stop to the front of the site will also improve transit access for seniors living in the complex.

- **Upgrade to True AAA Cycling Infrastructure:** The project materials note that separated bike lanes will be installed on Burley Drive, yet the current designs display them merely as painted lines, which do not offer adequate protection. The Burley Drive corridor requires All Ages and Abilities (AAA) fully separated protected bike lanes (using concrete barriers or grade separation) to ensure students can bike to school safely.
- **Continuous Sidewalks:** Where the sidewalk meets site driveways and conflict zones, the sidewalk must be raised and remain continuous in material and grade. Forcing pedestrians onto driveways prioritizes vehicles; a continuous sidewalk maintains true pedestrian priority and significantly improves accessibility for seniors and those with mobility aids.
- **Sidewalk and separated bike path on Taylor Way frontage:** As this is the first site along Taylor Way to redevelop in many decades, it sets a precedent for future developments. Safe access for both pedestrians and cyclists needs to be incorporated into the design, which will be replicated in future developments on the Taylor Way corridor. Depending on space constraints, either a sidewalk with a separated bike path or a single paved multi-use pathway needs to be added to the design. A good example of a sidewalk alongside a separated bike lane can be seen at the recently completed Executive on the Park development at the southeast corner of Taylor Way and Marine Drive.
- **Shift the #254 bus stop to the north in front of the Campus of Care:** Given the number of staff, visitors, and residents needing to access the site, residents should be able to easily take the #254 bus to Park Royal.

However, the bus stop is currently located on Taylor Way on the north side of the intersection with Burley Drive. It should be shifted to the south side of the intersection, in front of the Inglewood Campus of Care site. This will provide easier access, especially for those with mobility issues, who won't need to walk a longer distance to cross Burley Drive and access the bus stop. It will also improve safety for those waiting for the bus, with better lighting from the nearby Campus of Care along with much greater visibility than the current bus stop location.

- **Traffic Flow and Site Access Adjustments:** To mitigate the existing traffic friction near the site and prevent the surrounding local streets, the following adjustments should be conditioned:
 - **Lengthen and Widen the Southbound Right-Turn Lane on Taylor Way:** The current southbound right-turn lane on Taylor Way is too narrow and very short. Traffic frequently backs up southbound on Taylor Way because turning vehicles cannot access the lane when the through-lanes are queued. Lengthening and widening this turn lane will pull turning vehicles out of the main queue, reducing overall backups and letting local traffic flow more efficiently. In addition, it is unlikely that the Ministry of Transportation and Transit will allow trees in the road right of way as shown in the drawings, so this space will be better served as a longer right turn lane.
 - **Explore Direct Access to Taylor Way via North Laneway:** When traffic backs up on Burley Drive, exiting the site to reach Taylor Way could be challenging for residents, visitors and staff. I request that the District evaluate the potential for allowing direct access to Taylor Way from the laneway situated at the north end of the site, providing a vital secondary pressure valve for site egress.

The Inglewood Campus of Care is an excellent project that matches West Vancouver's demographic needs. By right-sizing the parking and securing these critical transportation upgrades, the District can deliver a project that is fiscally optimized, highly accessible, and safe for the surrounding neighborhood.

Thank you for your time and consideration of these improvements.

Sincerely,

s. 22(1)

--
s. 22(1)

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Tuesday, June 23, 2026 4:48 PM
To: correspondence; Mark Sager, Mayor; Nora Gambioli; Sharon Thompson; Linda Watt; Scott Snider; Christine Cassidy; Peter Lambur
Cc: Jenn Moller; Sean OSullivan
Subject: Public Hearing on the Inglewood Care Centre

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 Councillors,

I fully support this proposed development by the Baptist Housing Oak Bay Care Society. It will meet a desperate shortage of long-term care beds in West Vancouver by increasing the capacity from 230 to 364 beds, allowing more seniors to receive the support they need close to home, family, friends, and familiar surroundings. Not only that, but it will also create an additional 161 new seniors' rental housing units and 200 independent living apartments. So this is a win/win proposal by addressing the shortage of long-term care beds and the OCP's call for more diversified housing options.

I would now like to address the fact that I did not see in the project renderings any bike lanes on the perimeter roads. I feel that, as a condition of rezoning or density increases, the developer should be encouraged to construct or contribute to a separated bicycle facility along the property's frontage where Taylor Way, Inglewood Avenue and Burley Drive are all part of the District's designated cycling network. This would be consistent with the "complete streets" approach increasingly used in municipalities across Canada. Furthermore, it has become increasingly common on the North Shore to install separated bike lanes where new large multi-family buildings front designated bike routes. The following are recent examples:

1. Gateway Residences on Marine Drive immediately west of Taylor Way:



2. Executive on the Park immediately east of Taylor Way:



s.22(1)

3. Century on St Andrews Ave between 15th and 16th Streets East in North Vancouver:



Sincerely, s. 22(1)

--

s. 22(1)

West Vancouver, British Columbia,
Canada, s. 22(1)

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Tuesday, June 23, 2026 6:14 PM
To: correspondence
Cc: Mark Sager, Mayor; Christine Cassidy; Peter Lambur; Nora Gambioli; Scott Snider; Sharon Thompson; Linda Watt
Subject: Concerns about the Burley/Inglewood Development

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 a resident of [REDACTED] s. 22(1), West Vancouver.

While I am in favour of upgrading the care home. I have grave concerns about the proposed development, among which traffic congestion (the feeder route from Burley to Inglewood is already quite congested throughout any given day), the huge development would also disrupt the formerly quiet neighborhood for years, and upon completion, completely change the neighborhood.

I urge Council to defer adoption of Bylaws No. 5460 and 5461 until the Taylor Way Local Area Plan is complete — consistent with the standard Council applied to 695 Burley Drive in 2021 — and to direct staff to accelerate completion of that plan as an urgent priority.

Sincerely,

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

Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPad

Both the presentations by West Vancouver planning and by Mr. Kinna's presentation expressed that during the construction of the new care centre, the residents would remain in place, apparently as a condition of the support of Vancouver Coastal Health. Referring again to Mr. Kinna's statistics, one can understand the need to keep these beds available. But at what cost to the residents of Inglewood Care?

This evening I speak as an advocate for the residents of Inglewood during the construction of new facilities. Not only should the residents be considered, but also the staff. The residents remaining at Inglewood will live only metres away from the rebuild. We all know the constant, unacceptable noise level that comes with building what is intended. Before approval of this project can be given, the following questions need answering:

How will residents be protected from construction noise, vibration, dust, and disruption?

- How will quality of life be maintained for residents, particularly those living with frailty, mobility limitations, or dementia?
- What mitigation measures will be in place and how will they be monitored?
- Have alternative phasing or temporary relocation options been considered?
- How will residents and families be consulted throughout the redevelopment process?
- What will be done to contain the construction to permissible levels within our bylaws.

Mayor and Council have been sent links to studies that show: prolonged noise exposure can affect health and well-being, sleep disruption, communication difficulties, stress. Quality of life and noise exposure increasingly recognized as a health concern.

Mr. Kinna has expressed Baptist care for seniors: we support in the last 12-18 months of their lives.

These are precious moments in which the environment must be most supportive and most conducive to what we expect for our closest loved ones. Our team share a care giving spirit that is a shared and deeply personal commitment to how senior's live with dignity, purpose and belonging... we care about the lives of elders and the desire to serve them. We do it because of the caregiver's heart and because we are inspired by the values of Jesus. We do it because our elders, each and every one of them, are worth it. God loves them, and so we love them and serve them every day." Mr. Kinna, we admire your caring attitude, but please put this into practice. The office of the B.C. Seniors Advocate advises that yBaptist Housing is responsible for the planning, mitigation measures, and resident care throughout the development process.

having shared my concerns with the office of the B.C. Seniors Advocate, they have advised that my concerns, including those related to quality of life, environmental impacts, and resident consultation, will be documented and shared internally to inform

their ongoing monitoring of seniors services across the province. I was advised that the issues I have identified align with broader themes they continue to examine as part of their work.

West Vancouver Mayor and Councillors, Mr. Kinna, and staff of Baptist Housing, and Vancouver Coastal Health - come together and make an ethical, moral and caring commitment to the Inglewood residents the last phase of their lives deserve.

Mayor and Council must consider the factual information in the studies, require that the questions are answered, and ensure that a plan to protect residents with the respect they deserve is in place before this project can be approved.

s. 22(1)

West Vancouver, B.C.

s. 22(1)

Good Evening Mayor and Council.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak this evening regarding the Baptist Housing Project for the Inglewood Care Centre.

I think anyone listening to Mr, Kinna's presentation to Council on May 27th may have felt as I did - the overwhelming need for additional long-term care beds and the need to replace Inglewood Care Facility. We can admire that Baptist Housing has brought forward a revised plan for Inglewood with the assistance of Vancouver Coastal Health to rebuild Inglewood with an additional 130 publicly subsidized long term care beds. 130 beds is not quite half of the long-term care beds that West Vancouver once had with 75 beds at the West Vancouver Care Centre and Capilano Care Centre with 205 beds.

