

April 5, 2018

TO Stina Hanson & David Hawkins
District of West Vancouver

RE: West Vancouver Seniors Action Table
Comments on DWV draft Official Community Plan

Thank you for taking the time to review the draft OCP with WV SAT, and for the opportunity to review and comment on this phase of the process. WV SAT used the Highlights document provided by DWV which extracted seniors' related items in the draft. Comments were edited for clarity only.

Comments were gathered during a review of the draft OCP, at which we were able to review part of the Housing section (March 21). Additional comments were provided during the plan review with planning analyst Stina Hanson (March 28). More comments were provided by seniors in the community and from WV SAT members.

Specific comments and requests for information are in this review. Here are some general comments on the OCP and process:

While recognizing the OCP is an aspirational document with a longterm horizon, commenters sought specifics in certain areas (District plans to address current housing and transportation issues) and looked for details about sources and research for elements of the plan that are specific (housing units, for example).

WV SAT members who participated in the comments process felt the review period for a plan that will affect and influence the community greatly was too short, with an extension that coincided with spring break, given the complexity of the information in the plan. Others felt the review time was sufficient, given that the community will have additional opportunities to comment.

If we can clarify or provide additional information, please do get in touch.

Laura Anderson

[Redacted signature block]

West Vancouver Seniors Action Table + Lionsview Seniors Planning Society
Comments: District of West Vancouver draft Official Community Plan
delivered April 5, 2018

contact: Laura Anderson, Coordinator, WV SAT
[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

Key: Working with the Highlights document, comments are red, seniors related items are blue and purple.

Consider including information about West Vancouver as an Age-friendly, and soon to be a Dementia-friendly community in section 1 and / or 2 of the draft OCP.

Age Friendly Priorities and the Draft Official Community Plan:

- Draft OCP seeks to embed Age-friendly Priorities in all topic areas;
- District demographics and projections highlight that seniors are a key demographic now and in the future;
- Seniors have been engaged throughout the OCP review process (e.g. 31% of all survey respondents were over 65, and engagement events were held in the Seniors' Activity Centre); **Is a record of engagement events and activities specifically directed towards seniors during the public process available?**
- Sincere thank you to all Seniors Action Table members who have participated so far. **and we appreciate the opportunity to discuss and comment.**

WHO Age Friendly Priorities:

A. Outdoor spaces & public buildings:

Does the natural and built environment help older persons get around easily and safely in the community? Does our environment encourage active community participation? OCP Policies that address this:

Examples from "Local Economy":

2.3.13 Support placemaking through an attractive public realm and experience

2.4 "Transportation":

2.4.1 Complete the pedestrian and cycling network

- 2.4.2 Provide attractive alternatives to driving by enhancing the safety, accessibility and connectivity for pedestrians and cyclists through:
 - Wider and weather-protected sidewalks; and
 - Dedicated bike lanes.
- 1.1.4 Develop minimum pedestrian and cyclist design and infrastructure guidelines.
- 1.1.6 Expand wayfinding features (e.g.centres, schools, parks, churches and community facilities).
- 2.4.14 Universal access design principles for sidewalk, pathways, transit, and road for all ages and abilities.
- 2.4.16 Traffic calming guidelines for local traffic and residential access.
- 2.4.20 Collaborate to improve transportation safety and network to facilitate the movement of people and goods in the District and the North Shore.

Each of the above could be redrafted to include an Age-friendly component.

Specifically: reduce speed zones in the area bounded by 20 and 22 streets, and by Gordon and Bellevue Avenues to 30 kph. Extend crossing signal time at intersections at Marine at 21 and 22 streets (currently the crossing time is 32 seconds). Right (and left) turnings by vehicles is an increasing area of concern for pedestrians, particularly seniors.

Examples from "Parks & Trails"

- 2.7.1 Maintain and care for the District's parks and open spaces with the following values:
 - Active living, health and social and spiritual well-being;
 - Inclusiveness, accessibility and respect for all people;
 - Atmosphere that fosters community interaction and involvement;
 - Public safety and security;
- 2.7.6 Support activities in parks and open spaces including volunteer stewardship activities, invasive plant management, environmental art.
- 2.7.14 Establish new trails to improve connectivity across the District.
- 2.7.17 Improve safety, universal accessibility, and signage / wayfinding for community members of all ages and abilities, **as defined by the principles adopted by Age-friendly communities.**

Examples from "Social Well-being":

- 2.8.1 Meet community needs as demographic changes occur, with strategies for the delivery of services.
- 2.8.2 Incorporate universal accessibility design in public space and programs for users of all ages and abilities.
- 2.8.3 Improve access to services and resources for youth, seniors and persons with disabilities.

2.8.4 Provide services, programs and facilities that encourage seniors and people with disabilities to function independently, **encouraging private sector businesses and services to support accessibility requirements.**

2.8.18 Provide meaningful volunteer engagement opportunities

2.9.1 Optimize the use of existing recreation facilities to facilitate participation for all ages and abilities.

2.9.8 Support the West Vancouver Memorial Library as a lifelong learning institution, community gathering space and resource centre for people of all ages.

B. Public Transportation:

Can older persons travel conveniently and in safety wherever they want to go in the community? OCP Policies that address this:

Examples from "Transportation":

1.1.6 Work with TransLink to re-think and improve public transportation, **with an emphasis on demographic and ability trends.**

1.1.9 Develop streetscape design guidelines to support active transportation.

1.1.11 Partner with stakeholders to advance inter-municipal connectivity for all modes and explore alternatives (e.g. lower level road, rail, and ferry and water taxi services).

2.4.14 Universal **Age-friendly** access design principles for sidewalk, pathways, transit, and roads for all ages and abilities.

Examples from "Social Well-being":

2.8.13 Use placemaking strategies to promote public spaces **with consideration of logistic, disability and age specific inclusion and participation needs.**

Additional comments on Transportation:

The OCP promotes walking and cycling, neither are practical modes of transit for seniors, people with disabilities and mothers with babies and toddlers, particularly with the need to travel and park for shopping, health services and recreation.

Wider and weather-protected sidewalks are mentioned - where and when will they be installed?

Existing sidewalks (particularly within the Ambleside business district) are tripping hazards - is there a plan to fix them?

Transit (bus) service is already at a breaking point with existing density. How will transit will be improved, what impact future development will have on transit

service or traffic congestion, given the need for people to drive and park near a transit hub. Noted that the OCP is not a transportation document, yet housing and other key elements of the plan are dependent on transportation in various forms.

C. Housing:

Are the housing needs and preferences of older adults considered during the planning process by a diverse range of agencies and institutions? OCP Policies that address this:

Examples from "Housing & Neighbourhoods":

2.1.1-3 Allow for more housing options in neighbourhoods to enable older adults to downsize within their neighbourhoods through:

- Allow subdivisions to create smaller homes on smaller lots
- Incentivize heritage preservation and restoration
- Expand coach houses with rental and ownership options
- Consider new locations for duplexes

Note: improve bonus density incentives in Ambleside / Dundarave with consideration of smaller lot sizes and proposed building allowances.

1.1.1-14 Prepare Local Area Plans for Ambleside Town Centre, Taylor Way Corridor and Horseshoe Bay:

- Work with the community to determine forms and heights
- Confirm unit estimates and plan boundaries through that process

Note: explain to OCP readers that LAPs are not yet in place, refer to the Marine LAP as an example.

2.1.16 Support rental housing and renter households by prohibiting stratification, encouraging tenant assistance if renters are displaced, enabling rental replacement through bonus density and securing market and non-market rental through Housing agreements.

Note: include working with BC housing and tenancy to develop workable rental arrangements in West Vancouver.

Note: Hollyburn Family Services is developing a North Shore based Seniors' Roommate Registry.

1.1.17 Promote market and non-market rental, seniors and supportive housing units in appropriate locations by encouraging new units through bonus density, considering contributions to the District's Affordable Housing Fund, financial incentives, reduced off-street parking and using Housing Agreement to secure rental units.

1.1.18 Work with non-profit housing groups and senior government to maintain and create new non-market rental, seniors or supportive housing.

1.1.19 Ensure that new housing development meets the community's needs (e.g. range of unit sizes, variety of housing forms, including lock-off units,

prohibiting rental restrictions and increasing the provision of accessible and adaptable units), and associated transportation (public transit, pedestrians and private) needs (see Note below).

- 1.1.20 Use surplus District-owned lands to increase diverse and affordable housing, with consideration of support for seniors with financial needs, for care workers and for community workers.

Note: recommend consideration of Age-friendly transportation needs in all housing planning: public transit, personal vehicles, ride-sharing and Uber-type transit, pedestrianism.

A. Housing & Neighbourhoods

- 2.1.17 suggests reducing off-street parking requirements as one means of promoting new market, non-market rental, seniors and supportive housing units in appropriate locations close to transit and amenities. How will this impact seniors who find a car is essential? Also, young mothers with strollers, etc., who also find a car essential to ferry their families about? They will all likely own a car, even if they use it less, they still need somewhere to park.
- 2.1.20 Use surplus District-owned lands to increase the availability of more diverse and affordable housing. type, size, or tenure of housing; what is considered affordable, and implementation not defined.

Is a map or list of District-owned lands available?

- 2.2.7 > 2.2.16 Cypress Village Consider building a memory care community on this site. <http://vancouver.sun.com/news/local-news/the-village-is-just-one-model-for-people-with-dementia-says-seniors-advocate>. The Village, under construction in Langley, is modeled on dementia-friendly communities in the Netherlands, Switzerland, the UK and USA.

B. Social Participation:

Do older persons have opportunities to develop and maintain meaningful social networks in their neighbourhoods? OCP Policies that address this:

Examples from "Transportation":

- 2.4.1 Complete the pedestrian network with integration to transit, centres, community facilities, parks and trails system, **separate from cycling pathways, with consideration for seniors, persons with disabilities, mothers with strollers, and others who may require mobility aids.**
- 2.4.14 Universal access design principles for sidewalk, pathways, transit, and road for all ages and abilities, **separate from cycling pathways, with consideration for seniors, persons with disabilities, mothers with strollers, and others who may require mobility aids.**

2.4.16 Traffic calming guidelines for local traffic and residential access.

Examples from "Social Well-being":

- 2.8.11 Support community hubs and explore neighbourhood hubs based on community partnerships.
- 2.8.15 Support community activities (e.g. community-wide events to smaller private events) through policy, facilities and grants.
- 2.8.16 Work with schools and community groups to coordinate use of facilities.
- 2.9.2 Explore space sharing and versatile design of parks, greenways and recreation spaces, **with consideration of Age-friendly principles.**
- 2.9.4 Support complementary uses, activities and special events in parks.
- 2.9.10 Use community grants to encourage the long-term sustainable operation of community organizations. **Note: well done. volunteer based community organizations must continually reframe activities, even those proven to be successful, and re-apply for funding (already minimal) annually from a limited and decreasing pool of funders.**

C. Respect and Social Inclusion:

Are public services, media, commercial services, faith community and civil society respectful of the diverse needs of older people, and willing to include them in all aspects of society? OCP Policies that address this:

Examples from "Local Economy":

- 2.3.21 Encourage local businesses to employ socially and environmentally-responsible practices (e.g. accessibility features in commercial spaces);

Examples from "Social Well-being"

- 2.8.4 Provide services, programs and facilities that encourage seniors and people with disabilities to function independently **with consideration for those with cognitive challenges. Note: recognizing that a senior may have chronic health conditions, physical disabilities and cognition challenges.**
- 2.8.17 Engage the community and **stakeholder groups, including seniors,** in planning for services, programs, and facilities, and municipal decision-making, **with the inclusion of Age-friendly principles.**
- 2.8.18 Provide meaningful volunteer engagement opportunities
- 2.8.19 Enhance information sharing and participation in civic affairs through accessible communication (e.g. universal access).
- 2.9.10 Use community grants to encourage the long-term sustainable operation of community organizations.

D. Employment and Volunteerism:

Do older persons have opportunities to participate in community decision-making? Do older persons have opportunities their experience and skills to the community in paid or unpaid work? OCP Policies that address this:

Examples from "Local Economy":

2.3.17 Foster partnerships achieve mutual economic development objectives.

2.3.18 Support small business

2.3.21 Encourage local businesses to employ socially, **and** environmentally-responsible, **and Age-friendly** practices (e.g. accessibility features in commercial spaces);

Examples from "Social Well-being":

2.8.17 Engage the community in planning for services, programs, and facilities, and municipal decision-making.

2.8.18 Provide meaningful volunteer engagement opportunities.

E. Age Friendly Communications and Information:

Are older persons aware of programs and services available in their community? Is information readily available, appropriately designed and delivered to meet the needs of seniors? OCP Policies that address this:

Examples from "Social Well-being":

2.8.19 Enhance information sharing and **continuous** participation in civic affairs through accessible communication (e.g. universal access).

2.9.8 Support the West Vancouver Memorial Library **and the West Vancouver Seniors' Activity Centre** as a lifelong learning institutions, community gathering spaces and resource centres for people of all ages.

F. Community Support and Health Services:

Do older persons have access to social and health services they need to stay healthy and independent? OCP Policies that address this:

Examples from "Housing & Neighbourhoods":

1.1.17 Promote new market and non-market rental, seniors and supportive housing units in appropriate locations

Examples from "Local Economy":

2.3.16 Support emerging economic opportunities (e.g. expansion of the healthcare sector including independent and assisted living and residential care)

Examples from "Social Well-being":

- 2.8.1 Meet community needs as demographic changes occur, with strategies for the delivery of services.
- 2.8.2 Incorporate universal accessibility design in public space and programs for users of all ages and abilities.
- 2.8.4 Provide services, programs and facilities that encourage seniors and people with disabilities to function independently, **with consideration of social isolation among seniors.**
- 2.8.8 Collaborate **with service providers, seniors' focused community organizations, and individuals and their families,** to develop **Age- and Dementia-friendly based** plans, programs and services for aging adults with ~~dementia and other~~ cognitive challenges, **and their families and support networks.**
- 2.9.10 Use community grants to encourage the long-term sustainable operation of community organizations, **with recognition of current demographic evidence that 51% of West Vancouver's population is now single, and the community is trending sharply towards aging.**
- 2.9.11 **As a priority,** collaborate with community partners to provide a full continuum of support services to address issues related to mental health, addictions, health services, **increasing homelessness,** housing, employment and food security.

General Comments and Recommendations:

1. Recognition, appreciation and preservation of Heritage & History, not mentioned in the plan, are essential elements of a community's well being. West Vancouver is one of the few municipalities in British Columbia with no office dedicated to community heritage and history, nor a council liaison, notwithstanding the restoration of a heritage committee intended to replaced the defunct heritage commission.

Consider including a map of heritage sites, institutions and historical resources, identifying those which may be threatened by anticipated growth, and initiatives for recognition and preservation.

Consider including community information and educational initiatives about WV community history and heritage that are intergenerational, that involve local organizations, schools. It is important to note the history of West Vancouver, incorporated in 1912, is still within living memory, that is, West Vancouver seniors recall the stories and memories of their parents, who settled and built the community.

2. D. Parks & Environment / Protecting and Enhancing Ecological Integrity and Building Climate Resiliency

Clearcutting housing sites on a large scale creates glare and builds heat, conditions which compromise ecological integrity and has a negative impact on climate resiliency.

Clearcutting housing sites on a large scale creates the potential for landslides.

Water restrictions during dry, hot summers are not enforced currently; how will restrictions be implemented before 2041 to protect our water reserves?

2.7 Parks & Trails

2.7.3 Strategic dedication of acquisition of parkland

Consider including Point Atkinson (and Lighthouse Park) in this section.

Note: Lighthouse Park is described as a national historic site, however, Point Atkinson is the actual national historic site.

DFO lease on Point Atkinson ends in 2026, therefore the light station's future, and that of Lighthouse Park as well, should be included in the OCP.

2.7.6 support compatible activities to advance enviro. stewardship goals.

Does this clause address support or enhancement of community based organizations - Streamkeepers, Old Growth Conservancy, Foreshore / Shoreline protection?

3. Regarding elements yet to be incorporated into the plan: how will the community review and comment on these additions?
4. How will future plans for redevelopment of the Seniors Activity Centre site (as presented in March at the WV SAC AGM) fit in with the OCP?
5. How will developments underway by the Squamish Nation and North Vancouver, (specifically towers at Cap Road / Marine Drive) be addressed in the OCP, particularly as these developments will increase population density and further strain transportation and roadway resources?
6. Consider including in the second stage of the OCP approval process:
 - a summary of the OCP main points
 - a glossary of terms (e.g. rental, market, non-market / affordable)

- a timeline of the next phase of public consultation
- and a note about the OCP mandate that clarifies scope.

7. E. Social Well Being

cultural contributions from West Vancouver's indigenous population is absent from the plan, as are those from newcomer groups.

arts and culture seem to be included in a minor way, given the abundance and variety of practitioners, community organizations and outlets/

8. West Vancouver is an Age-friendly community.

- Consider including the fact that WV is an Age-friendly community and has been so since 2012 in section 1 and / or 2 of the draft OCP.
- Age-friendly principles and practices bring benefits to seniors and their families, to persons with disabilities and to parents with young children, and therefore the community as a whole.
- Adhering to Age-friendly principles contributes to a sustainable quality of life for the community.
- Commitment to Age-friendly principles will be maintained and enhanced as the community grows and develops.

SECTION II: COMMENT FORMS SUBMISSIONS

Phase 4 included a comment form where citizens could provide their input on the Draft Plan. The form was available online via the District's website, or as a hard copy form available at all Information Booths, stakeholder meetings and the front desk at Municipal Hall.

Draft Official Community Plan Feedback		
Submission Details exported April 2, 2018		
Submitted Time	Name	Comment
2018/02/13 23:17	[REDACTED]	<p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED] on the boarder of RS3 and RS5 zoning</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>We had a chance to talk to most of owners of this block and we had a good and positive outcome for idea of rezoning from RS3 to RS5 . Once those big size lots have a chance for subdivision, most neighbours and I will no longer be interested in building a large size houses . I believe smaller size houses will be more desirable and appealing in very near future rather than large huge sizes homes in our neighborhood ,, With that said smaller lots would accommodate smaller houses. All The lots in this block are perfect candidates for rezoning and as you very [REDACTED]</p> <p>I genuinely hope that the district will take the proposal into consideration 2018 OCP. I'm looking forward to get feedbacks from the district. Please let me know the district's thoughts on this proposal of rezoning and if there is any steps that we should take to voice our request at this point as residents and applicants for rezoning from RS3 to RS5!!</p> <p>Looking forward hearing back from district in near future.</p> <p>Yours truly,</p>

We write once again to convey our opposition as to the limited level of detail in the content included in various sections of the OCP and LAP. We recognize that it is the documented intention to bring forward previous content from previous OCP. As one Councillor explained, "The Local Area Plan Council adopted this year retained existing land use policies but this does not mean Council would be obliged to approve a development. It does allow them to consider any such proposals should they be forthcoming."

Given those comments it would seem that by resident approval of the OCP and/or LAP that Council would have our blessing to consider/approve any such matching "conceptual" or matter presented in the future. To be specific let us consider any one of the following: 1) The rezoning for the 752 Marine Drive Project. 2) Allow the rezoning in the Clyde Ave. area east of Taylor Way to allow for a mix of uses, including residential, mixed commercial residential building with street oriented commercial uses at grade, commercial office building, hotels and specialized residential facilities. 3) The street fronting retail along Marine Drive west of Taylor Way. 4) Options for rezoning the parking lot on the north-east corner of Clyde and Taylor Way for development in exchange for providing permanent public vehicular access to Taylor Way. 5) Contributing to upgrading the Wardance Bridge to complete The Spirit Trail over First Nations land whether or not leased to Park Royal.

As residents we are NOT comfortable that based on the current level of BASIC detail in the DRAFT OCP and LAP to permit Council to feel "blessed" in making decisions on say the above identified issues (and we wonder how many more similar situations are in the DRAFT documents) that do not take into account, zero in on, the specific current realities/needs in the District some of which are not temporary in nature but will be inherent over all of the Plan period of coverage of from 5 to 20 years. Examples of longer term issues are of course traffic and congestion, affordable housing, child care facilities, disability housing. All of these issues are front and centre in the minds of Council and residents and while the OCP highlights them the level of BASIC detail related to these issues affecting individual sections of the documents should also be front and centre and to a better degree documented to be considered by Council. In addition, in some sections the current situation contained in the document is factually incorrect - refer Park Royal Hotel demolished and replaced by Waters Edge residential homes years ago.

Again referring to the examples above: 1) In the case of 752 Marine Drive and for that matter the other two high-rise buildings covered in the LAP there are no specific minimums for building content - e.g. Child Care spaces. 2) The Clyde Ave. content advises there is an existing (Park Royal) hotel and also suggests a conceptual replacement, despite the suggested high-rise there is a suggestion of further density in the area by increasing size of current structures notwithstanding the limited available land, suggestion of the closing of 6th Street missing the fact 6th Street is used by West Royal Towers to exit their parking lot and as an exit from Waters Edge buildings, does not recognize the restricted vehicle access to the area, the need to ensure efficient exiting of West Royal Towers parking lot and the fact there are no left turns onto Taylor Way during rush hours - there appears that some further detail on key issues should be detailed like traffic and again the high rise building content, . 3) After all the concern for increased congestion at the Taylor Way and Marine Drive intersection that would have been impacted by more retail at the 752 Marine Drive site, the DRAFT suggests


		<p>that without any detail as to existing traffic flowing from the North Mall or changes in the North Mall business content that Council should consider development of more street fronting retail along Marine Drive west of Taylor Way. 4) Without any detail as to changes in the Mall makeup or densification of Clyde Avenue it makes no sense to consider such an issue without an understanding as to how congestion and traffic in the area would be affected by the removal of the parking building and the suggested street fronting retail along Marine Drive west of Taylor Way. 5) As for the Wardance Bridge Upgrade to complete The Spirit Trail through First Nations land (leased and not leased) there is no detail on the significance of or cap on the cost involved or risks involved or ongoing legal ability to access the Trail through all the Squamish Nation Land which agreement incidentally expires in 2019. Given the level of spending, it was recently pointed out that the District lost any available grants and Council ended up in recently approving \$700,000 for what we believe is less than a perfect solution at a cost which is more than a third of the total Spirit Trail cost of \$2,020,790 for the 7 kilometres completed of the 19 kilometre Trail. We have not looked into the DRAFT OCP for details and location of The Spirit Trail commitment which is only 37% complete at a cost of \$6,372,008 including Grants and has never been fully included in the District 5 Year Financial Plan?</p> <p>So in essence in general and in some specific terms we cannot support the DRAFT OCP or LAP given the lack of an acceptable level of BASIC and what we feel should be needed decision making detail included, which would present a clear reflection of our view on a conceptual or actual matter to be reflected on by Council in their approval process.</p>
2018/02/20 19:51	[REDACTED]	<p>The discussion groups were based on themes that led people to certain answers at a very high level that lacked details. Transportation in particular was not well covered. The conclusion is we apparently want affordable housing and thus will be achieved by imposing higher density on certain neighbourhoods in West Vancouver. I think the plan fails to answer 1) With such high land prices is affordable housing in West Vancouver even achievable? 2) What do we define as affordable and to whom and for whom? Recent and planned density developments have certainly not been affordable. If we are building high rises, townhomes and duplexes who are we building these new homes for? Before we add to our population and traffick gridlock through higher density we need to solve our transportation issue and this will not be solved by bicycle lanes and transit alone. A third crossing or additional lanes on our bridges will be key as much traffic is through traffic by vehicle to our parks (grouse mountain and cypress), to ferries for the island and Sunshine Coast, Squamish and Whistler. And much of the construction traffic will not use transit.</p>
2018/02/21 10:02	[REDACTED]	<p>Hello,</p> <p>Transportation, traffic, and commuting in West Vancouver have become a serious hassle in our everyday life. There is no day that we don't face with heavy traffic on the streets/roads. Many unnecessary shopping centers, infrastructure, and rising new residential complexes which ending to remain unoccupied, definitely are some of the important reasons for creating commuting problems.</p> <p>Please think about this matter before it is too late. Thank you.</p>

2018/02/23 10:25	[REDACTED]	<p>In general, I am in total support of the proposed OCP Draft.</p> <p>In fact, I would generally say the steps taken to improve both quality of life, affordability, and quantity of homes is less bold than I fear is necessary to stave off the immanent problems the District would face if we do nothing at all (i.e. reject the draft).</p> <p>Better than nothing, but I hope the adopted OCP is even more forward thinking than currently drafted, i.e. even more proposed density possibilities, more units than currently projected allowed, bolder transportation solutions made.</p> <p>But great start. Keep up the good work.</p>
2018/02/23 13:34	[REDACTED]	<p>I have lived on the North Shore [REDACTED] never in the District of West Vancouver. My aunt, [REDACTED] lived in a West Vancouver [REDACTED] in the excellent care [REDACTED]. I am a professional planner and I worked in the public sector on the North Shore for most of my career. Based on my reading of your new Official Community Plan, I am very impressed with the comprehensive approach being taken -- this will be a big step forward for residents, businesses, prospective residents, and other government agencies when attempting to understand how West Vancouver plans to provide municipal services and to plan for change and growth in the coming years. I particularly think the co-ordination with the rest of the North Shore being proposed for growth and renewal along the Marine Drive corridor in West Vancouver is appropriate. I very much like the proposal to have growth occur near existing mixed use areas and where there are abundant services nearby. The old, the young and the environment in these neighbourhoods will all benefit from this approach. Keep up the good work.</p>
2018/02/23 15:47	[REDACTED]	<p>Free bus (electrical, quite and friendly to enviornment) lines redesign. More routes, allow every family have the possible to take bus to Parkroyal or community center or horseshoe bay every half hour, and plus more bikes (very cheaper daypass, or weekpass, or monthpass). Thus, one family can reduce one car. everyone can use free bus and lower cost bike to move from anywhere to anywhere in westvancouver. Increase property tax, take from local people, and work for local people.</p>
2018/02/25 16:12	[REDACTED]	<p>My comments are based on your Draft OCP</p> <p>2.1 The plan should not say what the estimated number of new sensitive infill units are.</p> <p>2.1.2 The floor maximum area for rental coach houses should be specified as a percentage of the lot size.</p> <p>The missing middle (triplex, townhouse, mixed-use) options should not specify the number of new units. Also the maximum area of the basement suite should be based on a percentage of the area allowed for a lot say 25% of that allowance. Also the maximum lot coverage for these units should be specified to ensure that there is some reasonable area for gardens.</p> <p>2.1.7 Reporting to council after preliminary review must be by public input not just the opportunity for public input. Also reviewing form and character must have public input not just the provision for public input.</p> <p>2.1.8 This is too vague the regulation for neighbourhood must be enforceable and not up to planning department to make decisions.</p> <p>2.1.9 Off-street parking requirements should not be reduced. The public must be allowed to give input before council can approve Heritage</p>

Revitalisation Agreements.