Listening to Mr. Kina's presentation several time, it was interesting to hear how many times Mr. Kinna referred to West Vancouver, and to community. A total of 19 times during his presentation inferring

this project was for the West Vancouver community. It is important to clarify, the Vancouver Coastal Health centralized, needs based system. Once deemed eligible, applicant's are placed on a centralized waitlist and asked to choose up to three preferred care homes within their local geographic health catchment area. VCH attempts to accommodate these preferences but cannot guarantee placement at a specific site. If a preferred facility has a waitlist, or if an applicant is in a hospital and no beds are available in their preferred community, they be offered an "interim bed" at another facility . Interim residents remain on the transfer list and are moved to their preferred home when a space opens. It is important to understand, that because Inglewood Care Home is in West Vancouver, there is no guarantee that as a resident of West Vancouver, one would be able to receive an Inglewood placement. Likely, you may have had a friend, or a friend's family member who is/was placed in the Lynn Valley Care Centre for lack of a bed at Inglewood. That Inglewood beds are not specifically for West Vancouver residents does not detract from the necessity of rebuilding

Inglewood and the the additional 130 long term care beds, but not necessarily for West Vancouver residents.

As mentioned, the additional 130 beds only replace about half of the long-term care beds that were once in West Vancouver. This poses the question of why Council is considering changing the zoning of the Inglewood Care site from PH1, Private Hospital Zone, to CD 56, Comprehensive Development. The great need for long term care beds has been identified. Mayor and Council must rethink whether an area of one of West Vancouver's most important healthcare-designated properties should be substantially committed to residential housing before future healthcare needs are determined. Need for seniors rental units and private independent care units not been established by Baptist or shown in our community.

s. 22(1)

West Vancouver, B.C. s. 22(1)

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Saturday, June 13, 2026 10:27 AM
To: correspondence
Subject: Keep Batch Ambleside open!

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 morning,

I wanted to express my support for reopening Batch Ambleside as soon as possible.

I understand there may be delays, but it was a fantastic gathering space that brought people together and added so much to the waterfront experience. It's disappointing to see the space sitting unused during the summer months, and I hope the process can be moved forward so it can reopen as soon as feasible.

Thank you!

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Monday, June 15, 2026 1:55 PM
To: correspondence
Subject: Batch Ambleside Reopening

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

Dear Mayor and Council,

I am writing to express my support for the reopening of Batch Ambleside as soon as possible.

Batch has become a valued part of the waterfront community, and many residents have been looking forward to its return this summer. Given the amount of community support, I am wondering why the process has taken so long and what specific obstacles remain before reopening can occur.

I encourage the District to do everything possible to help move this process forward without further delay.

Best,

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Thursday, June 18, 2026 8:05 AM
To: correspondence
Subject: Batch opening

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 West Vancouver council - staff;

I am a long-time West Vancouver resident/tax payer and am in full support of the wonderful Batch establishment opening as soon as possible.

We walk in the area often and I miss seeing that happy and vibrant little place with its community feel. I think it adds so much to the area and hopefully it will be able to be open very soon.

Yours truly,

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)
West Vancouver

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Thursday, June 18, 2026 12:27 PM
To: correspondence
Subject: REOPENING?? Batch restaurant- Ambleside

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

Hi,

Is there anyone I can reach to encourage / support the reopening of Batch?

Just two short blocks from my home, it became a delightful addition to the neighbourhood last summer. Truly. It was so well run and enjoyed by it's many patrons, I'd assumed it would be back up and running by now. It's a real shame to see such a special, unique place still sitting empty.

Thanks,
[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Thursday, June 18, 2026 1:34 PM
To: correspondence
Subject: Batch, Ambleside

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 whom it may concern,

I just wanted to write to say Batch in Ambleside is desperately missed. It was a wonderful highlight of last summer. A beautiful place to drink and eat local produce, listen to live music and finally see a younger crowd enjoying the area too. Please bring it back, it was such a huge asset to West Vancouver and I'm certain it will be again!

Yours Sincerely,
[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Thursday, June 18, 2026 11:35 AM
To: correspondence
Subject: Batch Ambleside Opening Date

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

Hello,

I am writing to add my support for opening Batch Ambleside as soon as possible. We have so few casual gathering places in our community where we can enjoy the outdoors, music, affordable drinks, and our beautiful beach. It is a shame they are missing out on this beautiful weather as well for their business.

Thank you,
[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Friday, June 19, 2026 12:13 PM
To: correspondence
Subject: Batch

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,

Please remove all barriers in the way of this fabulous pop-up meeting place re-opening this summer. There are precious few such locations in West Vancouver, which has a waterfront crying out for social venues, allowing us to enjoy the incredible beauty while sharing a drink with friends. Last summer was special with this place available for us, please do not prevent Batch from making our summer in WV so special.

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Saturday, June 20, 2026 3:31 PM
To: correspondence
Subject: Batch

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,
We are looking forward to seeing Batch open this summer in Ambleside.
Thank you,
[REDACTED] s. 22(1)
West Vancouver Resident s

From: Jennifer Clay [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Thursday, June 18, 2026 10:10 PM
To: Erik Wilhelm <ewilhelm@westvancouver.ca>
Cc: [REDACTED] s. 22(1); Michelle McGuire <mmcguire@westvancouver.ca>; [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
[REDACTED]; Sharon Thompson <sthompson@westvancouver.ca>; Linda Watt
<lwatt@westvancouver.ca>; Scott Snider <ssnider@westvancouver.ca>; Peter Lambur <plambur@westvancouver.ca>;
Christine Cassidy <ccassidy@westvancouver.ca>; Nora Gambioli <ngambioli@westvancouver.ca>; Mark Sager, Mayor
<mark@westvancouver.ca>
Subject: Heritage Alteration Permit 24-090 for 4798 The Highway

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.

Attached please find a letter of support from North Shore Heritage for this project.



NORTH SHORE HERITAGE PRESERVATION SOCIETY

2695 NELSON AVENUE, WEST VANCOUVER, BC V7V 2R8 | (604) 313-9639
INFO@NORTHSHOREHERITAGE.ORG | WWW.NORTHSHOREHERITAGE.ORG
BC SOCIETY REGISTRATION NO: S-49292

June 18, 2026

Erik Wilhelm
Senior Community Planner
District of West Vancouver
Via Email: ewilhelm@westvancouver.ca

RE: 4798 The Highway

I am writing on behalf of North Shore Heritage to express our support for the above-referenced application.

Over the past several months, the applicant, Frank Saniuk, has undertaken extensive consultation with both North Shore Heritage and the neighbouring residents. In response to feedback he received during this consultation, he has made substantial revisions to the design, size, and footprint of the proposed house, as well as to the landscape plan.

The revised design now reflects a more traditional West Coast Modern approach, incorporating additional clerestory windows and a simplified exterior material palette. The overall building footprint and massing have also been reduced. In addition, Mr. Saniuk engaged Paul Sangha, a respected landscape designer known for his West Coast Modern work, to develop a planting plan that provides effective screening for the most immediate neighbours.

These changes were driven largely by input received during two key engagements:

1. The neighbourhood consultation held on May 9, 2026, and
2. A subsequent on-site meeting with neighbours where Mr. Saniuk staked the proposed footprint and used a balloon to illustrate the building height.

Based on the revisions made to date, we believe the proposed house and landscape design are now suited to the character of the neighbourhood. North Shore Heritage supports the application and recommends that the project be approved.

Sincerely,

s. 22(1)

Jennifer Clay
President

Cc : Frank Saniuk
Cc : Mayor and Council

From: Frank [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Friday, June 19, 2026 7:33 AM
To: correspondence
Subject: Fw: Heritage Alteration Permit 24-090 for 4798 The Highway
Attachments: 4798 The Highway - NSH Letter of support.pdf

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.

Frank Saniuk

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Jennifer Clay [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
To: ewilhelm@westvancouver.ca <ewilhelm@westvancouver.ca>
Cc: [REDACTED] s. 22(1) mmcguire@westvancouver.ca <mmcguire@westvancouver.ca>; [REDACTED] s. 22(1) sthompson@westvancouver.ca <sthompson@westvancouver.ca>; lwatt@westvancouver.ca <lwatt@westvancouver.ca>; ssnider@westvancouver.ca <ssnider@westvancouver.ca>; plambur@westvancouver.ca <plambur@westvancouver.ca>; ccassidy@westvancouver.ca <ccassidy@westvancouver.ca>; ngamboli@westvancouver.ca <ngamboli@westvancouver.ca>; mark@westvancouver.ca <mark@westvancouver.ca>
Sent: Thursday, June 18, 2026 at 10:10:07 p.m. PDT
Subject: Heritage Alteration Permit 24-090 for 4798 The Highway

Attached please find a letter of support from North Shore Heritage for this project.



NORTH SHORE HERITAGE PRESERVATION SOCIETY

2695 NELSON AVENUE, WEST VANCOUVER, BC V7V 2R8 | (604) 313-9639
INFO@NORTHSHOREHERITAGE.ORG | WWW.NORTHSHOREHERITAGE.ORG
BC SOCIETY REGISTRATION NO: S-49292

June 18, 2026

Erik Wilhelm
Senior Community Planner
District of West Vancouver
Via Email: ewilhelm@westvancouver.ca

RE: 4798 The Highway

I am writing on behalf of North Shore Heritage to express our support for the above-referenced application.

Over the past several months, the applicant, Frank Saniuk, has undertaken extensive consultation with both North Shore Heritage and the neighbouring residents. In response to feedback he received during this consultation, he has made substantial revisions to the design, size, and footprint of the proposed house, as well as to the landscape plan.

The revised design now reflects a more traditional West Coast Modern approach, incorporating additional clerestory windows and a simplified exterior material palette. The overall building footprint and massing have also been reduced. In addition, Mr. Saniuk engaged Paul Sangha, a respected landscape designer known for his West Coast Modern work, to develop a planting plan that provides effective screening for the most immediate neighbours.

These changes were driven largely by input received during two key engagements:

1. The neighbourhood consultation held on May 9, 2026, and
2. A subsequent on-site meeting with neighbours where Mr. Saniuk staked the proposed footprint and used a balloon to illustrate the building height.

Based on the revisions made to date, we believe the proposed house and landscape design are now suited to the character of the neighbourhood. North Shore Heritage supports the application and recommends that the project be approved.

Sincerely,

s. 22(1)

Jennifer Clay
President

Cc : Frank Saniuk
Cc : Mayor and Council

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Friday, June 19, 2026 10:04 AM
To: correspondence
Subject: 4798 Highway New Revised Plans

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

To Council,

Having reviewed the new smaller footprint, design and landscape details in the plans for 4798 Highway we are in favour it.

We have previously lived close to the Lower Caulfeild area for many years and are familiar with this unique neighborhood.

The new revised plans show that a great deal of effort has been made by the applicants to fit in with this community and to abide by the requirements of the District.

We sincerely hope approval of this project goes ahead.

Regards,

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

Sent from my iPhone

From: Jennifer Clay [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Friday, June 19, 2026 11:51 AM
To: correspondence
Cc: Frank Saniuk
Subject: Fwd: Heritage Alteration Permit 24-090 for 4798 The Highway
Attachments: 4798 The Highway - NSH Letter of support.pdf

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

I've been asked to forward this to this email address.

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Jennifer Clay <jclay732@yahoo.ca>
Date: June 18, 2026 at 10:09:53 PM PDT
To: ewilhelm@westvancouver.ca
Cc: [REDACTED] s. 22(1), mmcguire@westvancouver.ca, [REDACTED] s. 22(1), [REDACTED], sthompson@westvancouver.ca, lwatt@westvancouver.ca, ssnider@westvancouver.ca, plambur@westvancouver.ca, ccassidy@westvancouver.ca, ngamboli@westvancouver.ca, mark@westvancouver.ca
Subject: Heritage Alteration Permit 24-090 for 4798 The Highway

Attached please find a letter of support from North Shore Heritage for this project.



NORTH SHORE HERITAGE PRESERVATION SOCIETY

2695 NELSON AVENUE, WEST VANCOUVER, BC V7V 2R8 | (604) 313-9639
INFO@NORTHSHOREHERITAGE.ORG | WWW.NORTHSHOREHERITAGE.ORG
BC SOCIETY REGISTRATION NO: S-49292

June 18, 2026

Erik Wilhelm
Senior Community Planner
District of West Vancouver
Via Email: ewilhelm@westvancouver.ca

RE: 4798 The Highway

I am writing on behalf of North Shore Heritage to express our support for the above-referenced application.

Over the past several months, the applicant, Frank Saniuk, has undertaken extensive consultation with both North Shore Heritage and the neighbouring residents. In response to feedback he received during this consultation, he has made substantial revisions to the design, size, and footprint of the proposed house, as well as to the landscape plan.

The revised design now reflects a more traditional West Coast Modern approach, incorporating additional clerestory windows and a simplified exterior material palette. The overall building footprint and massing have also been reduced. In addition, Mr. Saniuk engaged Paul Sangha, a respected landscape designer known for his West Coast Modern work, to develop a planting plan that provides effective screening for the most immediate neighbours.

These changes were driven largely by input received during two key engagements:

1. The neighbourhood consultation held on May 9, 2026, and
2. A subsequent on-site meeting with neighbours where Mr. Saniuk staked the proposed footprint and used a balloon to illustrate the building height.

Based on the revisions made to date, we believe the proposed house and landscape design are now suited to the character of the neighbourhood. North Shore Heritage supports the application and recommends that the project be approved.

Sincerely,

s. 22(1)

Jennifer Clay
President

Cc : Frank Saniuk
Cc : Mayor and Council

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Friday, June 19, 2026 12:17 PM
To: correspondence
Subject: support for 4798 The Highway project

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 whom it may concern,

I have reviewed the updated plans for the proposed development at 4798 The Highway and was so happy to see the input and support of the Northshore Heritage Society. I think it has made a world of difference to this project. I previously had my own home, [REDACTED] s.22(1) and think the new house at 4798 The Highway is a great West Coast Modern design that will blend brilliantly into the landscape. I support this project.

Best Regards,

[REDACTED]
s. 22(1)

From: s. 22(1)
Sent: Monday, June 22, 2026 9:34 AM
To: correspondence
Subject: 4798 The Highway

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

From: s.22(1)

Subject: 4798 The Highway, HAP 24-090

Firstly, I would like to commend everyone working in the orb of Community Planning, at the District.

Lower Caulfeild, has been helped, very professionally, along a tortured path, to reach impressive resolutions to the issues, at 4798 The Highway. North Shore Heritage, deserves praise, up and down, for promoting a West Coast Modern design. Heritage Guidelines were met by modifying the siting and size of the build, and, saving the conifers. Wildfire Hazard codes ✓

The onsite meeting, with neighbours, created further Good Will! So, the proposed Heritage Alteration Permit 24-090, for 4798 The Highway, has my complete support and respect.

Sincerely, s. 22(1)

From: s. 22(1)
Sent: Monday, June 22, 2026 12:08 PM
To: correspondence
Subject: 4798 The Highway/Statement for Submission

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.

Can the below statement be presented at the Council Meeting tonight? Is the 4798 Project still on the agenda?

Please advise!

s. 22(1)

My name is s. 22(1), and I am the owner of s. 22(1) this project. As this project represents a completely new development, on a lot that has never before had a home standing upon it, in a Heritage District, every step contemplated has created a concerning precedent, with ramifications beyond this one proposal.

It has always clear from the design, that a lot ill-suited for *any* sized home is now being planned to be filled to capacity, with variances that push *beyond* current regulations.

This to me is audacious and unprecedented, concerning the unique configuration and unusual history of the lot in question.

I believe that for all these reasons, *no* variances whatsoever should be entertained, and a smaller footprint of the home should be required, more in keeping with the size and unique character of the lot, and its place in this Heritage District.

If this project is allowed to go through as it is currently proposed, it will immediately and negatively impact the property values of not only the adjoining neighbors, but everyone living in Lower Caulfeild. This to me is a test case that will have ramifications for the future of West Vancouver, as currently, after the disbandment of the LCAC, the City is in a transitional period when it comes to mechanisms to address projects of this nature in an area once considered an "historic" district.

As far as many concerned neighbors can see, there is no aspect of this development that benefits *anyone* currently residing in this historic neighborhood, or anyone in West Vancouver.

Approval would create a dangerous precedent — where new empty lots can be crammed with inappropriately scaled homes, due to an exploitation of currently elastic City guidelines.

It cannot be stressed enough that any *new* structure on a lot, in a Heritage District, where no structure has existed before should be treated differently than a "tear down" and replacement home upon the same footprint.

Neighbors with considerable property investments are being aggressively forced to confront an entirely new structure, on a lot that always represented a zoning aberration, for a project that was never imagined when they invested in their home — let alone on a lot that literally is a gateway to The Cove.

For this reason, NO variances whatsoever should be allowed on this project, unless it can be conclusively demonstrated that they would reduce the overall impact upon our historical — and unique-- neighborhood.

s. 22(1)

A large black rectangular redaction box covers the text in this block.

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Monday, June 22, 2026 4:18 PM
To: Erik Wilhelm; correspondence
Cc: Jim Bailey; Sharon Thompson; Christine Cassidy; [REDACTED] s. 22(1); Mark Sager, Mayor; Nora Gambioli; Peter Lambur; Scott Snider; Linda Watt
Subject: Proposed Heritage Alteration Permit 24-090 for 4798 The Highway
Attachments: Letter to West Vancouver Council 20260622 [REDACTED] s.22(1).pdf

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 Eric

Attached please find my response to the proposed development at 4798 The Highway, for consideration at today's Council meeting.

Best regards
[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

s. 22(1)

s.22(1)

West Vancouver, BC

June 22, 2026

Subject: Submission to Council – Heritage Alteration Permit for 4798 The Highway

Focus: Non-compliance with Lower Caulfeild Heritage Conservation Area Guidelines

Dear Mayor and Council,

s.22(1) 4798 The Highway and once again wish to express my concerns regarding the proposed design under the Heritage Alteration Permit.

While the application may satisfy underlying RS-3 zoning metrics (height, setbacks, and floor area), it **does not comply with the intent of the Lower Caulfeild Heritage Conservation Area (HCA) guidelines**, which are the governing framework for design approval.

1. Excessive Perceived Mass Contrary to Neighbourhood Character

The guidelines emphasize **buildings with broken-up massing** that are **sensitively sited within the natural landscape**.

The proposed design presents as a **large, continuous building volume with limited segmentation**, resulting in a scale that exceeds the established neighbourhood character.

This is not a question of floor area, but of **how mass is expressed and perceived**.

2. Lack of Mass Articulation and Upper Storey Step-back

The HCA guidelines require new development to **fit within the landscape through additive forms and articulated volumes**.

The proposal instead:

- Aligns the upper storey directly over the lower walls
- Lacks meaningful step-backs
- Presents **continuous, unmodulated wall planes**

This materially increases the **apparent bulk**, particularly from adjacent properties.

3. Dominant Neighbour-Facing Elevation at Minimal Setback

At approximately **2.1 m side setback**, the proposal introduces a **tall, unarticulated vertical wall plane**.