- 2.1.10 Changes to changes to parks or public right of way must get public approval not just Planning or Council approval
- 2.1.11 Why would Eagle Island get this ruling while others areas don't.
- 2.1.13 The rugby fields and the squash club with parking should be protected from any development.
- 2.1.14 This should be approved by a citizen vote not by Council.
- 2.1.15 This should be approved by a citizen vote not by Council.
- 2.1.16 There should be limit on sizes defined
- 2.1.20 The use of District lands should not be used without the vote of Citizens, should not be a Council decision.
- 2.1.21 The new regulations should be approved by tax payers.
- What about adding new parking regulations that encourage contractors and developers to have a more efficient and less pollution for employee transportation.
- 2.1.17 What does this mean. You certainly should not allow contractors to buy revisions to bylaws without the approval of Citizens.
- 2.2.2 This should be approved by Citizens not Planning and Council, they should make the recommendation but Citizens should have the vote.
- 2.2.4 Again this should be approved by Tax Payers
- 2.2.5 Should not be decided by financial values but by a citizen vote.
- 2.2.7 Should be approved by Citizens and administered by Council
- 2.2.9 Should be approved by Citizens and administered by Council
- 2.2.11 and 2.2.12 Should be approved by Citizens and administered by Council
- 2.2.13 to 2.2.16 Should be approved by Citizens not by Planning and administered by Council
- 2.3.1 How about providing better parking, like marking the parking spots so parking is more efficient. People drive onto Park Royal if they can't find a place to park in Ambleside.
- 2.3.4 Dunderave needs nothing other than cheaper rents and better parking that can be provided by painting the parking spots on Marine Drive.
- 2.3.7 What about the boat launching ramp at Ambleside, this needs to be put back in use.
- 2.3.10 This should only be allowed if the accommodation is registered and they pay extra taxes for it.
- 2.3.11 There should be a height limit for hotel buildings.
- It should be noted that we lost an attractive heritage hotel when Council allowed the Park Royal Hotel to be demolished for a developer to put in apartments.
- 2.3.16 Technology employment should only be created in commercial areas.
- 2.3.19 Park areas should not be used
- 2.3.21 We should encourage local businesses but not foreign
- 2.4.1 Don't want Spirit Trail on Seaview Trail, it should stay pedestrian.
- 2.4.2 Most bikers are not friendly and do not obey the traffic laws and we don't have police out there enforcing our laws.
- 2.4.10 Very important that we do this.
- 2.4.14 Pedestrians cannot use sidewalks and pathways with cyclists, majority of cyclist ignore pedestrians as if they have right of way.
- 2.4.17 And have the parking spots marked (painted)
- 2.4.19 Limit the number of vehicles that contractors can bring to a site and have the bylaws enforced, which you don't do now.
- 2.4.22 Enforce the bylaws on cyclists
- 2.5.1 Stop the complete coverage a site with concrete so existing drainage is not changed
- 2.5.5 Encourage a hospital being built in West Vancouver.

		<p>2.5.7 Don't just encourage it you should enforce the OCP unlike what you have done with the existing and current OCP.</p> <p>2.5.13 The current OCP recognises this and Planning and Council have not enforced it.</p> <p>2.5.14 Prohibit developments that effect this.</p> <p>2.5.15 The current OCP recognises this and Planning and Council have not enforced it.</p> <p>2.6.1 and 2.6.2The existing OCP did this but it is not enforced by Planning and the Council.</p> <p>2.6.7 The existing OCP says you should do this but Planning and Council don't enforce it.</p> <p>2.6.10 Let people take their dogs on the beaches especially those that are hardly used by anybody else like the beach at the bottom of 29th. Limit the maximum size of a house going on a large lot, say 8000 square feet , you should not be allowed to build the sae percentage area on a larger lot than you can on a smaller.</p> <p>2.6.18 Tax people have large polluting vehicles like Rolls Royce, Maserati and big pickups and use the extra taxes to fund environmentally friendly projects.</p> <p>2.7.15 Don't convert the Seaview trail to the Spirit trail unless you leave undeveloped ie no black top and you don't let racing cyclists on it.</p> <p>2.8.10 Do not sell public land without having a vote from citizens to approve it.</p> <p>3.2 The new OCP should be approved by the Citizens and not by Council, we should approve it and Council should administer it.</p>
2018/02/26 10:43	[REDACTED]	<p>Finally the government is playing catch up. West Vancouve is the only district that the population is decreasing. There's not enough housing types, or more affordable housing in the area. There is only the single house selling for multiple millions of dollars. Even the new Grosvenor Ambleside project is selling close to \$2,000/sf.</p> <p>We need more townhouse, or low rise apts that's more affordable for young families. We need more selections close to amenities like Park Royal.</p>
2018/02/26 12:04	[REDACTED]	<p>*would like to own a business in West Vancouver*</p> <p>Thank you for putting so much time and effort into the Community Draft Plan. I particularly liked the outreach at the community center in February with the easy to understand infographics for each section; it is community outreach like that that will speak to younger generations. I'm sure I'm one of the few that read through the entire 53 page document, yet there was enough information on those infographics for most people.</p> <p>Your housing options are a much needed upgrade, particularly the lane housing being allowed to stratify, and converting/allowing residential above commercial for mixed use. [REDACTED] first to design and develop a mixed use building in Calgary, [REDACTED]. Since that time, Calgary has seen immense and much needed density, as well as bringing young people from all over the country to live and work.</p> <p>In response to section 2.1 I love the new height restrictions! Thank you for allowing multi-family dwellings within some of these monster homes.</p> <p>2.1.10-1, we have seen too many beautiful evergreens cut down without community feedback up here in the British Properties - many of us live here to be closer to nature, not for sun exposure!</p> <p>2.1.11 - Disagree. "small island character" allows for smaller dwellings. I think what the plan meant to say was "exclusive island character"</p> <p>2.1.19 - Yes! The prohibition of rentals in stratas is a ridiculous caveat for</p>

		<p>sales, and for the rental market. Thank you for disallowing that!</p> <p>Regarding Cypress Village: Originally hailing from Lynn Valley, I myself am a mountain biker. I myself know there is a "huge" community of Mountain Bikers all over the North Shore, and Vancouver generally within the age range of 18-40. Cypress Mountain has world renowned mountain bike trails that some see as literal Mecca for riders. This is a tourist drive. This is absolutely a drive for the "missing generation" to come to West Vancouver. See the boom on Mount Fromme, and Mount Seymour for inspiration. Alas, these trails are at the whim of actual topography. There are only a few available, and rideable terrains in West Vancouver, and they aren't close to Horseshoe Bay. It is in my opinion, and the opinion of any rider that's had the pleasure of riding the coveted North Shore to preserve these trails. I'm extremely concerned with the "complementary non-residential uses". Keep in mind, without these trails, there is the possibility of even more congestion with people needing to drive either up the sea to sky, or east to the other rideable mountains. Also see Whistler's success with their summer bike park, also take note of Big White's initiatives, as well as Silverstar, and Sunpeaks. Cypress I believe is a Crown Corp, and it too should invest in summer activities to ease congestion on the sea to sky, and even Ferry services to Mount Washington.</p> <p>2.5.15 Love this excerpt.</p> <p>2.7.5 Keeping the natural elements is super important for us on the North Shore. We come here, and live here because of the nature, not despite of the nature. I love this idea of keeping green belts and spaces for our urban wildlife to continue living in harmony with us.</p> <p>2.8.17 - Again coming back to the lovely media inspired infographics I saw, I'd like more of this on social media for people in my generation. I find people love to post and share opinion pieces on politics without knowing how to actually make a difference. As in, they honestly don't know the order of operations. I would like to see more education geared towards young people in how to get involved, even if it's behind a computer. Text, graphics, and an implementation of social media can have major impact, see Nasa's work with instagram for instance.</p> <p>As a closing thought, please allow for younger generations to implement business plans in West Vancouver more easily. I'd love to see access to tour guides, dog walking, cannabis production and retail, food trucks, more privatization of liquor stores or cold beer and wine (possibly in the new Cypress Village) and home based businesses. Having lived some time in Alberta, there's a huge push for the younger generations to move there only on the dream of free market. I know this will be a strategy that will work for West Vancouver as well. Having the ability to live and work in West Vancouver, while contributing to the overall economy is what will drive young people here, and industries across the board are changing. Restaurants aren't brick and mortar; marijuana is being legalized; sites such as Airbnb are offering "experiences" etc etc.... There needs to be less red tape, and more productive business to attract young people.</p> <p>Good luck on your implementation!</p>
2018/02/27 11:36		<p>PLEASE do not put new buildings on the green parkland assembled between the seawall and Argyle... it is unique, beautiful, and well used by many individuals and family groups.</p> <p>PLEASE include lighting along the seawall between 18th and 15th streets. Currently there is NONE and it is very dangerous, especially on cold, dark</p>

		winter nights to attempt to walk there. I make sure to carry my own flashlight!
2018/02/27 12:32		My understanding of the suggestions for Coach Houses will NOT result in any more to be constructed anytime soon. Floor Area bonuses are needed when the main house is preserved. Many of the lots in West Vancouver (Dundurave+Ambleside specifically) are smaller than what is stated in the current zoning and the FAR will not permit any livable size Coach House. Please include floor area or FAR exemptions for new coach houses that preserve the primary residence (and therefore "neighbourhood character"). Please look at Vancouver as a local example that has produced many laneway houses and infill housing.
2018/03/01 10:01		I support to raise the density to support more people to live and work in West Vancouver, not only wealthy people, which also will be benefit for local economy development.
2018/03/01 10:25		<p>We're currently in a housing crisis - but Council does not appear to be doing what is necessary to fix the problem.</p> <p>The draft OCP is a good start - but it does not go nearly far enough. We need more far density along Marine Drive - particularly in Ambleside and Dundarave. Based on research done by the West Vancouver Community Foundation, 33% of people are planning to move in the next 5 years and over 60% do not feel there are good housing choices for them in West Vancouver. We need smaller floor plates and more multi-unit housing to increase affordability. We're not currently meeting the needs of existing West Vancouver residents and we need to significantly increase density in order to meet those needs. We should really be pre-zoning much of the area around Marine Drive in order to encourage development.</p> <p>I know there is opposition, but based on research done by the district, its estimate that over 80% of existing West Vancouver residents want more density and more development. They want to create a thriving community. There are somewhat less that 8% of residents who are generally opposed to development - but they show up for council meetings and for elections.</p> <p>We need to do more to encourage development and density, particularly around Marine Drive.</p>
2018/03/01 14:09		<p>a) I support in the densification along Taylor Way Corridor</p> <p>b) I support increasing the boundary east of Taylor Way along Anderson Crescent inclusive of Eden Place and 8th St.</p> <p>c) I am concern about the diminishing population and affordability and encourage multi family home and condo development with additional units in order to achieve affordable prices through smaller units which will enable younger generations to enter the market and engage in and develop the community as a whole.</p> <p>d) I support providing rental dwellings which will enable the local work force to not have to live far away due to lack of inventory and affordability and be able to live in the community which they are providing services in.</p>