The governing objectives for the HCA explicitly require:

- Buildings to be **sensitively sited**
- Development to **fit with natural site attributes and surrounding context**
- Preservation of **neighbour compatibility and spatial openness**

In its current form, the building creates a **visual enclosure effect** inconsistent with these principles.

4. Inconsistent Roof Form and Dominant Flat Roof Visibility

Lower Caulfeild character is defined by **low-profile, horizontally expressed, and articulated roofscapes** integrated into the natural setting.

The proposal introduces a **broad, flat roof form** that is:

- **Visibly exposed when approaching along The Highway,**
- Readable as a **large, continuous dark roof plane,** and
- Likely to appear as a **dominant “tar roof” condition within the streetscape**

This is particularly problematic in a neighbourhood defined by **varied, articulated rooflines and buildings that recede into the landscape**.

The result is not only architectural inconsistency, but a **highly visible departure from the expected character when experienced from the public realm**.

5. Insufficient Response to Natural Topography

The guidelines emphasize buildings that **retain natural site attributes and are carefully integrated with terrain**.

The proposed design appears to:

- Normalize grade rather than step with it
- Create **larger exposed vertical wall areas**

This causes the building to **read as imposed on the site rather than integrated within it**, contrary to the foundational intent of the HCA.

6. Conflict with the Official Community Plan and Heritage Framework

The Lower Caulfeild HCA is not discretionary guidance—it is embedded within the **Official Community Plan (OCP), which serves as the District’s primary policy framework guiding land-use decisions and Council approvals.**

The OCP explicitly requires that new development:

- **Maintain the area’s distinctive character,** and
- **Be designed to fit with and retain natural site attributes**

More broadly, Heritage Conservation Areas are recognized in British Columbia as formal planning tools under the Local Government Act, intended to **identify, protect, and manage heritage character at the community level through enforceable guidelines and permits.**

At the provincial level, the **Heritage Conservation Act defines “alteration” to include any change that detracts from heritage value,** and frames conservation as actions taken to **protect, preserve, and enhance that value.**

In this context, the current proposal represents:

- **A clear deviation from the stated conservation objectives,** and
- **A design that risks detracting from the recognized heritage character of the area**

7. Precedent Risk and Integrity of the HCA

Approval of a proposal that does not conform to the established guidelines is not isolated—it has broader implications.

Heritage Conservation Areas function effectively only when applied **consistently and credibly.** As recognized in provincial guidance, they are tools intended to **protect heritage value through structured and repeatable decision-making.**

Approving a design that materially departs from:

- Modest scale
- Articulated massing
- Landscape integration
- Established roof character

creates a **precedent that weakens the enforceability of the HCA** and undermines its purpose.

In practical terms, it signals that compliance with heritage guidelines is optional rather than required.

This is **problematic from both a policy and governance perspective,** particularly in a designated Heritage Conservation Area where these guidelines are the primary mechanism for maintaining neighbourhood character.

Conclusion and Requested Direction

This application highlights a critical distinction:

- It may be **zoning-compliant**, but
- It is **not compliant with the intent, objectives, and guidelines of the Lower Caulfeild Heritage Conservation Area, as embedded in the OCP**

I respectfully request that Council **require substantive design revisions prior to approval**, including:

- Reduction of perceived mass through **clear volumetric articulation**
- Introduction of **upper-storey step-backs**, particularly on neighbour-facing elevations
- Breaking up of **continuous wall planes**
- Replacement of the **dominant flat roof expression with an articulated roof form consistent with neighbourhood character**
- Improved **integration with natural topography** to reduce exposed vertical mass

These are reasonable and expected refinements within the Heritage Alteration Permit process and are necessary to ensure alignment with both **local policy and provincial conservation intent**.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

s. 22(1)

Appendix – Summary of non-compliant items

Appendix – Summary of non-compliance items

Non-Compliance Item	What the Official Documents Actually Say (Expanded, Specific)	Source (link)
Excessive perceived mass (single continuous volume)	The HCA identifies Lower Caulfeild as a landscape-dominated neighbourhood where buildings are secondary to natural features and must be “sensitively sited” and integrated into the setting. New development must be designed to fit with and retain natural site attributes , which by definition requires avoiding a single dominant built mass that visually overwhelms the site or reads as one continuous block.	HCA Guidelines HAP Overview
Lack of mass articulation and step-backs (stacked building form)	The character description emphasizes buildings that are “lightly situated” within the landscape, implying forms that are broken down, responsive to terrain, and visually subordinate . Designs that stack upper floors directly over lower walls without modulation conflict with the objective to “conserve and enhance the heritage character” through context-responsive development.	HCA Guidelines
Massive rear elevation / wall-like appearance	The HCA requires buildings to be integrated with natural grade and topography , with development that retains site attributes rather than imposing large vertical surfaces . A tall, continuous rear wall—particularly where grade drops away—contradicts the intent that buildings be lightly positioned on the terrain , minimizing the perception of height and bulk from neighbouring properties.	HCA Guidelines
Dominant neighbour-facing elevation at minimal setback	The OCP/HCA framework requires “sensitively-sited buildings” within a cohesive neighbourhood setting, where development responds to both site conditions and surrounding context . A large, unbroken vertical plane at minimal setback fails this test by creating a visually dominant condition that is not consistent with context-responsive siting or preservation of spatial openness .	HCA Guidelines
Flat roof form inconsistent with guideline intent	While the guidelines may not prescribe a single architectural style, they describe a neighbourhood characterized by picturesque, historically derived forms integrated into the landscape , and require new development to maintain this distinctive character . A large, flat, unarticulated roof plane —especially one highly visible from the street — conflicts with this	HCA Guidelines

Non-Compliance Item	What the Official Documents Actually Say (Expanded, Specific)	Source (link)
	requirement by reinforcing a dominant, monolithic form rather than a context-integrated architectural response .	
Highly visible roof mass from public realm	The defining elements of Lower Caulfeild include views, landscape integration, and buildings that defer visually to their surroundings . A roof that becomes a primary visual element when approaching along The Highway undermines this condition by shifting visual emphasis from landscape to built form , contrary to the objective of maintaining the area’s distinctive character.	HCA Guidelines
Insufficient integration with natural topography	The guidelines explicitly require that new development be “designed to fit with and retain natural site attributes”, including terrain and landform. Buildings should be positioned in response to slope and existing conditions , not designed as flattened or imposed forms that create exposed vertical mass or abrupt grade transitions .	HAP Overview
Failure to maintain distinctive neighbourhood character	The core objective of the HCA is to “maintain Lower Caulfeild’s distinctive character”, defined by the relationship between built form and landscape, informal layout, and coherent visual identity. Development that introduces dominant massing, incompatible roof forms, or visually intrusive elements diminishes this character rather than conserving it.	HAP Overview
Deviation from OCP decision-making framework	The Official Community Plan is the District’s primary policy framework guiding Council decisions and land-use changes , and HCA guidelines are embedded within it. Approval of development that does not meet HCA objectives represents a departure from the policy basis on which decisions are intended to be made .	West Vancouver OCP
Erosion of heritage value through incremental non-compliance	Heritage Conservation Areas are established tools to identify, protect, and manage heritage character through enforceable guidelines . Under the BC Heritage Conservation Act, alteration includes actions that “detract from the heritage value” of a property. Repeated approvals that do not align with guidelines risk cumulative degradation of heritage value over time .	HCA framework (BC) Heritage Conservation Act

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Monday, June 22, 2026 3:59 PM
To: correspondence
Subject: Feedback Against Rezoning Proposal at 1552 Esquimalt Avenue (Bylaw Nos. 5465 and 5466)

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

Dear Mayor and Council,

I am writing to express my deep concerns and strong opposition regarding the proposed OCP and Zoning Bylaw amendments for 1552 Esquimalt Avenue. As a resident who lives right in this neighborhood with my family, I believe this development will significantly diminish the quality of life in our community.

A 3.0 Floor Area Ratio (FAR) is far too dense for this location, and I object to the project due to the following direct impacts:

* **Overwhelming Parking & Traffic Issues:** Our streets are already crowded. The massive number of new residents will create an immediate parking crisis, overflowing onto surrounding residential roads and making everyday driving and walking unsafe.

* **Loss of Privacy and Daylight:** A multi-story apartment building of this scale will [REDACTED] s.22(1). Furthermore, it will block natural sunlight, leaving neighboring homes in the shadows.

* **Infrastructure and Environmental Strain:** I am very concerned that our local services, water, and sewage systems cannot handle this sudden increase in density. Additionally, removing mature trees to build this structure will permanently ruin the green and natural character of West Vancouver.

* **Prolonged Construction Disruption:** The sheer scale of this project means our neighborhood will have to endure years of noise, dust, and heavy truck traffic, disrupting the peace of our daily lives.

I respectfully urge the Council to listen to the immediate neighbors, prioritize the livability of our current community, and reject these proposed bylaws.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

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

Re: Proposed Rezoning of 1552 Esquimalt Ave, West Vancouver.

Proposed Official Community Bylaw No. 4985, 2018, Amendment Bylaw No. 5465, 2026

Proposed Zoning Bylaw No. 4662, 2010, Amendment Bylaw No. 5466, 2026

Proposed development Permit 26-012

June 23, 2026

Mayor and Council,
District of West Vancouver,

I am writing to formally express my objections to the proposed rezoning and redevelopment of 1552 Esquimalt Avenue.