2018/03/06 17:59	[REDACTED]	<p>In order for the commercial district to survive in West Vancouver, the issues of demographics and density need to be addressed. We need a revised OCP that allows for higher density, mixed-use buildings, and parcels of land need to be encouraged in order to allow for anchor tenants, which are vital in any successful business district. We have plenty examples in Metro Vancouver where such changes are successful. Stop listening to the nay-sayers who don't want change. We have incredible natural surroundings that should be attracting outsiders, however those who do visit the area do not utilize the other amenities, as what we currently have to offer is not attractive enough to make a day-tripper want to stay. We need a healthy combination of people coming from outside West Vancouver to experience all that we have to offer, while growing the local population by offering more affordable housing options. If we keep focusing on meeting the needs of the large population of retirees the community is going to continue to decline. We need residents of all age groups to live here and spend their money here.</p>
2018/03/06 19:09	[REDACTED]	<p>we hope to Support the densification along Taylor Way Corridor. concern of diminishing population and affordability and encourage multi family home and condo development with additional units in order to achieve affordable prices through smaller units which will enable younger generations to enter the market and engage in and develop the community as a whole.</p> <p>help our community for rental dwellings affordable and working place and residential be close to each other , therefore less commuting would have lots of benefit like less cost less pollution and no traffic .</p> <p>I am really interested to increase the boundary east of Taylor Way along Anderson Crescent inclusive of Eden Place and 8th St.</p>
2018/03/07 11:02	[REDACTED]	<p>I think the planning staff have done a very good job engaging the community broadly. The plan is clear and makes me feel hopeful about the future of West Vancouver.</p> <p>I would like to recommend that staff look at creating more opportunities for duplex and other denser housing options in and around schools. For example, expanding the Dundarave area to Kings, between Irwin Park and Pauline Johnson elementary schools. Also, a larger area around Hollyburn Elementary and West Vancouver Secondary schools. Enacting a principle, that WV schools are hubs for duplex and other smaller housing options for families.</p> <p>With respect to reconciliation, I would like to recommend that major street names (and building signage for district buildings like the recreation centres; seniors centre; and municipal hall appear in both Indigenous and English language, on street signs.</p>

2018/03/07 11:39	[REDACTED]	<p>Early in the draft document statistics are given regarding the volume of commuting into our community by people who work or study in West Van. The twice daily traffic snarls around all our schools and roadways support this. The percentages noted - 75% who work here, live outside and 25% who go to school here are from elsewhere, will presumably only increase with time. Given this reality, and our declining population, it appears that West Van is morphing into a brand and not a community. The plan also notes that there is little if any housing available in our community for working or middle income folks, whether it be rental accommodation or more modestly priced apartments for sale. The draft plan and its provisions regarding housing accurately notes this problem, but presents a much too timid response to this situation. Ambleside in particular is a de facto inner city neighbourhood, and reserving it as such, after only slight modifications, will not deal with the problems we face now and in the future. The draft plan reserves most of Ambleside as single family. Single family homes in Ambleside are low density, and what is contributing to our population decline in West Van is this and as well not 'empty homes' but more 'unfinished homes'. In my block there are three constructions going on - two of them involve land changes that date back approximately 6 years ago. None show signs of completion of projects, so I suppose the work around for any 'empty homes' taxes that can be conceived is to continue the West Van pattern of perma-construction . All three of these lots once had people in them, now they are sites where the occasional trade shows to hammer a few nails, or dig with a backhoe. We need more land devoted to multifamily and greater Ambleside is the place to do this.</p>
2018/03/07 18:38	[REDACTED]	<p>I completely support the drive for densification and increased diversity in the housing stock, particularly aimed at addressing the 'missing middle'. I believe this to be the highest priority in the plan as it impacts so many other factors. I would support special zoning rules to encourage developers to support the densification strategy. By way of example, my neighbours are trying to sell two contingent lots with the idea that a developer can build three single family homes. A better use of these lots would be a townhouse development supporting densification, if it were allowed.</p> <p>I support Cypress Village development as this is the single greatest housing and economic development in the district. It offers a unique opportunity that will serve to promote and generate growth for the whole district.</p> <p>I consider the infill option a tactical action and not a substitute for more impactful townhouse/duplex/low and high rise development.</p> <p>Increasing housing around the Taylor way corridor will only serve to increase localized traffic issues hence I do not support that development. The caveat being if it were seniors orientated thereby have less traffic impact.</p>

2018/03/07 18:50	[REDACTED]	<p>I support the Cypress Village access proposal together with the developments of alternatives to bypass Lions Gate bridge and to cross the Capilano.</p> <p>I believe that more work is required re parking options to encourage public transport usage into Vancouver together with better parking options to reduce peak congestion in Ambleside.</p> <p>Notably WV has no ca4 sharing access and this together with electrification of vehicles needs to be encouraged.</p> <p>I find the commitment to bike paths inadequate. We need separated and dedicated bike paths, bike lanes are less effective. We need a hard target in terms of km of dedicated bike lanes to be delivered. Needless to say this will require strategic choices regarding parking options to free up space currently used for roadside parking. Increased cycle usage is also key for environment and health related benefits - look at the Danish model.</p>
2018/03/07 19:49	[REDACTED]	<p>Successful and vibrant economy is contingent on successful densification and improvements to parking. Existing businesses struggle hence making it difficult to develop further unless greater foot traffic can be attracted be it tourism, residents or diners merely stopping en route to/from whistler. Park Royal is a great draw and a hotel nearby would be a real asset. Currently there is only the motel options off Capilano Road. A WV hotel would be a real draw and viable alternative to downtown hotels.</p> <p>We have a great asset in Hollyburn Mountain and more development and support is required to make this a real draw both summer and winter, together with Cypress Village.</p> <p>I fell that real progress on the local economy will be a by product of success in other areas of the plan.</p>
2018/03/07 20:04	[REDACTED]	<p>I feel that strategic development of certain larger parks is required to support the economic plan. The intention being a tourist draw and for residents alike.</p> <p>A significant improvement to trail signage in upper lands is required, again this will encourage usage and support the development model. Hosting events is a way to boost the profile and awareness leading to more discovery and usage.</p> <p>I would encourage a replanting requirement to mitigate tree loss as a result of housing development.</p> <p>Building greater off road walkable connectivity between neighbourhoods would encourage less motor vehicle usage together with providing more varied short walk options other than the sea wall. Signage is required to support this interconnectivity. Where connectivity is issue for example MacDonald Creek below Inglewood creative solutions should be sought like elevated walkways.</p> <p>Needless to say I support preservation of our natural assets.</p>

2018/03/07 20:21	[REDACTED]	<p>I support the Social Well-Being plan but want to ensure that adequate provision of services reach deep into the community, for example a satellite library/seniors facility at the community centre at Gleneagles.</p> <p>I do feel we need to consider what public assets are missing or need upgrading. I think the track at WV secondary is a particularly important initiative. Also to seek to encourage new attractions to boost tourism e.g. high ropes course at Ambleside, mountain bike park at cypress as part of cypress village development. Well chosen assets will further support the economic model.</p> <p>I encourage development of multi-use space across the community.</p>
2018/03/07 21:19	[REDACTED]	<p>Day by day the young population of west van is getting less and less because there is no affordable housing . I therefore strongly support the plans the district has for rezoning and much higher density in our area that will provide affordable housing. we need more apartments, condos and townhouses as opposed to single family.</p>
2018/03/07 21:29	[REDACTED]	<p>I am currently living in the south of the border because I cannot find an affordable housing in or around the area where I grew up. one day I would like to return home and urge the district of West Van to create much more denser accomodation that is affordable and modern. I have reviewed the draft OCP and are in agreement with higher density in our area.</p>
2018/03/08 10:34	[REDACTED]	<p>Hello,</p> <p>My comment relates to the density that is being designated for the duplex zones. I would like to see a density of at least approximately at least 1 FSR for this zone. Anything less than this will result in little to no redevelopment whatsoever. The price of land is too high and the lot sizes are too small (most are +/- 4,000 sf) to make the numbers work.</p> <p>For example, the Ambleside zone. The lowest prices home that is currently available is \$2,188,000 with a lot size of 4,026 sf. That alone means that you are paying \$543/buildable square foot for land assuming 1 FSR. Even at 1 FSR, this will be extremely difficult to make this make sense given the rising costs of construction.</p> <p>Please ensure that these areas are appropriately densified to economically allow for redevelopment or don't include the areas in the OCP at all.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
2018/03/08 10:35	[REDACTED]	<p>As resident in West Vancouver, we STRONGLY support the OCP development proposal for Taylor Way - Anderson area. The house price in West Vancouver has increased dramatically and many people (including my family members) have difficult time looking for an affordable home that is close to where we live for support. Taylor way area is the perfect and convenient location to increase its density and provide more rental properties for elderly and families in need. In order to better serve as a community, I think densification needs to expand a little wider than just along Taylor Way strip but in my opinion include Eden pl and 8th St. We need more apartments in this location!</p>
2018/03/08 10:37	[REDACTED]	<p>Lots of people have and are leaving neighbourhood in West Vancouver because both young and old cannot afford the cost of housing, or there are not enough vacancies. I strongly support the densification of the area mentioned above and including all the neighbourhood.</p> <p>[REDACTED] would love to come and live in the neighbourhood familiar to them but they cannot afford to move. we need a lot more affordable housing . thank you.</p>

2018/03/08 10:39	[REDACTED]	<p>Many of West Van's apartment buildings are circa 1970's and 1980's. They are usually organized as strata corporations. Many buildings have dated amenities which are not used by residents. Owners argue that public facilities and "coached" wellness facilities (fitness clubs) are more fun and better. Hence amenity space in buildings are neglected, while at the same time, aging buildings are stressed to keep up with their capital projects, such as envelope repair, window replacement, parkade servicing etc.</p> <p>We think it is reasonable that FAR calculations be waived in an existing building if a strata can evidence underutilized space (like a party room or gym) is not required and can be re-purposed to a strata unit for sale. This would help capitalize the strata for the bigger projects, which they should declare they would undertake.</p> <p>The extra unit(s) would help with the housing requirements.</p>
2018/03/08 10:40	[REDACTED]	<p>Love the proposed OCP, excited to see it implemented and hoping it happens well before the target date.</p>
2018/03/08 10:41	[REDACTED]	<p>I have submitted a long commentary on the Draft OCP directly with specific comments about each of the categories. What I also need to add is my real sense that we do not have time to waste. We have indeed wasted too much of it already-with previous OCP which simply did not set specific targets/goals-and as such allowed our community to get into a "hurry up and wait " mode when it came to any change. This OCP does set targets/goals. I urge Council to not get caught up talking about process, for it's own sake-but focus on setting goals/delivery dates-and position our community to adjust so that we can begin to meet to set targets, rather than meet so that can avoid them.</p>
2018/03/08 11:29	[REDACTED]	<p>I am pleased to see that "Section 2.1.11 Support the small island character of Eagle Island by prohibiting attached or detached secondary suites (i.e. basement suites or coach houses)." has been included in the new draft OCP.</p> <p>"Small island character" is an excellent choice of wording to sum up a variety of issues that are peculiar to our neighborhood.</p>
2018/03/08 13:51	[REDACTED]	<p>I just wanted to say that I agree with</p> <p>Section 2.1.11 - Support the small island character of Eagle Island by prohibiting attached or detached secondary suites (i.e. basement suites or coach houses).</p> <p>Thank you very much!</p>
2018/03/08 14:22	[REDACTED]	<p>We [REDACTED] are strongly supportive of respecting the character and protecting the heritage values of this small island community. We are highly supportive of the proposed prohibition of secondary suites on Eagle Island as expressed in the draft Official Community Plan at 2.1.11:</p> <p>2.1.11 Support the small island character of Eagle Island by prohibiting attached or detached secondary suites (i.e. basement suites or coach houses).</p>
2018/03/08 17:50	[REDACTED]	<p>I heartedly support the statement in 2.1.11 to 'Support the small island character of Eagle Island by prohibiting attached or detached secondary suites (i.e. basement suites or coach houses).'</p>

2018/03/08 18:15	[REDACTED]	<p>I live [REDACTED] in West Vancouver and write with respect to "The Official Community Plan" draft. I wholeheartedly agree with and commend the planning department for the following inclusion in the draft plan:</p> <p>Section 2.1.11 - Support the small island character of Eagle Island by prohibiting attached or detached secondary suites (i.e. basement suites or coach houses).</p> <p>With the inclusion of section 2.1.11 in the Official Plan (without exception), hopefully our Island can once again return to a sense of normalcy and neighbourhood friendliness.</p> <p>Thank you, [REDACTED]</p>
	[REDACTED]	<p>RE: Official Community Plan Draft & Specifically Section 2.1.11</p> <p>Further to receiving and reviewing in detail a copy of the newly completed Official Community Draft Plan, I firstly wish to thank the City for the extensive amount of completed work and input. I have been advised the this draft will be presented to Mayor and Council later this spring.</p> <p>As a West Vancouver owner [REDACTED] I wish to express my full support to keep, in full as written, as part of the Official Community Plan, Section 2.1.11 that states " Support the small island character of Eagle Island by prohibiting attached or detached secondary suites (i.e. basement suites or coach houses)".</p> <p>There has been over 2 years of ongoing strife and uncertainty, concerning the above issue on Eagle Island. With the above noted inclusion being approved, it will allow Eagle Island residents to put this unpleasant issue behind us, and return our community to its previous state of happiness.</p> <p>I thank you for all your hard work, and look forward to approval of the Community Plan Draft. Yours truly, [REDACTED]</p>
2018/03/09 14:20	[REDACTED]	<p>i strongly SUPPORT the small island character of EAGLE ISLAND prohibiting coach houses and secondary suites as described in section 2.1.11 of the OCP draft. additionally, dock space for watercraft and vehicle parking is already stretched to the limit as are emergency health and fire services. previous assessments to the contrary failed to account for extreme tides and wind conditions and lack of navigable water to enlarge the docking facilities. i am a resident of [REDACTED]</p>
2018/03/10 9:36	[REDACTED]	<p>I am writing to record my support for the OCP: Part One document. I endorse the themes, directions and objectives detailed in the OCP draft. If we can plan, implement, manage and govern within the guidelines and "spirit" of the OCP, then we will ensure that the District of West Vancouver remains a viable, inclusive and healthy community into the future. Well done on the OCP consultation, preparation and reporting! Sincerely, [REDACTED]</p>



My general comment is that the current draft of the OCP is very good and I encourage council to adopt it soon and certainly before the next municipal election.

Below, I have provided a range of suggestions for each section of the plan

A) Housing and Neighbourhoods

In section 2.1.22, add the following bullet:

Changing land use patterns so that each neighbourhood has more complete services and walkable.

Add a new section 2.2.17

Ensure that there is good connectivity between Cypress Village and other parts of West-Vancouver through public transit, cycling and pedestrian paths.

B) Local Economy

Add two more bullet under 2.3.16

Energy supply innovations (eg. micro-hydro, solar arrays, in-building energy utilities)

Environmental initiatives that create jobs (eg. environmental education programs, eco-demonstrations, green infrastructure)

C) Transportation

Add a new section after 2.4.6

Expand cycling infrastructure (bike storage lockers, bike racks, bike parking areas, showers in public buildings)

Add section 2.4.25

Carefully monitor autonomous vehicle developments to ensure prompt adoption of this new technology once it achieves regulatory approvals.

Change the wording of 2.5.10 to clarify the word "reuse" and "Expand organics and food waste reduction through backyard and on-site composting, including finding local markets for the compost produced."

Change the wording of 2.5.11 to specifically address whole building deconstruction, which is now available in the lower mainland.

"Facilitate reductions in demolition waste through source separation and diversion, including whole building deconstruction."

Expand the wording in 2.5.18 to read

"Lead by example by actively pursuing water conservation, energy conservation, waste reduction and recycling within civic facilities."

Clarify in 2.5.19 that Corporate energy emissions are those that come from District facilities so as to reduce confusion with 2.6.18 which refers to community wide emissions and has a different target.

E) Social Well-Being

At the beginning of the section change "Supporting Demographic Diversity" to "Supporting Demographic and Cultural Inclusion", which is more what you are striving for.

In this first section, there is no mention of Indigenous Peoples and that West Vancouver should strive to collaborate with First Nations in meaningful ways (not just a welcome at the beginning of an event).

		<p>Add a new section 2.9.14 Strive to address the community health and well-being issues raised in the Vital Signs report, which is prepared every two years by the West Vancouver Community Foundation.</p>
2018/03/10 21:01	[REDACTED]	<p>Please note that in light of the development activity along Taylor way and that has occurred in the form of senior's housing and the large Evelyn drive projects and recent comments by the district on the OCP, I support densification along the Taylor Way corridor but suggest that you expand the corridor of densification to consider areas west of Taylor Way – below 8th Avenue, out to include all of Eden place and along Anderson Crescent particularly as this whole area's topographical layout – (bowl-shape and on a hill) will allow for a variety of housing. As well if a larger area is secured, rather than a narrower corridor, you most likely be able to provide for a greater variety of housing, and a much more attractive project. Several years ago our family inquired about the possibility of putting up two townhouse on ours property to replace our large single family home. We would have lived in one townhouse and rented the other to one of our daughters. Living close to the new care home we figured this would have been possible – but it never happened and in turn, both our daughter's moved out to North Van. The district needs to develop more variety of housing for seniors like us but also for younger families and singles that may still wish to stay in district and that may work in West Vancouver. It may mean having more rentals and smaller condo's both which are in short supply in West Vancouver.</p>
2018/03/10 21:03	[REDACTED]	<p>Thank you for allowing me to make comments on the proposed development activity in West Vancouver. Both our kids are university educated and well-employed and would have loved to live in West Vancouver where they grew up. However, like many of their friends they had to move to North Vancouver not only because housing was cheaper but also because the district has very little in the way of rentals or smaller condominium space for them to consider. So I am hoping that the district, in light of its recent statements on the OCP – will actually expand the potential zoning on Taylor way, to create more than a narrow corridor of development, but also consider the whole area below 8th street and west of Taylor Way to include that natural enclave which is bound on the west by Anderson Crescent and which includes all of Eden Place. This whole area is naturally separated from surrounding homes and would be a good place to build a variety of housing including rental, multifamily and possibly some townhouses. For sure this variety of housing close to park Royal would be appreciated by owners and renters alike and soon to be seniors like us.</p>

2018/03/10 22:48	[REDACTED]	Given the serious population problem in West Vancouver, I support the idea of increase the density in Taylor Way corridor. Instead of mid-density, it shall be high-density. Isolated by Sentinel Hill, the high-rise buildings won't affect the appearance of West Van in general. And Taylor Way (#99) itself can absorb the traffic caused by increased population in corridor.
2018/03/11 3:52	[REDACTED]	According the draft OCP, I totally support the Taylor Way Corridor. I totally agreed we need more condo apartments in West Vancouver. I want the city allow to build more high density apartments. Then, more people can afford to live in West Vancouver. West Vancouver is a beautiful city and also it have many good public schools. Therefore, if the city allow to build more apartments, I believe more people will move to West Vancouver. According to the West Vancouver school board, many students studied in West Vancouver are coming from North Vancouver. So, high density apartments is needed. I am highly expecting Taylor Way Corridor can become true. I wish Taylor Way Corridor as same as Cambie Corridor in Vancouver in one day. Thank you so much.
2018/03/11 9:18	[REDACTED]	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide my comments and feedback on the proposed development activities in West Vancouver. I grew up in West Van, and now live in North Van, mostly due to the price and lack of variety of housing type in West Van. My husband and I are both graduate-school educated and well-employed professionals with a young family and would have loved to call West Van our home.</p> <p>Our generation is especially focused on contributing to local businesses, and we do so by living close to the businesses we support. As such, housing within walking distance of amenities (Park Royal and Ambleside Beach) would be ideal. It pains me to see that, from my perspective, West Vancouver is losing its appeal because of the lack of variety in housing types, which has in turn also led to a lack of socio-economic diversity, which I believe helps maintain the character of the district. I believe this even contributes to the declining trend in single family housing costs, as I have heard numerous people (who could afford a home in West Van), say they are going to put their money in North Van instead because it is more diverse and accessible to future generations because of variety of housing, including rentals.</p> <p>With all this said, I strongly support expanding the potential zoning on Taylor way, to include Anderson Cres. and Eden Place. The area is beautiful and provides a variety of view potential (with the varying grades and hills) and is also convenient, and most importantly, well-suited to multifamily housing.</p>
2018/03/11 9:40	[REDACTED]	I support the OCP revision, particularly the Taylor Way corridor plan. West Vancouver is in desperate need to bring younger families to the communities. The last 10+ years has created a calamity for West Vancouver's viability and future. We need to look at how we can reinvigorate the community, and young families are the missing link in the community now. We need adults who live here year-round and work in the local economy and can contribute financially to local businesses (living closer also decreasing the traffic gridlock that is so apparent as people commute to the North Shore in the mornings, and off the North Shore in the afternoons) as well as support services. As well, we need to have a solid stable population of younger people, including school age children. We have a large percentage of people who live outside of West Vancouver who come to West Vancouver School District and go the West Vancouver Community Centre. This can shift in a short period; we cannot rely on that. We need to encourage young families to settle in West Vancouver, and we do need to look at how to do so. Encourage non-single family housing options in areas

		like around schools, transport areas like Taylor Way, services and commercial areas. Also really focus on ensuring that housing will be accessible and lived in by families, and not just opportunities for speculators or investors to be left vacant or underoccupied.
2018/03/11 13:15	[REDACTED]	<p>I am in my [REDACTED] year of residence in West Vancouver. Things are changing and new plans being made. I am writing to support these concepts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Densification of the Taylor Way corridor. - Extension of the western boundary of the densification along Andersen Cres. to include Eden Place and 8th St. - I support plans to increase a broad range of new housing opportunities, including affordable rental.
2018/03/11 13:20	[REDACTED]	<p>I am a resident of [REDACTED] and agree with the section of the OCP below:</p> <p>Section 2.1.11 - Support the small island character of Eagle Island by prohibiting attached or detached secondary suites (i.e. basement suites or coach houses).</p>
2018/03/11 13:26	[REDACTED]	<p>I am a resident of [REDACTED] and in agreement with Section 2.1.11 - Support the small island character of Eagle Island by prohibiting attached or detached secondary suites (i.e. basement suites or coach houses).</p>
2018/03/11 13:27	[REDACTED]	<p>I just wanted to put my full support behind section 2.1.11 in not allowing coach houses or secondary suites on Eagle Island. I fully support densification where it makes sense. But Eagle Island is the least conducive area to further densification. The infrastructure, sewer, water pressure, parking, walk score, barge and rowboat space just can't handle more single family dwellings.</p> <p>So much of staff and council's precious time and money has been spent hearing about this issue and with this section's inclusion in the OCP, no more time or public money has to be thrown away by entertaining repeat applications.</p> <p>Thank you for your hard work on the OCP.</p>
2018/03/11 14:41	[REDACTED]	<p>I work in West Vancouver and my family own a property [REDACTED]</p> <p>I support Section 2.1.11 - Support the small island character of Eagle Island by prohibiting attached or detached secondary suites (i.e. basement suites or coach houses).</p> <p>Thanks so much,</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>