I live at [REDACTED] s. 22(1) [REDACTED] subject property and I expect to [REDACTED] s.22(1) [REDACTED] increase in density, building massing, and the prolonged impact associated with construction and the noise it will create, as well as already existing parking difficulties.

My concerns are:

Neighbourhood Density and Infrastructure Capacity:

Ambleside is an already a heavily utilised neighbourhood with increasing pressure on local infrastructure, traffic circulation, public services and residential amenities to absorb additional demands. I believe this would have a negative effect on the quality of life for the existing residents.

Parking and Traffic Impacts:

Parking in this area is already challenging, particularly evenings, weekends and tourist season. This proposal will inevitably make this problem even greater.

Residents should not have to bear the burden of increased congestion and reduced street parking.

Construction Impacts:

The project would likely result in an extended construction period, potentially lasting years. Residents, [REDACTED] s. 22(1) [REDACTED]; would have to endure sustained noise, vibration, dust, construction activity, restricted access and daily disruptions for a substantial period of time.

Skyline Impacts and Neighbourhood Character:

The proposed building height and massing raise are serious concerns regarding the alteration of the skyline and character in this area. The established sight-lines, neighbourhood character and streetscape that already exist would be harshly altered and impacted.

I respectfully ask that council reject this rezoning proposal and that they reconsider the realities and the scale of disruption this project will have not only on the residents but on this beautiful and established character surrounding.

Sincerely,

s. 22(1)

A large black rectangular redaction box covers the signature area, obscuring the name and any handwritten notes.

West Vancouver.

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Wednesday, June 24, 2026 7:15 AM
To: correspondence
Subject: Official Opposition to Proposed Rezoning and Development at 1552 Esquimalt Avenue

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

Dear Mayor and Council,

I am writing to formally express my strong opposition to the proposed OCP and Zoning Bylaw amendments (Bylaws 5465 and 5466) and Development Permit 26-012 for the property at 1552 Esquimalt Avenue.

As a local resident, I am deeply concerned about the negative impacts that a high-density project with a 3.0 Floor Area Ratio (FAR) will bring to our community. I urge the Council to reject this proposal based on the following critical issues:

- 1. Loss of Natural Light:** The proposed size and height of the apartment building will block natural sunlight, casting large shadows over neighboring properties and significantly reducing the livability of the immediate area.
- 2. Severe Parking Shortage:** Our neighborhood already lacks adequate parking space. Introducing a high-density development will bring an unsustainable number of vehicles, leading to a severe parking crisis and overflow onto adjacent residential streets.
- 3. Loss of Privacy:** The scale and height of the proposed building will directly overlook existing homes, invading the privacy of neighbors in their yards and private living spaces.
- 4. Traffic Congestion and Safety:** The influx of vehicles will cause serious traffic delays on Esquimalt Avenue and neighboring streets, creating safety hazards for pedestrians, cyclists, and transit users.
- 5. Strain on Infrastructure:** Our local infrastructure, including water, sewage, and waste management services, is not designed or equipped to handle such a rapid, massive increase in density.
- 6. Environmental Impact:** The development will lead to the removal of mature trees and green spaces, destroying the natural character of our neighborhood and harming the local environment.
- 7. Construction Disruption:** A project of this scale will subject the neighborhood to prolonged noise, dust, and heavy machinery traffic, severely disrupting the peace and daily lives of current residents for an extended period.

For these reasons, I believe this proposal is entirely unsuitable for this location and will permanently damage the character of West Vancouver. I respectfully request that Council vote against these amendments.

Thank you for your time and for protecting our community.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

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

From: ADRA westvan <adrawestvan@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, June 19, 2026 3:58 PM
To: correspondence; Mark Sager, Mayor; Christine Cassidy; Linda Watt; Sharon Thompson; Nora Gambioli; Peter Lambur; Scott Snider
Subject: Metro Vancouver's NSWWTP project - Demand for public inquiry - Section 765 Local Government Act

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,

On behalf of the ADRA Directors, I am writing further to our email of July 18, 2025 at which time we requested your support for an independent inquiry under section 764 of the Local Government Act into the estimated \$3.86 billion cost overrun of the North Shore Waste Water Treatment Plant.

Now that an out-of-court settlement of civil action between Metro Vancouver and Acciona has been reached, it is time to pass a motion at the next regular Council meeting calling upon our province's Inspector of Municipalities to initiate an inquiry, pursuant to section 765 of the Local Government Act into Metro's apparent gross mismanagement of its North Shore Wastewater Treatment Plant project.

ADRA, a member of the North Shore Neighbourhoods Alliance(NSNA), is in full support of the contents of the NSNA June 1, 2026 email sent to each of the three North Shore municipalities. This is a major taxpayer accountability issue for North Shore residents who will be shouldering the costs for an estimated 30 years! We also understand that the costs will be increasing with decommissioning and remediation of the existing facility yet to come. No doubt legal costs will be included.

West Vancouver residents deserve more than a Metro Vancouver-managed review. In fact, all North Shore taxpayers deserve an independent, open public inquiry through the Inspector of Municipalities as requested under Section 765 of the Local Government Act.

In closing, ADRA urges Mayor and Council, representing the interests and financial concerns of West Vancouver taxpayers, to pass a motion at the next regular Council meeting, calling upon our province's Inspector of Municipalities to initiate an inquiry, pursuant to section 765 of the Local Government Act, into Metro's apparent gross mismanagement of its North Shore Wastewater Treat Plant project since its inception.

Yours sincerely,

Heather Mersey, President
Ambleside & Dunderave Residents Association
P.O. Box 91641
West Vancouver, B.C. V7V 3P3

Please do not Redact

--

Visit our website: ADRAwestvan.ca

From: s. 22(1)
Sent: Sunday, June 21, 2026 6:14 PM
To: Mark Sager, Mayor; Christine Cassidy; Nora Gambioli; Peter Lambur; Scott Snider; Sharon Thompson; Linda Watt; correspondence
Cc: jerry.dobrovolny@metrovancover.org
Subject: Metro Vancouver North Shore Wastewater Treatment Plant Program Update

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

Mayor and Council: I understand that representatives of Metro Vancouver will be attending the June 22 Council meeting to provide an update on the North Shore Wastewater Treatment Plan project.

Could you please request that Metro Vancouver provides answers to the following questions either at or immediately following the Council meeting?

1. Of the \$3.86 billion estimated cost of the NSWWTP project how much is allocated to the North Shore in total, and, specifically, to the District of West Vancouver, the City of North Vancouver, the District of North Vancouver, the Squamish First Nation and Tsleil-Waututh First Nation?

Please provide the breakdown of each of these amounts between the “base” cost (\$1.06 billion in total) and “cost overrun” (\$2.8 billion in total) components.

Is the portion of the \$3.86 billion estimated cost allocated to the North Shore equal to \$3.86 billion x 37.3% = \$1.44 billion and the portion allocated to the DWV equal to \$1.44 billion x 30% = \$432 million, as implied by Note 12(d) to the DWV’s 2025 audited financial statements?

2. Is the cost allocation to the North Shore equal to 37.3% of the total cost (as stated in Note 12(d) to the DWV’s 2025 audited financial statements) or is there a higher cost allocation percentage (e.g. 46%) applicable to the “base” cost of \$1.06 billion?
3. Why is 30% of the North Shore cost allocated to the DWV (as stated in Note 12(d) to the DWV’s 2025 audited financial statements) when West Vancouver represents only 22.6% of the North Shore population (47,929 out of 212,398)?

Based on the 22.6% population percentage, the portion of the NSWWTP cost allocated to the DWV would be \$1.44 billion x 22.6% = \$325 million, rather than \$432 million – a material difference of \$107 million.

4. What is the annual schedule of estimated NSWWTP amortization payments for the DWV for (a) the “base” cost, and (b) the “cost overrun”, for the 5-year phase-in period beginning in 2025 and the balance of the 30-year amortization period? Please show the breakdown between principal and interest payments.
5. What is the interest rate charged in determining the DWV’s annual amortization payments?

How is this interest rate determined? Is it the same rate for both the “base” cost and the “cost overrun”?

Is this a fixed rate for the 30-year amortization period, or is it a variable rate?

If a variable rate, how will it be redetermined and how frequently?

6. Why has the \$3.86 billion cost estimate remained unchanged since April 22, 2024 when Metro Vancouver first disclosed this figure?

When were the three cost estimates referenced on page 20 of the MV presentation prepared? Have these been updated? If so, what is the most reasonable current estimate of the cost of the NSWWTP project?

7. With respect to the \$235 million settlement with Acciona, what does the word “provided” mean?

Specifically, what are the components of the \$235 million and what form does each component take?

8. How does the \$325 million settlement affect the \$3.86 billion estimate of the cost of the NSWWTP project and the portion of that cost allocated to the DWV?

Thank you.

s. 22(1)

West Vancouver

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Tuesday, June 23, 2026 2:41 PM
To: Mark Sager, Mayor; Christine Cassidy; Nora Gambioli; Peter Lambur; Scott Snider; Sharon Thompson; Linda Watt; correspondence
Cc: jerry.dobrovlny@metrovancover.org
Subject: RE: Metro Vancouver North Shore Wastewater Treatment Plant Program Update

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: Please see below the responses that I received today from Metro Vancouver concerning the questions I asked in my June 21 email.

I very much appreciate the promptness of Metro Vancouver's responses.

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

From: NSWWTTP <NSWWTP@metrovancover.org>
Sent: Tuesday, June 23, 2026 1:54 PM
To: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Subject: RE: Metro Vancouver North Shore Wastewater Treatment Plant Program Update

Good afternoon [REDACTED] s. 22(1)

Thank you for providing your questions. Please find Metro Vancouver's responses below in red.

Best regards,

Kris Etches

Program Manager, Community Engagement, LWS
External Relations



From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Date: June 21, 2026 at 6:14:11 PM PDT
To: Mark Sager <Mark@westvancover.ca>, Christine Cassidy <ccassidy@westvancover.ca>, Nora Gambioli <ngambioli@westvancover.ca>, Peter Lambur <plambur@westvancover.ca>, ssnider@westvancover.ca, Sharon Thompson <sthompson@westvancover.ca>, Linda Watt <lwatt@westvancover.ca>, correspondence@westvancover.ca
Cc: Jerry Dobrovlny <Jerry.Dobrovlny@metrovancover.org>
Subject: Metro Vancouver North Shore Wastewater Treatment Plant Program Update

Mayor and Council: I understand that representatives of Metro Vancouver will be attending the June 22 Council meeting to provide an update on the North Shore Wastewater Treatment Plan project.

Could you please request that Metro Vancouver provides answers to the following questions either at or immediately following the Council meeting?

1. Of the \$3.86 billion estimated cost of the NSWWTP project how much is allocated to the North Shore in total, and, specifically, to the District of West Vancouver, the City of North Vancouver, the District of North Vancouver, the Squamish First Nation and Tsleil-Waututh First Nation?

Please provide the breakdown of each of these amounts between the “base” cost (\$1.06 billion in total) and “cost overrun” (\$2.8 billion in total) components.

Is the portion of the \$3.86 billion estimated cost allocated to the North Shore equal to $\$3.86 \text{ billion} \times 37.3\% = \1.44 billion and the portion allocated to the DWV equal to $\$1.44 \text{ billion} \times 30\% = \432 million , as implied by Note 12(d) to the DWV’s 2025 audited financial statements?

Metro Vancouver’s capital costs are not allocated directly to member jurisdictions (i.e., the District of West Vancouver, the City of North Vancouver, the District of North Vancouver). Metro Vancouver borrows after the project spend occurs and allocates debt costs based on the GVS&DD Cost Apportionment Bylaw, which defines how the annual liquid waste services levy is shared amongst sewerage areas.

As per the bylaw’s original cost allocation formula, the North Shore is paying 46% (\$48 million) of the initial \$1.058 billion program cost, while the other sewerage areas in the region pay 54% (\$58 million). For the remaining \$2.8 billion portion of the overall cost, the three other sewerage areas are each taking on an additional \$10 per household above the original cost allocation formula. This results in a 37% (\$78 million) and 63% (\$1.3 billion) split between the North Shore and the other sewerage areas for the increased costs.

Metro Vancouver does not allocate costs to First Nations, including Squamish Nation or Tsleil-Waututh Nation, as they are not GVS&DD members.

2. Is the cost allocation to the North Shore equal to 37.3% of the total cost (as stated in Note 12(d) to the DWV’s 2025 audited financial statements) or is there a higher cost allocation percentage (e.g. 46%) applicable to the “base” cost of \$1.06 billion?

This question has been answered by response #1.

3. Why is 30% of the North Shore cost allocated to the DWV (as stated in Note 12(d) to the DWV’s 2025 audited financial statements) when West Vancouver represents only 22.6% of the North Shore population (47,929 out of 212,398)?

Based on the 22.6% population percentage, the portion of the NSWWTP cost allocated to the DWV would be $\$1.44 \text{ billion} \times 22.6\% = \325 million , rather than \$432 million – a material difference of \$107 million.

The allocation above is based on a historical division of costs. The allocation is now transitioning from a fixed percentage model to a flow-

based model as part of the adoption of wet weather pricing. The transition to wet weather-based apportionment is being phased in over 10 years and we are currently three years into that transition.

4. What is the annual schedule of estimated NSWWTP amortization payments for the DWV for (a) the “base” cost, and (b) the “cost overrun”, for the 5-year phase-in period beginning in 2025 and the balance of the 30-year amortization period? Please show the breakdown between principal and interest payments.

Our debt projections are based on sewerage area. The following are the debt projections for the North Shore Sewerage Area (NSSA).

Overall NSSA Portion of NSWWTP Debt	Provisional	*Projections	-----
	2026	2027	2028
Original NSWWTP debt servicing (\$1.058 billion budget)			
Interest	4,793,046	6,164,454	6,164,454
Principal	2,155,922	4,202,227	4,202,227
	6,948,968	10,366,681	10,366,681
Incremental NSWWTP debt servicing (\$2.8 billion budget)			
Interest	3,615,888	12,633,438	22,378,547
Principal	-	6,085,667	13,573,918
	3,615,888	18,719,105	35,952,465
Overall NSWWTP Debt Servicing	10,564,856	29,085,786	46,319,146

5. What is the interest rate charged in determining the DWV’s annual amortization payments?

How is this interest rate determined? Is it the same rate for both the “base” cost and the “cost overrun”?

Is this a fixed rate for the 30-year amortization period, or is it a variable rate?

If a variable rate, how will it be redetermined and how frequently?

Rates are set by the Municipal Finance Authority at the time of borrowing. Metro Vancouver does not borrow in advance of spending. Municipal Finance Authority bond rates are generally fixed for 10 years and then refinanced for the next term.

6. Why has the \$3.86 billion cost estimate remained unchanged since April 22, 2024 when Metro Vancouver first disclosed this figure?

When were the three cost estimates referenced on page 20 of the MV presentation prepared? Have these been updated? If so, what is the most reasonable current estimate of the cost of the NSWWTP project?

The three separate cost estimates that informed the updated program cost were completed in 2023 and are based on completion of the new

treatment plant in 2030. The updated program cost was developed using our best-practice cost estimating framework, which considers cost escalations and risk reserves. These risk reserve and escalation amounts are appropriate for the program, and there are no issues that suggest there is a risk to the current cost estimate or schedule.

7. With respect to the \$235 million settlement with Acciona, what does the word “provided” mean?

Specifically, what are the components of the \$235 million and what form does each component take?

We cannot comment on this due to privilege.

8. How does the \$325 million settlement affect the \$3.86 billion estimate of the cost of the NSWWTP project and the portion of that cost allocated to the DWV?

Funds from the settlement with Acciona will be allocated to the North Shore Wastewater Treatment Plant Program. Further allocation of the funds to sewerage areas will be a GVS&DD Board decision.

Thank you.

s. 22(1)

West Vancouver

From: s. 22(1)
Sent: Sunday, June 21, 2026 12:55 PM
To: correspondence
Subject: Bylaw enforcement on Spirit Trail?

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:

Perhaps council could consider having a bylaw officer or police officer on the "shared" Spirit Trail between Ambleside Park and the CN rail tracks on weekends. Cyclists travel at high rates of speed ignoring signs and endangering pedestrians walking on the trail with children and pets. They seem to think rules are for others.

They also roll through all the stop signs along Bellevue again endangering pedestrians in the crosswalks. Cyclists seem to think because they are not burning fossils fuels they can ignore the rules of the road!

Thanks for considering,
s. 22(1)

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: David Marley <domarley52@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, June 21, 2026 11:24 PM
To: correspondence; Mark Sager, Mayor; Christine Cassidy; Nora Gambioli; Peter Lambur; Scott Snider; Sharon Thompson; Linda Watt
Cc: News NS; jseyd; Richter Brent
Subject: Council Remuneration and Expenses Policy - Item 11 on Monday's Council Agenda

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the organization from email address domarley52@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.

What is this about? It's coming out of the blue. It appears you're trying to line your pockets while residents and businesses are struggling with ever-increasing costs. It's grotesque! This item needs to be removed from Monday's Council meeting agenda.

I hereby request that neither my name nor contact information be redacted.

David Marley

s. 22(1)

West Vancouver, BC

s. 22(1)

Agenda: <https://westvancouver.ca/sites/default/files/media/documents/26jun22-agenda-web-revised.pdf>
Item 11: <https://westvancouver.ca/media/11714>

From: s. 22(1)
Sent: Monday, June 22, 2026 11:33 AM
To: correspondence
Subject: Canyoning in Cypress Creek

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.

Attention: Mayor and Council

I am writing to show my support for Westcoast Canyoning operating in the Cypress Creek. I have been fortunate to have participated in five guided tours with Westcoast Canyoning over the last six years. Two of these trips happened in the Cypress Creek area, two at Britannia Creek and one just west of Squamish. FX Gagnon has been the lead guide in all of my trips and I have extreme confidence in his abilities as a guide, as well as his leadership skills in terms of finding and training other guides.

Canyoning is a unique and exhilarating adventure, one that combines breath taking scenery, controlled adrenaline rush, and confidence building, lasting experiences. FX has always been very respectful of the creeks, taking time to explain the vegetation, geology and honour the First Nation's ancestral claim on this land. He has educated us on the reasons and ways to respect and preserve the lands we are recreating in, while also encouraging us to enjoy the amazing terrain.

One of my initial concerns was the risk of such an undertaking. This was quickly abated as FX took time to explain and to train us on how to be safe, how to repel down te water falls, and how to walk on the wet rocks along the canyon floor. I participated with five different groups, including my family, and can honestly state that in every case we all felt confident in his leadership and that of his team. Also, after each successive trip that confidence continued to grow.