2018/03/11 14:52		<p>and support that the land use not change as there are issues around parking and barge access. I support coach houses but only when they do not impact on a neighbourhood around access. We have our own dock but even then there are supposed to be extra dock space incase the weather is bad and we cannot access our docks. That means there has to be 9 extra spaces on the communal dock, which there are not, at present. Therefore we cannot increase the island density. If we were granted extra dock space and parking space I would support a land use change.</p> <p>With thanks</p>
2018/03/12 0:07		I am against rezoning.
2018/03/12 8:06		I hope the distric would rezone more area to duplex and townhouses to make the housing pricing more affordable.
2018/03/12 8:08		No more Monster Houses!
2018/03/12 8:09		No more Monster Houses!
2018/03/12 8:10		No more Monster Houses!
2018/03/12 8:10		No more Monster Houses!
2018/03/12 8:40		Protect the west Vancouver living environment is important
2018/03/12 10:02		<p>I have the concern about the rezoning area. I think the rezoning area should be considered seriously. In the very limited area to build high density condo or high building is acceptable(Near by Park Royal, Taylor way). But in a large area to build duplex or triplex it will impact the character of neighbourhood definitely. Is there will be a city we want to live any longer? If only put the plan on house, city don't have the plan on transportation, traffic road, commercial facilities, how can be the city will be?</p> <p>I don't agree with the rezoning plan!</p>
2018/03/12 11:02		<p>West Vancouver is the most desired high-end community in BC, as a residence, we don't want our community to be expanded to a more-populated community with more people, more traffic, small house, rental houses etc.</p> <p>The change of building forms and neighborhood character do not help with economy, but will bring more criminal and safety concern.</p> <p>I strongly against the change of building forms and neighborhood character.</p>
2018/03/12 11:17		I have concerns about the preservation of Whyte Lake and Nelson Canyon Park areas. From the Map on page three of the "Official Community Plan Part Two" it looks like this area is for "future neighborhoods" . I find the Protection Guidelines UL8 on pg 86 to be very vague.
2018/03/12 11:53		I have carefully read your master plan and want to congratulate you on a very complete survey of resources and what can be done to improve the lives of those living here. I agree 100% on your plans. Preserving what we have and providing more amenities (cheaper housing for younger workers well as the generation of sons and daughters growing up here) are so

		important for the continuation of preserving this idyllic community. Extending the ease of availability to shopping areas is important too.
2018/03/12 12:46		The local infrastructure is far behind to meet the requirements for increasing population. The burden of public transport is predictable. People will be struggling with the local traffic everyday in West Vancouver. Also the local education system will face a huge test. I definitely say no with this plan!
2018/03/12 12:52		Better transit system is most important, then think about increasing population and apartment!
2018/03/12 13:33		<p>Official Community Plans of the past and recent dialogue indicate that the majority of West Vancouverites wish to conserve & protect the District's forest landscapes. There is also indication that the majority of residents favour thoughtful development which honours the natural landscape both in its ecological structure and function and housing options which will attract young families and allow older residents to stay in the community. I support these core ideas and fully support higher densities being achieved by a variety of housing options—infill; coach houses; condos & lowrise towers (6–8 stories) B.P.P. plans for Cypress Village are well thought out and they have provided many opportunities for full community engagement.</p> <p>- My concerns about W. Van's future lie with transportation issues. I feel very strongly that the District (along with the communities of Squamish and Lions Bay) should advocate for the installation of a commute train. Prior to CN purchasing CN Rail, the tracks running through W. Van services a passenger trail from N. Van—>Prince George. A daily commute train would relieve tremendous pressures of gridlock now seen on a daily basis on the North Shore.</p> <p>- Any expansion in residential housing in West Van will add to this paralyzing congestion.</p> <p>- I also think that the Mayor & Council should work toward higher funding for the maintenance of W. Van's natural parks in order to honour environmental stewardship policies & laws in place.</p>
2018/03/12 13:40		<p>Thank you for asking for opinions of people who actually live in West Van. I have a few points.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We live in the British Properties which is sort of a ghost town now—you can tell the empty houses are the ones that have ALL the lights come on at a specific time and completely overgrown gardens with weeds sprouting out of driveways that haven't been driven on in years. This is demoralizing and destroys neighbourhoods along with feelings of safety. 2. There is a lot of talk about "affordable housing" but that house is out of the barn and has probably died of old age. Specifically I am referring to A. Cressey—only for the super rich and B. Grosvenor on Bellevue—only for the super-rich. What a joke. 3. There is complete disregard for people who choose to live/stay in their own houses—views are blocked, huge towering homes built beside them, i.e. [REDACTED] monster box [REDACTED] What about the people who live beside/near these homes? Who cares? Nobody. 4. Environmental footprint of large homes. I wonder why I wash out tuna fish cans for recycling when my "neighbour" is building [REDACTED] home nobody will ever live in.

		Council seems to do a lot of handwringing but always saves in to developers.
2018/03/12 13:46		<p>*Support for plan - "It's amazing." -->highlighting a few things below:</p> <p>CAR SHARING (lack of same) LACK OF HOTELS (boutique or ?) LACK OF MARINA (WHERE SAILING CLUB IS) LACK OF FERRY (DOWNTOWN)</p>
2018/03/12 13:49		<p>Finally the mayor and councillor are facing the housing shortage in West Van. I live [REDACTED] with my parents [REDACTED]. I wanted to move out, but doesn't make a lot of economic sense and affordability to do so in West Van. So have moved to Vancouver East side [REDACTED]. If there are apartments or townhouses, I will definitely move back closer to home.</p> <p>I have alot of friends in the same boat as I am.</p>
2018/03/12 13:51		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - improve amenity of bus shelters. buses should run on-time. - improve visibility & safety of cross-walks. VERY dangerous now, see Marine/26th/27th etc. I was almost run over: sucks. - hiking corridors from sea walk up to Cypress road-currently lack of connector trails (e.g. Marr Creek down to Marine) - expand park space through urban area. improve fencing of trails at Lighthouse Park. - BAN salting of roads - Pedestrian safety along Marine Parade needs to be a priority. It is currently VERY VERY VERY dangerous—traffic is speeding, crosswalks are poorly marked, no warning to watch for foot traffic. Please fix this before more people get run over. <p>-Plan looks good but I worry about lack of parks within urban core, and affordability of Cypress Village.</p>
2018/03/12 14:01		<p>To encourage the construction of more stratas, rental apartments, lane housing and houses in limited areas will simply expand the number of people wishing to commute to Vancouver and other municipalities and consequently the traffic, be it by bus or car, will expand and the desireability of living in those areas will diminish for most people.</p> <p>Do you not think that to increase the number of people commuting for work, shopping or play is exactly what we do not need?</p> <p>Consider the infintesimal likelihood of another access to Vancouver and</p>

	<p>other municipalities being constructed in the lifetimes of any one of us. Vancouver has made it abundantly clear that they will not permit the construction of any additional road, tunnel or any other practical form of passage through that city.</p> <p>Please consider what you are proposing. So long as you remain in West Vancouver it is reasonably easy to shop, dine and enjoy life. But bear in mind that not everyone can stay in West Van and must commute. Don't make commuting more difficult.</p> <p>I do understand that most of our children do not have the money to reside here but to think to construct more and more crowded residences which might allow them to live here is insane.</p> <p>Your proposal of constructing more places to live in Ambleside Centre and other parts of West Van will make living here less attractive and less desirable and likely still expensive.</p> <p>Please consider how present residents feel.</p> <p>Please wake up!</p>
2018/03/12 14:18	<p>Some densification & more affordable housing is badly needed in West Vancouver. This could be achieved by changing by laws & allowing larger properties to be subdivided. I do believe though that we should preserve the village character of our waterfront. Development should be sensitive to the present low density, village feel of Ambleside & Dundarave.</p> <p>We do not need more development (which is unaffordable to all but the very wealthy) similar to the oversized development currently under construction at 14th and Marine!</p> <p>Future development should be designed to aid the local population to find affordable accommodation, not just line the pockets of developers & allows overseas buyers to speculate & park their millions in our real estate market!</p> <p>Thanks for giving the opportunity to express the above opinions.</p> <p>████████████████████</p>

2018/03/12 14:21

Very comprehensive draft report, taking into consideration the interconnectedness of the themes.

Some small notes—on the commercial areas with marines, you may need to accommodate light industrial to support the businesses to boating that would be a key element to a thriving marina industry -> in West Van.

When doing the Ambleside TC lap, you may wish to give some thought as to how to plan for an orderly & reasonable re-fresh/renewal of the high rise apartment stock (whether rental or owned by strata). With the age of some buildings, it makes sense to "blow them up" and rebuild. Rebuilds will have to be much higher than existing to be economically feasible. The risks of capping at existing height or lower are: 1) Nothing gets done --> no hot new units; 2) Residents get stuck in decrepit buildings that no one will fix or bring up to standad.

To encourage development in the key areas (Ambleside Town Centre, Taylor Way, Marine Dr. H. Bay) you may wich to consider allowing for pre-zoning and ease of land assemblies.

To encourage lower GHG emitting dwellings, you could consider giving an annual tax break on dwellings that are proven to be low or nil net emitters. This in perpetuity, and in addition to a break on permit fees at the time of construction.

Allow for pre-fab modular construction (via permitting) to minimize disruption in neighbourhoods during building process.

2018/03/12 14:38

THERE IS ONE AMBULANCE IN WEST VANCOUVER (STATION 255 AT 1542 FULTON AVE). THIS AMBULANCE IS PARKED IN AN OPEN-SIDED CARPORT — SEE ATTACHED ARTICLES FROM NORTH SHORES NEWS — 21/8/2013 & 28/3/2014.

THERE ARE TWO AMBULANCES IN NORTH VANCOUVER STATIONED UNDER "ATE HOPE CENTRE AT LIONS GATE HOSPITAL — SEE ATTACHED ARTICLE FROM NORTH SHORE NEWS — 5 JUNE 2015

PLEASE CONSIDER MAKING PROVISION FOR AN IMPROVED STATION FOR OUR ONLY AMBULANCE IN THE EXISTING FIRE STATION AT 760 16TH STREET — NEXT TO STATION 255.

i AM ONE OF OVER [REDACTED] THERE IS NO RESIDENT CARETAKER. AMBULANCE CREWS ARRIVING IN THE EVENING RELY ON THE W.V.F.D. TO GIVE ACCESS TO ALL BUILDINGS. THERE IS ONE EMPLOYEE AT NIGHT TO PROVIDE ACCESS TO THE MANOR, BUT ONLY FOR ASSISTED LIVING RESIDENTS.

FIRE CREWS HAVE ACCESS TO LOCK BOXES REQUIRED BY BC BUILDING CODE. THERE IS OBVIOUS NEED FOR A SIMIAR LOCK BOX FOR AMBULANCE CREWS & OPERATES BY PUSHING BUTTONS. (I ASSUME AMBULANCE COMPUTERS COULD STORE THIS INFORMATION).

[REDACTED]

2018/03/12 14:45	<p>I love the zoning for separate titles in the Ambleside [redacted] I would love to redevelop my home into strata sip [intelligible] titles duplex and coach house –it would allow me to [intelligible] to my kids & still live in the same neighbourhood. Great idea. City must make it easy for us to do this. Thank you!!</p> <p>Add more vibrancy to neighbourhood–Ambleside/Dundarave zoning–spot zoning on corner key locations on 15th/11th/12th commercial below multifamily above or on corner grocery store, coffee shop, wine bar, love to see this.</p> <p>Please please make re-zoning cheaper & standardized & helpful homeplanners with creative ideas for separate title coach houses & budgets for building. Simplified development creates less stress & less worry and less mistakes in a shorter need time frame:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - commercial zoning (spot) panel - design panel - zone panel -creative development panel (coach house/triplex/duplex ideas)
2018/03/12 14:49	<p>Page 16 - Respecting character and protecting heritage:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Vague and general guidelines -Suggest more specific objectives: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Expedite MAC and Community involvement 2. Fast track development permits for retaining heritage properties 3. Tax (property) exemptions in heritage properties --> eg: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -tax exemptions in heritage portion of property if using density bonds or other development incentives - waive development permit fees for heritage owners who contemplate retaining structure(s) -waive or refund municipal fees for retaining heritage
2018/03/12 17:56	<p>Good afternoon, my officers,</p> <p>I just noticed that our OCP like that today. I never been reached before about our OCP from city. Generally the new OCP will develop the density of whole area, but there is no one main traffic plan to solve our terrible situation. I really doubt who made this plan, do they live in WV, or do our OCP members live in WV?</p> <p>As a local resident, I totally agree to build more affordable homes for young people or local people, but most important is that we should have a good plan to solve our current bad traffic issues first. We can not suffocate at road every day, and we can not absorb more people to live in terrible crowded traffic city.</p> <p>So please add main traffic plan to the OCP first.</p> <p>Very appreciate it if could get any feedback from OCP committee</p> <p>[redacted]</p>

<p>2018/03/12 21:09</p>	<p>[REDACTED]</p>	<p>I just want to take this opportunity to thank the district for taking the initiative and doing the right thing by asking the residents of West Vancouver what they want to see for the next 20 years in the community.</p> <p>I know there has been alot of skeptical criticism that nothing will ever be built because West Vancouverites has always been known for anti-developement. Senior's land..... [REDACTED] land owner that doesn't want their view to be blocked or their nice privacy set backs to be at least 20 meters away from their neighbours. Not willing to co-operate and do land assemblies to create more housing supply that's needed to support the community. I think If we can learn from other municipalities's mistakes and sucess. The effort of this OCP will not be a great success, but also a model for other municipalities who's thinking of conducting OCP to follow.</p> <p>I grew up in West Van, [REDACTED] West Van is home to me, but unfortunately with school and job. I recently moved to Vancouver. Ever since I moved to East Vancovuer, [REDACTED] I am impressed by the OCP that the city of Vancouver initiated. They went from single houses to townhouse, row house and low rise apartments on quiet residential neighbourhoods. I see more options suitable for differnt needs whether young professionals or families looking for smaller sizes, but not necessary 1 bedroom apartments. It's impossilbe for young families or professionals to afford single houses or duplex. But with Townhouse, Row house offers enough indoor room and also some outdoor space at a more affordable price. It's just impossible to feed a family plus a full-time gardener to take care of the 10,000sf lot!</p> <p>We are losing talents and younger generation to other municipalities. I think if West Van can offer the same type of housing choices Vancouver does, who would want to move away from home. I would move back in a heart beat!</p> <p>Thank you very much for taking the time.</p>
<p>2018/03/13 2:08</p>	<p>[REDACTED]</p>	<p>STREET AND SIDEWALK LIGHTING</p> <p>Surprisingly, this topic has NOT been discussed or addressed.</p> <p>Lighting is a very important aspect of planning our environment whether it's our home or our community or city.</p> <p>Light pollution is a source of concern for cities around the world. When planning the future of a city, community, or municipality, it is important to consider how lighting affects residents, wildlife, and the environment.</p> <p>It is important that we avoid light pollution and install non-light-polluting sidewalk lamps and street lamps.</p> <p>Light pollution is caused when city sidewalk and street lamps are unshaded and allow light to radiate 360° into the environment around the source.</p> <p>We plan our home lighting, and we spend money to install the right kind of lighting for specific situations. Basically, in our homes, we want the two kinds of lighting available to us in nature via daylight (light) and night (nearly dark):</p> <p>1) USEFUL - bright lighting, to perform various activities. This is the purpose of daylight.</p>

2) RELAXING - low lighting, to allow us to relax in our environment without disturbing our circadian rhythm (our internal clock). This is the purpose of pre-darkness.

So why would we not spend as much care and consideration planning the lighting in our communities and cities?

As human beings, we need and want to see the stars. And we need darkness to sleep.

Plants and animals depend on Earth's daily cycle of light and dark rhythm to govern life-sustaining behaviors such as reproduction, nourishment, sleep and protection from predators.

Scientific evidence suggests that artificial light at night has negative and deadly effects on many creatures including amphibians, birds, mammals, insects and plants.

PLEASE, PLEASE, PLEASE. I AM REQUESTING THAT A NEW CATEGORY BE CREATED FOR LIGHTING.

We want city sidewalk and street lighting that does NOT create light pollution.

We want all city sidewalk lamp standards to have shades that direct the light downward.

You can read more on darksky.org.

It's time that West Vancouver city hall planners dragged themselves into 2018 and learned from more enlightened city planners and scientists and environmentalists around the world. GET WITH IT.

I/WE WANT INCLUDED IN THE OCP:

- NO MORE LIGHT POLLUTION.


- ONLY NON-LIGHT-POLLUTION STYLE LAMP STANDARDS TO BE USED FOR SIDEWALKS AND STREET LIGHTING IN WEST VANCOUVER.

- NEW EMPLOYEES HIRED/OLD EMPLOYEES FIRED IF THEY CANNOT GET UP-TO-DATE ON LIGHT POLLUTION.

West Vancouver city hall does not care about light pollution. The same employees have made the same poor choices in lighting for over two decades. That's as far back as I can remember although I have lived in West Vancouver since 1952.

Not once in decades has city hall ever talked about the issue of light pollution.

The environmental strategy of West Vancouver's city hall is all smoke and mirrors. It only cares about fish. It doesn't care about other wildlife and birds, and it most certainly doesn't care about the environment its residents have to

		<p>live in. If West Vancouver city hall cared about the environment, it wouldn't fill it with street and sidewalk lighting that radiates light in 360°, creating enough glare to blind pedestrians, night-flight birds, drivers, and residents trying to enjoy the natural nighttime environment and the privacy of their homes.</p> <p>I WANT:</p> <p>NO LIGHT POLLUTION.</p> <p>NEW RULES ON WHAT SPECIFIC TYPES OF NON-LIGHT-POLLUTING STANDARDS CAN BE USED FOR SIDEWALK AND STREET LIGHTING.</p> <p>Do I make myself clear?</p>
<p>2018/03/13 2:23</p>		<p>I want a working group on sidewalk and street lighting.</p> <p>I want sidewalk and street lighting that does NOT create light pollution.</p> <p>Light pollution is created by light standards that allow light to radiate 360° degrees into the sky and environment.</p> <p>Light pollution is known to have negative affects on wildlife and human beings.</p> <p>See darksky.org for the best, most up-to-date information on light pollution and how to reduce it. LEARN ABOUT IT.</p> <p>I want shaded sidewalk and street lamp standards that direct light downwards, so it doesn't create light pollution and glare. Glare can cause traffic accidents.</p> <p>West Vancouver is an environmental nightmare when it comes to street and sidewalk lighting.</p> <p>Do we want Marine Drive to resemble the Las Vegas strip at night? No resident wants that. Yet, West Vancouver's employees in charge of street and sidewalk lighting have - FOR DECADES - chosen and installed the worst kind of light polluting lamp standards along West Vancouver's Ambleside waterfront, ruining a nighttime experience for pedestrians. These employees should be fired immediately and replaced with more environmentally intelligent and progressive individuals. I am not kidding. Over the years, I have made complaints about their lighting choices but my intelligence and knowledge was dismissed and these individuals were never fired. As a result, they have spent taxpayers' money on creating light pollution. They know no shame.</p> <p>I, for one, am sick of it.</p> <p>So, i request that you CREATE a working group to implement and choose NON-light-polluting alternatives to the polluting street and sidewalk lighting that West Vancouver currently has installed - especially along and close to the waterfront. Lighting that invites late-night strolls instead of walking under a glare. Lighting that doesn't pollute and harm wildlife. it's their environment too.</p>

2018/03/13 7:54	[REDACTED]	Re 2.7 please add: hire/employ/retain well trained (in plant ID, pruning etc)/highly qualified staff in 'Valuable Parks on a permanent basis to ensure the District's parks and Open Spaces', trails are maintained and cared for with the values listed in 2.7.1.
2018/03/13 8:11	[REDACTED]	<p>I am against monster homes in general but especially when it affects the character of a neighbourhood and totally disregards the beautiful natural landscape features (e.g. granite rock outcrops, mature trees etc). I hope that 2.1.8. will help address this.</p> <p>The tasteful renovation [REDACTED] with subdivision and new house, plus coach house then thoughtful landscaping plus retention of interesting mature trees is an example of good infill while keeping a lovely, maybe not Heritage status, home but a great oldie. Lets keep this builder/developer doing good work in West Van.</p>
2018/03/13 8:31	[REDACTED]	<p>2.6.2 Mitigate on and off-site environmental impacts... by requiring orange fencing to be placed along the property line that borders a natural or otherwise park, but especially a NATURAL PARK, to prevent damage to the natural park DURING CONSTRUCTION. This would stop excavating equipment, trucks etc from either knowingly or unknowingly driving into parks and damaging the natural fauna that is so important to our ecosystem.</p> <p>The District is full of these natural vegetated areas that various Volunteer groups are trying to maintain by getting rid of invasive species etc but to the uneducated can look like unsightly or like a wasteland when in fact they are valuable habitats for our native birds and animals. This understanding of the importance of natural parks/areas will come with education, hopefully.</p>
2018/03/13 8:48	[REDACTED]	I am not in favour of this OCP and increasing density in specific neighbourhoods. I think there is already a correction happening in the local market that looks like it could lead to more accessibility for young families if prices keep trending down. Either way, your projection of increasing the population dramatically here which has remained fairly steady for the last 50 years is not something I favour. It will invariably change West Van for the worse to put more people in here.
2018/03/13 9:09	[REDACTED]	I fully support densifying Marine Drive Corridor along the transit line. In order to encourage people taking public transit instead of driving to downtown Vancouver, I suggest city should mandate builder/developer to provide yearly free bus riding pass to residents/household who will be moving to newly built residential multi-units in West Vancouver. I believe some of Toronto high rise buildings are doing that now.
2018/03/13 9:45	[REDACTED]	<p>[REDACTED] I own a home at [REDACTED].</p> <p>We are absolutely in favour of Section 2.1.11 of the Official Community Plan which supports the small island character of Eagle Island by prohibiting attached or detached secondary suites.</p> <p>We absolutely do NOT want coach houses on Eagle Island.</p>
2018/03/13 13:50	[REDACTED]	<p>Dear Planners,</p> <p>After reviewing the Draft OCP, I shared the concerns that I have heard from many other residents in our city and in our neighbourhood. The concerns and questions we have are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Do we really want to see our heritage house being torn down that we become a town without history at all? This is specifically for the Implement the Marine Drive Local Area Plan, the Amberside Rezoning, the Change of Building Forms and the Significant Change of Neighbourhood in the OCP. 2) Do we really expect one day we wake up and find a different duplex, triplex, townhouse, coach house constructed in our single house neighbour lot?

		<p>3) Do we really desire more people from elsewhere coming to live and visit our town, causing more congestions on Marine Drive, Taylor Way, Lines Gate Bridge and Highway 1? Although it is important to develop our economy, do we have a plan, vision to solve this problem above? The traffic in West Vancouver is probably the WORST in Great Vancouver Area with a only THREE LANE Lions Gate Bridge to the South. The whole north shore is lack of a big picture for the transportation plan!!!!!!</p> <p>4) Increasing the resident, and affordable houses and having a thriving economy is crucial and good for everyone in our city, but without a full transportation plan, increasing people purely means creating more congestion and produce more green gas and pollution in the North Shore! This is absolutely not for THE BEST INTEREST of Our residents in West Vancouver.</p>
2018/03/13 14:40		<p>I am impressed with the plan. A major omission however is no mention of measures to protect against the risk of major fires given that West Vancouver is surrounded by forested land. In addition the rules around the removal or pruning of trees both on private and public land are so restrictive that they significantly increase the risk of fire, and damage to housing through trees being too close to residential structures and being blown down by the wind.</p> <p>I recognize that West Vancouver residents enjoy the presence of trees, however since we are surrounded by natural forest I feel the rules regarding the removal of trees in residential areas are too restrictive.</p>
2018/03/13 17:01		<p>I feel that high rise apartments will have a negative impact on the neighbourhoods of west Vancouver as they not only block our beautiful views of the ocean and city but they would make our community feel like a city in itself. One of the reasons that my family loves to live here is for the peaceful surroundings. Small condominiums are acceptable alternatives to housing needs.</p>
2018/03/14 8:23		<p>Hello,</p> <p>My family owns a lovely home [REDACTED] in West Vancouver. It is a close knit and wonderful little community where the majority of the neighbours all know each other, spend time together, and support one another.</p> <p>I fully support section 2.1.11 of the draft Official Community Plan which prohibits attached or detached secondary suites (i.e. basement suites or coach houses). The Island is at capacity and simply does not have the car parking, barge parking or necessary infrastructure to support more residences.</p>
2018/03/14 9:53		<p>I would like to voice my support in the densification along Taylor Way Corridor and would like to express interest to increase the boundary west of Taylor Way along Anderson Crescent inclusive of Eden Place and 8th St. [REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED] 8th street [REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED] included within the boundary [REDACTED]</p> <p>We believe it can also address many issues which West Vancouver faces such as the alarming diminishing population and affordability and encourage multi family home and condo development with additional units in order to</p>

	<p>achieve affordable prices through smaller units which will enable younger generations to enter the market and engage in and develop the community as a whole. [REDACTED] I am concerned about the affordability in West Vancouver as all house are very big and their only chance to stay in West Vancouver is through more multifamily and smaller units.</p> <p>[REDACTED] [REDACTED] as one large parcel we can allocate other concerns such as rental dwellings which will enable my children and the local work force to not have to live far away due to lack of inventory and affordability and be able to live in the community which they are providing services in.</p>
<p>2018/03/14 9:56</p>	<p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>I would like to voice my support in the densification along Taylor Way Corridor and would like to express interest to increase the boundary west of Taylor Way along Anderson Crescent inclusive of Eden Place and 8th St. [REDACTED] 8th street [REDACTED] included within the boundary [REDACTED]</p> <p>We believe it can also address many issues which West Vancouver faces such as the alarming diminishing population and affordability and encourage multi family home and condo development with additional units in order to achieve affordable prices through smaller units which will enable younger generations to enter the market and engage in and develop the community as a whole. I have two children and I am concerned about the affordability in West Vancouver as all house are very big and their only chance to stay in West Vancouver is through more multifamily and smaller units.</p> <p>Also with my neighbours we believe as one large parcel we can allocate other concerns such as rental dwellings which will enable my children and the local work force to not have to live far away due to lack of inventory and affordability and be able to live in the community which they are providing services in.</p> <p>I am concerned because age group in West Vancouver very high and not enough young people like my children because of lack of multifamily supply, rentals, and affordability.</p>
<p>2018/03/14 10:30</p>	<p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>"Support the small island character of Eagle Island by prohibiting attached or detached secondary suites (i.e. basement suites or coach houses)."</p> <p>Dear Sirs, Thank you for all the work you have done on the Official Community Plan. I am fortunate to be a resident of Eagle Island and I would like to express my desire to preserve the character of this island. I believe that both attached and unattached secondary suites would have an enormous detrimental effect on the character of Eagle Island, which means I am expressing my support for Section 2.1.11 on OCP.</p> <p>[REDACTED] [REDACTED]</p>