I would encourage Council to approve this impact free, clean and healthy activity to operate in Cypress Creek. The experience for those who choose to participate is amazing and forever memorable.

Sincerely,

s. 22(1)

West Vancouver BC

From: s. 22(1)
Sent: Tuesday, June 23, 2026 9:37 PM
To: correspondence
Subject: FORMAL STATEMENT OF GRIEVANCE AND CLARIFICATION

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.

TO ALL GOVERNMENT OF CANADA

TO ALL RELIGIOUS LEADERS

TO ALL WORLD LEADERS

TO ALL CANADIAN CITIZEN

TO ALL MILITARY CANADA

TO ALL POLICE CANADA

FROM: s. 22(1)
EMAIL: s. 22(1)
EMAIL: s. 22(1)
EMAIL: s. 22(1)
TEL: s. 22(1)
WHATSAPP: s. 22(1)

FORMAL STATEMENT OF GRIEVANCE AND CLARIFICATION

THIS STATEMENT SERVES AS A FORMAL RECORD REGARDING ONGOING HARASSMENT AND THE SPREAD OF DEFAMATORY INFORMATION. SINCE s. 22(1) I HAVE BEEN THE VICTIM OF SUSTAINED ABUSE BY THE NAME s. 22(1), WHO RESIDES IN s. 22(1), CANADA. I AM FORMALLY REQUESTING THAT THE RELEVANT AUTHORITIES INVESTIGATE THESE ACTIONS AS HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS AND PURSUE THE NECESSARY LEGAL RECOURSE. s. 22(1) SHOULD BE ARRESTED AND CHARGED FOR CRIMINAL ACTIVITIES, s. 22(1) SHOULD BE ARRESTED AND CHARGED FOR FRAUDS, SCANDALS, AND FORGERIES OF DOCUMENTS. ALSO, THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT OF CANADA SHOULD STRIP HIM OFF HIS CANADIAN CITIZENSHIP AND DEPORT HIM TO s. 22(1) IMMEDIATELY BECAUSE s. 22(1) IS HURTING CANADIAN BORN CITIZENS AND HE SHOULD BE PUNISHED AND DEPORTED IMMEDIATELY.

FURTHERMORE, I WISH TO CLARIFY MY POSITION REGARDING CERTAIN FALSE ACCUSATIONS. I STATE UNEQUIVOCALLY THAT I HAVE NEVER COMMITTED ANY ACTS OF SEXUAL MISCONDUCT OR ASSAULT AND I HAVE NEVER FINGERED ANYONE. I ALSO FIRMLY DENY ANY AFFILIATION WITH AL-QAEDA OR ANY OTHER EXTREMIST ORGANIZATIONS. THESE CLAIMS ARE ENTIRELY WITHOUT MERIT AND REPRESENT A DELIBERATE ATTEMPT TO DAMAGE MY CHARACTER. I [REDACTED] s. 22(1) [REDACTED], IS ALSO NOT A RAPIST, I HAVE NEVER MOLESTED ANYONE, I HAVE NEVER MASTURBATE IN FRONT OF ANYONE, AND I HAVE NEVER COMMITTED SUCH ACT OF CRIME, BECAUSE I AM A GOOD CHRISTIAN AND I WILL NEVER PARTICIPATE IN ANY KINDS OF CRIMINAL ACTS. ALSO, THIS IS ALL ALLEGATIONS AND NOT A FACT.

I AM SEEKING A FAIR REVIEW OF THESE ALLEGATIONS AND THE IMMEDIATE PROTECTION OF MY LEGAL RIGHTS AND I MUST BE COMPENSATED FOR THE DAMAGES AND DESTRUCTION THEY HAVE CAUSED ME IN CANADA.

FROM:

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

(BRITISH COLUMBIA CANADA)

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Wednesday, June 24, 2026 12:49 AM
To: Mark Sager, Mayor; correspondence; Council Workshops
Subject: sirens installed on Lawson Creek — [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Attachments: Video.mov

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 Council,

I'm writing as a follow-up to my previous correspondence regarding [REDACTED] s. 22(1), this time about a separate issue: motion-activated sirens installed [REDACTED] s. 22(1) within the creek corridor [REDACTED] s. 22(1).

For approximately five months, these sirens activated repeatedly — often multiple times a day, including early mornings and at night — in response to [REDACTED] s.22(1). I contacted Bylaw about this multiple times. On at least one occasion, I was told the matter had been resolved when it had not been, and I had to follow up again before the sirens were eventually turned off.

At the time, my concern was simply the disturbance itself. What I didn't know then, and only learned recently, is that the District's own Creeks Bylaw No. 3013 states that it is unlawful to place or alter any structure within a creek protection area without first obtaining permission from the Director of Operations, with penalties of between \$5,000 and \$50,000. I have attached a photo showing sirens, fencing and signage installed directly within the creek bed.

Given how many times Bylaw attended in relation to these sirens, I would have expected this requirement to have been raised at some point, and I'm concerned it may simply have been overlooked. I'd appreciate knowing whether any permit was ever sought or granted for this installation, and if not, what the District's process is for addressing it.

Thank you for your attention to this.

Sincerely,
[REDACTED] s. 22(1)







Sent from my iPhone



WEST VANCOUVER MEMORIAL LIBRARY BOARD

MINUTES

April 15, 2026, 7:00 p.m.

The Lab

Present: A. Krawczyk [Chair], S. Dennis, A. Donovan, B. Hafizi, E. He, H. Kaart,
P. Morris, A. Nimmons, S. Sanajou, D. Taylor, S. Thompson, T. Wachmann

Regrets: A. Basco

Staff: S. Hall, S. Gill, S. Dale

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 7:03 p.m.

2. Land Acknowledgement

3. Approval of Agenda

Moved by: P. Morris
Seconded by: T. Wachmann

THAT the Agenda be approved.

CARRIED

4. Approval of Consent Agenda

Moved by: D. Taylor
Seconded by: P. Morris

THAT the Consent Agenda be approved.

CARRIED

5. Business Arising from Minutes

None.

6. Chair Update

A. Krawczyk provided the following updates:

- Resolutions between meetings:
 - Impact Report was approved for printing and release
 - A new Public Programming Sponsorship was approved for our music lecture series.
- The social gathering with the Foundation, Board, and Senior Team scheduled for Thursday, April 16, 2026, has been cancelled.
- Strategic planning
 - The HR committee will meet to develop a timeline and plan a planning start-up Board workshop.

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 are back on track after the re-opening of the Mezzanine.
- Staff are monitoring bot traffic and think a seeming jump in virtual visits could be related.
- Adult attendance is expected to decline this year, following a one-time increase in 2025 driven by the Robin Wall Kimmerer event. Attendance numbers do tend to fluctuate year-to-year.
- There was an increase in new card signups for the month due to the timing of the School Library Card project.

8. Governance

a) Policy Updates

S. Hall advised that the Policy Sub-committee will meet in advance of the May Board meeting to discuss Board policies on Donations, Naming, and Sponsorships.

b) Board Recruitment

A. Nimmons mentioned that the Board recruitment takes place in the fall. Now is a good time to begin thinking about our upcoming needs for skills, connections, personal qualities, and diverse perspectives.

S. Dale will send the Board Skills and Experience Matrix to Trustees to provide a baseline for recruitment planning.

This item will be discussed further at the May Board meeting.

9. Strategy

a) Brief Update

S. Hall noted that the HR Committee will survey the Board in advance of the initial planning workshop. The board may decide to hire a facilitator for a session or sessions in the fall.

10. Finance

a) 2025 Year End Financial Report

S. Gill provided an update noting that at year end, the Library's operating results were below budget, mainly due to lower than expected expenses included salary and benefits and communications. Areas with higher than expected expenses included physical & digital resources, administration, technology, and facility. Savings on salary and benefits were mainly due to staff vacancies and coverage for staff leaves at lower salary rates. Capital results show a positive variance predominately due to incomplete facility and technology related projects. The funds on those incomplete projects will be carried forward to 2026. Unspent 2024 and previous year infrastructure funds have been carried over to 2026 for infrastructure improvements, for use for the Library heating upgrade, and for furnishings and shelving.

b) 2023-2025 Provincial One-time Library Public Enhancement Grant Proposed Expenditures

S. Gill advised that a portion of the grant has already been expended in 2023 and 2024 and there is a remaining amount of approximately \$129,000 that has been carried over to 2026.

The Library proposes to expend the remainder of the Enhancement Grant in the same categories as communicated to the Board previously, which included staff wellness, inclusion & outreach, technology equipment, honouring reconciliation, programs & services, facilities & equipment,

[4]

temporary project staffing and third-party services and service improvements/enhancements. However, we are requesting Board approval to reallocate some amounts between categories in order to expend the grant.

Moved by: D. Taylor

Seconded by: T. Wachmann

To approve the expenditure of the remaining funds from the one-time Provincial Public Enhancement Grant for the library, as specified in the indicated categories; and,

To permit the Library to reallocate funds within these categories to ensure the complete utilization of the grant.

CARRIED

c) 2026 Budget Adoption

S. Gill advised that the 2026 budget (Five-Year Financial Plan Bylaw) was adopted at the Council meeting on March 9, 2026.

Moved by: B. Hafizi

Seconded by: A. Nimmons

To adopt the Library's 2026 operating and capital budgets.

CARRIED

11. Infrastructure Committee

D. Taylor reported on the following projects:

1. Heating System Upgrade

New electric boilers and radiators have been ordered, and we expect to receive all equipment within 10 to 12 weeks. Piping work in the mechanical room has begun. The contractor will provide a detailed construction schedule soon with an anticipated project completion by summer.

2. Concrete Work on Rooftop

Work to replace the pavers on the rooftop parking lot with concrete is expected to commence the week of April 27th and will be completed within a few weeks.

3. Youth Area Design

The concept layout for the Youth area was presented to Council at a closed session. Library staff are currently reviewing the cost estimate recently provided by a quantity surveyor to refine the project budget and develop an appropriate funding strategy.

4. Skylight Replacement

Library and District Facilities are in the final stages of contractor selection for the skylight replacement project. The existing skylights will be replaced with new high efficiency skylights. Work will commence in late spring/summer 2026.

12. InterLINK

H. Kaart reported that the Board is in the process of electing a new Chair. The role of the Board was discussed, including a potential reduction in board size likely beginning in 2027. Meetings will move to a quarterly schedule, and recruitment of additional directors is underway. It was emphasized that members represent InterLINK as a whole, rather than their individual libraries.

13. BCLTA

A. Krawczyk spoke to the 2026 BC Library Conference held April 22-24. He highlighted the BCLTA – Present and Future presentation scheduled for Friday, April 24 where they will discuss BCLTA's role and why it matters. The BCLTA Board will share their mission, goals, and specific activities of the Association and what programs and supports to public library boards and trustees they provide. They will also explore future possibilities and aspirations for the organization. It will also be a good opportunity to meet newly appointed President, Laura Vilness.

14. Arts & Culture Advisory Committee

A. Krawczyk reported on the ongoing meetings with the Arts & Culture Advisory Committee (ACAC) to discuss the potential relocation of the West Vancouver Art Museum. ACAC supports the identification of the Sweeney Triangle site and the adjacent spaces as a key aspect of the Ambleside Local Area Plan to enable the construction of a purpose-built Arts and Culture Centre located in the area of 16th Street and Bellevue Avenue as envisioned in the Arts and Culture Facility Plan. This was presented to Council for their consideration and approval. He highlighted the Public Hearing for the Ambleside Centre Local Area Plan confirmed for April 27, 2026.

15. Engagement Committee

T. Wachmann thanked Trustees for their involvement in preparing and engaging in the coffee meetings with Councillors.

T. Wachmann reviewed the committee's priorities and suggested waiting to finalize plans until after meeting with the Foundation. It was noted that aligning with the Foundation's upcoming Youth department renovation engagement strategy would be beneficial.

16. Council Update

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

- Order by the Province to adopt Ambleside Local Area Plan (LAP). There is a Public Hearing scheduled for April 27, 2026.
- Bill 25 was not supported for adoption.
- Rapid Bus commitment from Metrotown to Park Royal.
- The progress of Rails to Trails, looking at creating a bike path from the North Shore up to Whistler/Pemberton.
- Nelson Avenue order regarding dangerous and derelict homes.
- Letter from Canada Post advising that West Vancouver will be moving to their community box. This will likely happen over the next 5 years.
- Nominations for West Vancouver Community awards are being accepted until Sunday, April 26.

17. New Business

None.

18. Date of Next Meeting

Wednesday, May 20, 2026, 7 p.m.

19. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:05 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



WEST VANCOUVER MEMORIAL LIBRARY BOARD

MINUTES

May 20, 2026, 7:00 p.m.

Via Zoom

Present: B. Hafizi [Chair], A. Basco S. Dennis, E. He, H. Kaart, P. Morris,
A. Nimmons, S. Sanajou

Regrets: A. Donovan, A. Krawczyk, D. Taylor, S. Thompson, T. Wachmann

Staff: S. Hall, S. Gill, S. Dale, K. Srinivasan

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m.

2. Land Acknowledgement

3. Approval of Agenda

Moved by: S. Sanajou

Seconded by: E. He

THAT the Agenda be approved.

CARRIED

4. Approval of Consent Agenda

The Board expressed appreciation for the 75th Anniversary report and acknowledged the exceptional level of work undertaken by staff throughout the year.

Moved by: P. Morris

Seconded by: E. He

THAT the Consent Agenda be approved.

CARRIED

5. Business Arising from Minutes

None.

6. Chair Update

None.

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:

- Auto-renewals were unavailable for two weeks in April, which impacted circulation statistics.
- Program attendance tends to fluctuate

8. Governance

a) Summer Reading Club – 5pm Closure Request

S. Hall advised that the Youth Department is requesting that the Library close one hour early on Friday, September 18 at 5 p.m., both to allow for a more reasonable time for setup and to offer families earlier time slots to received medals: 6 p.m., 6:30 p.m., and 7 p.m.

Moved by: A. Nimmons

Seconded by: E. He

To approve the early 5pm closure of the Library on Friday, September 18, 2026 to allow set-up time for the Summer Reading Club Medal Ceremony.

CARRIED

b) Policy Committee Update

The Ad Hoc Policy Committee is currently reviewing Board policies around Donations, Sponsorships, and related matters. The goal is to get Board and Foundation policies in alignment prior to a capital campaign.

c) North Shore Library Boards Joint Workshop

Although nothing has been finalized, joint workshops for North Shore trustees have typically been scheduled for the Thursday following the October Board meeting.

The Board supported the concept as a valuable opportunity for both networking and a shared educational component.

Suggested topics included accessibility and misinformation.

S. Hall will email the Board to gauge interest and availability.

9. Strategy

a) 2026 Q1 Business Plan

S. Hall provided an overview of the Business Plan progress for Q1 – overall, we are on track.

b) Strategic Planning

The HR Committee deferred the initial strategic planning workshop until June. Between meetings, they will survey board members about preferred process for the strategic planning year, and any exemplar plans the group may want to review. The planning session itself will comprise of:

- i. A standard SWOT-type exercise
- ii. Identification of a few (1-3) key focus areas that may need research
- iii. A discussion on process with a view to mapping out the rest of the planning year.

10. Finance

a) 2026 Q1 Report

B. Hafizi advised that overall, operating results are slightly above target budget and highlighted the following:

- The revenue from third parties includes the unexpended portion of the Public Enhancement Grant carried over from 2025 and the remaining revenue from third parties is generally received at year-end.
- Expenditures for Salary are below budget for the quarter due primarily to staff vacancies and coverage for staff leaves at lower salary rates.

[4]

- Expenditures for Technology and Physical & Digital Resources are over budget for the quarter primarily due to the timing of payments for electronic resources and periodical subscriptions.
- Expenditures for Administration and Facility are under budget for the quarter but are expected to be fully expensed by year end.

It was noted that the Finance Committee reviewed the report and no concerns were noted.

Moved by: S. Sanajou
Seconded by: S. Dennis

To accept the 2026 Q1 operating and capital results as presented.

CARRIED

11. Infrastructure Committee

S. Gill reported on the following projects:

1. Heating System Upgrade
Piping work in the mechanical room continues and the heat exchanger and boilers will be installed soon. The radiators have been ordered and will arrive in the coming weeks. The project is anticipated to be completed by summer.
2. Concrete Work on Rooftop
The pavers have been replaced with concrete, and the area has reopened to the public. This project is now complete.
3. Youth Area Design
The updated cost estimate for the Youth area has been finalized and will be shared with Council for information ahead of the 2027 budget cycle.
4. Skylight Replacement
A contractor has been selected for the skylight replacement project, and a kick-off meeting has occurred. Skylights will be ordered in May/June, and work will commence in early July.
5. Parking Signage and Line Painting
Parking signage has been updated from 9am-6pm Monday to Saturday to 9am-8pm every day to better align with library hours. Line, crosswalk, and pavement marking painting is scheduled for this spring. Depending on the

outcome of the rooftop garden review, we may also be working on a redesign of our rooftop lot next year.

Discussion took place regarding rooftop parking. The Board noted that parking is a concern and that the rooftop patio is not well utilized outside of programming.

S. Hall advised that the findings of the review will be presented to the Board in the fall for further discussion.

12. InterLINK

H. Kaart reported that InterLINK met and that the subcommittees now report through the executive, which aligns closely with the new structure planned for 2027. Financial reports were also reviewed.

13. BCLTA

None.

14. Arts & Culture Advisory Committee

None.

15. Engagement Committee

None.

16. Council Update

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

- Council implemented 90 minutes of free parking in Ambleside while conflicts with the program are resolved and a comprehensive plan from Ambleside to Dundarave is developed. This rollout may take 4–6 weeks, and further details are expected before the next meeting.
- Acciona has settled with Metro on the wastewater treatment plant (\$235 million). Metro will resume the project with an independent review.
- Appointment of a new Police Chief is in the works but has not been finalized.
- Council is beginning the process for the Taylor Way LAP.
- Two library resolutions were fully supported at the LMGA:
 - Funding for a bookmobile
 - \$30,000 in funding for libraries

[6]

- The northbound on-ramp from Park Royal to Taylor Way is expected to be completed by the end of June.
- Water restrictions came into effect on May 1.
- Rail discussion north of Squamish: The Province has agreed to retain the line, and Columbia Rail is engaging with CN on potential passenger and freight additions. Further detailed discussions are expected to commence in July.
- Community Awards will take place on June 1 at WVYC, with Alistar Nimmons and Tracy Wachmann as two of the recipients.
- Canada Post is transitioning to community mailboxes.

17. New Business

None.

18. Date of Next Meeting

Wednesday, June 17, 2026, 7 p.m.

19. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:51 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