2018/03/14 10:37	[REDACTED]	<p>"Support the small island character of Eagle Island by prohibiting attached or detached secondary suites (i.e. basement suites or coach houses)."</p> <p>To Whom It May Concern,</p> <p>Thank you for all your hard work on OCP. I have lived on Eagle Island for [REDACTED] and have seen many changes. Some good, some I would politely call progress. Something of great concern would be the addition of attached or unattached secondary suites. I believe this would change the character and most particularly the culture of Eagle Island. Therefore, I strongly support Section 2.1.11 of OCP.</p> <p>Sincerely, [REDACTED]</p>
2018/03/14 12:33	[REDACTED]	<p>Of all the categories included in OFC, Parks & Recreation is the category I feel I am most able to assess and respond to, [REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED] The OCP includes all the information and recommendations I would make regarding Parks & Environment. I trust that DWV Mayor & Council, present & future, will act on these recommendations.</p> <p>I have lived and/or worked in West Vancouver [REDACTED], and have seen many changes in our community, some good; some not so good. My hope is, that fifty years from now, the cabin community on Hollyburn Ridge will continue to exist and that the trail system on Hollyburn will remain much as it is today. Many photos and some videos of the trail system may be found on the Hollyburn Heritage Society website (www.hollyburnheritage.ca) under "Geography".</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 06. Hollyburn Ridge Lakes (Photos) 07. West Lake (Videos) 08. Blue Gentian Lake (Videos) 09. Hollyburn Ridge Creeks (Videos) 10. Natural Historians at Work on the Brothers Creek Trail (July 2013 - Photos & Video) 11. Old Growth Conservancy on Hollyburn Ridge (Photos)
2018/03/14 13:32	[REDACTED]	<p>Thank you for considering my perspectives on development in West Vancouver. I grew up in West Vancouver [REDACTED]. How privileged was I to be able to live near amenities - both a natural and commercial. Unfortunately, when it came [REDACTED] to start our family, we knew we would not be able to live in my home community. There were simply no affordable options. [REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED] I could not afford to move back to West Van. Judging by the demographic trends in West Vancouver, I know I am not alone.</p> <p>I see the Taylor Way corridor - including the boundary east of Taylor Way along Anderson Crescent inclusive of Eden Place and 8th St - as an opportunity to diversify the housing stock in, and bring back the sense of community to, West Vancouver. Including multi-family homes, condo units, and rental housing will create a much-needed stock of affordable housing - not only for families but also for the local work force which should have the right to a respectable commute. It is my hope that West Vancouver will once again have streets full of children playing and families socializing. I see so little of this happening today and the municipality suffers for it.</p>

2018/03/15 13:40	[REDACTED]	<p>Hello,</p> <p>I am looking to forward to move to West Vancouver. For I am working in Burnaby, the best location for me would be somewhere close to #1 highway and Taylor way.</p> <p>I hope there would be some condo available in this location now or in near future.</p> <p>Thanks</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>
2018/03/15 16:50	[REDACTED]	<p>I am emailing in support of the densification along the Taylor Way Corridor and state our collective interest to increase the boundary west of Taylor Way along Anderson Crescent to 8th St.</p> <p>We are concerned of the higher age group and overall diminishing population and affordability issue and encourage multi family home and condo development with additional units in order to achieve affordable prices through smaller units which will enable younger generations to enter the market and engage in and develop the community as a whole.</p> <p>As a unified group we would like to express support for rental dwellings which will enable the local work force to not have to live far away due to lack of inventory and affordability and be able to live in the community which they are providing services in as well as provide other opportunities in allowing younger families to be able to move to and live in this beautiful community.</p>
2018/03/15 16:52	[REDACTED]	<p>I am emailing in support of the densification along the Taylor Way Corridor and state our collective interest to increase the boundary west of Taylor Way along Anderson Crescent to 8th St. This is a great opportunity for the district of West Vancouver to include 8th St as it is a very narrow street and quite dangerous for cars to travel through it.</p> <p>We are concerned of the higher age group and overall diminishing population and affordability issue and encourage multi family home and condo development with additional units in order to achieve affordable prices through smaller units which will enable younger generations to enter the market and engage in and develop the community as a whole.</p> <p>As a unified group we would like to express support for rental dwellings which will enable the local work force to not have to live far away due to lack of inventory and affordability and be able to live in the community which they are providing services in as well as provide other opportunities in allowing younger families to be able to move to and live in this beautiful community.</p>
2018/03/15 16:54	[REDACTED]	<p>I am emailing in support of the densification along the Taylor Way Corridor and state our collective interest to increase the boundary west of Taylor Way along Anderson Crescent to 8th St.</p> <p>We are concerned of the higher age group and overall diminishing population and affordability issue and encourage multi family home and condo development with additional units in order to achieve affordable prices through smaller units which will enable younger generations to enter the market and engage in and develop the community as a whole.</p> <p>As a unified group we would like to express support for rental dwellings which will enable the local work force to not have to live far away due to lack of inventory and affordability and be able to live in the community which they are providing services in as well as provide other opportunities in allowing younger families to be able to move to and live in this beautiful community.</p>

2018/03/15 16:59	[REDACTED]	<p>I am emailing in support of the densification along the Taylor Way Corridor and state our collective interest to increase the boundary west of Taylor Way along Anderson Crescent to 8th St. We [REDACTED] want to make sure the District of West Vancouver understands the opportunity of increasing the boundary and including the [REDACTED] 17 homes along Anderson Cr, 8th St and Eden Place which allows the District to really make a beautiful community with much needed rental dwellings and multifamily housing along with perhaps parks, green space and institutional services such as a daycare etc. We are concerned of the higher age group and overall diminishing population and affordability issue and encourage multi family home and condo development with additional units in order to achieve affordable prices through smaller units which will enable younger generations to enter the market and engage in and develop the community as a whole.</p> <p>As a unified group we would like to express support for rental dwellings which will enable the local work force to not have to live far away due to lack of inventory and affordability and be able to live in the community which they are providing services in as well as provide other opportunities in allowing younger families to be able to move to and live in this beautiful community.</p>
2018/03/15 17:05	[REDACTED]	<p>I am emailing in support of the densification along the Taylor Way Corridor and state our collective interest to increase the boundary west of Taylor Way along Anderson Crescent to 8th St. We are concerned of the higher age group and overall diminishing population and affordability issue and encourage multi family home and condo development with additional units in order to achieve affordable prices through smaller units which will enable younger generations to enter the market and engage in and develop the community as a whole. My husband and I live and work in West Vancouver and we are getting concerned that our daughter is going to be squeezed out of the market as there are very low supply of smaller multi family homes and more of single family houses which cost so much. We need to think of the future and increase the supply and we have all gathered together with our neighbours to bring this opportunity to the District and really hope they consider this assembly; this is an opportunity that members of the community would all benefit from with potential of allocating so many different options in addition to multi family developments, such as rental dwellings and daycares for the single parents and the younger generation so they can stay close to their parents and supporting families.</p> <p>As a unified group we would like to express support for rental dwellings which will enable the local work force to not have to live far away due to lack of inventory and affordability and be able to live in the community which they are providing services in as well as provide other opportunities in allowing younger families to be able to move to and live in this beautiful community.</p>
2018/03/15 18:33	[REDACTED]	<p>Hopefully, we'll see more multi-family dwellings and fewer monster houses in our community.</p>
2018/03/15 19:59	[REDACTED]	<p>I support in the densification along Taylor Way Corridor</p> <p>I would like to see an increase the boundary west of Taylor Way along Anderson Crescent inclusive of Eden Place and 8th St.</p> <p>I am concerned about the diminishing population and affordability and encourage multi family home and condo development with additional units in order to achieve affordable prices through smaller units which will enable</p>

		<p>younger generations to enter the market and engage in and develop the community as a whole.</p> <p>I support rental dwellings which will enable the local work force to not have to live far away due to lack of inventory and affordability and be able to live in the community which they are providing services in.</p>
2018/03/15 20:33	[REDACTED]	<p>I support the densification along Taylor Way Corridor</p> <p>I would like to see an increase in the boundary west of Taylor Way along Anderson Crescent inclusive of Eden Place and 8th St.</p> <p>I have concern about the diminishing population and affordability and encourage multi family home and condo development with additional units in order to achieve affordable prices through smaller units which will enable younger generations to enter the market and engage in and develop the community as a whole.</p> <p>I would like to express support for rental dwellings which will enable the local work force to not have to live far away due to lack of inventory and affordability and be able to live in the community which they are providing services in.</p>
2018/03/15 22:49	[REDACTED]	<p>I disagree with this rezoning plan. It must break West Vancouver's serenity, the most valuable characteristic of this city. Meanwhile, I don't think the new plan can remedy the housing problem, However, house price always goes up with new development, and local people are evacuated by coming richer. I am living here because I love the quite neighborhood environment of West Vancouver. This is the most important thing we should protect.</p>
2018/03/15 22:53	[REDACTED]	<p>I'd like to convey my support for the densification along the Taylor Way corridor outlined in the 2018 Draft OCP. In addition, I am in favor of increasing the boundary of this zone west of Taylor Way (along Anderson Crescent, inclusive of Eden Place and 8th St).</p> <p>[REDACTED] currently living [REDACTED] in West Vancouver. I'm hoping to stay in the community but am unable to find many options to live independently.</p> <p>The diminishing population in West Van is concerning to me (especially the missing generation of young adults) and it's obvious that housing affordability, availability, and options are a direct cause. I'd like to see high density multi family home and condo development in order to achieve affordable prices by producing smaller units which will enable younger generations to rent or enter the market.</p> <p>[REDACTED] my [REDACTED] grandmother, [REDACTED] would love for her to have more options to be able to downsize in the community she's raised her family in [REDACTED]</p> <p>The changing needs of all age groups can be better met by providing more housing diversity and choices. Through addressing housing attainability and affordability the community can age in place, better accommodate its workforce, and attract new families and younger generations.</p>
2018/03/15 23:02	[REDACTED]	<p>I'd like to express my support for the densification along the Taylor Way corridor outlined in the 2018 Draft OCP. In addition, I am in favor of increasing the boundary of this zone west of Taylor Way (along Anderson Crescent, inclusive of Eden Place and 8th St).</p> <p>I've grown up in West Vancouver but had to move away due to the unaffordability and lack of housing options, I have many family members that still live in the community and would love the opportunity to move back.</p> <p>The diminishing population in West Van is concerning to me (especially the</p>

		missing generation of young adults) and it's obvious that housing affordability, availability, and options are a direct cause. I'd like to see high density multi family home and condo development in order to achieve affordable prices by producing smaller units which will enable younger generations to rent or enter the market.
2018/03/15 23:24		<p>Hello,</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>We are planning to move to West Vancouver [REDACTED] A nice apartment in Park Royal area would be fantastic for us, but most real estates in West Vancouver are houses. If there are more available apartments with 2 bedrooms would be great.</p> <p>Thank you</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>
2018/03/16 8:31		Maybe nothing to do with OCP but perhaps if not already in place a need to require builders to wire-in emergency generator if they are building full basements. In a multimillion dollar home, it does not cost much more to wire-in, even if they don't supply the generator.
2018/03/16 8:33		Without mass transit system (subway/street rail) bottle neck/bridge, density/population growth will only make matter worse.
2018/03/16 8:40		<p>[REDACTED] live at [REDACTED] and are encouraged to see that a variety of more dense housing types are explicitly set out. [REDACTED]</p> <p>P.S. Will add my "old saw" that part of making the Ambleside revitalization a reality is to recognize that Park Royal is a huge regional shopping draw. Ambleside should draw from this flow of visitors by such things as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -signage "To Ambleside Shops" as close into Park Royal as easily allowed -perhaps have a weekend "weekend train" to take parents & kids along the Spirit Trail to the Ambleside Park and John Lawson kids play areas -shops should focus on niche "mom & pop" classy shops and restaurants to draw people from the Park Royal style shops -consider establishing some "draw" feature e.g. 1. feature art gallery shows 2. striking (ideally controversial) public art 3. ?? eg. stage events
2018/03/16 8:46		<p>A recommendation to have townhomes and apartments at [REDACTED] West Vancouver</p> <p>Dear City Hall planners,</p> <p>As home owners [REDACTED] of West Vancouver, we highly recommend to have townhomes and apartments [REDACTED] area for below reasons.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. [REDACTED] is an independent corner area where won't connect to other residential communities. If townhomes and apartments are built in this area, the density population won't disturb other house owners nearby. 2. [REDACTED] [REDACTED] If town homes and apartment are built here, it will be a easy way for people who live here to get in and out [REDACTED] 3. [REDACTED]. All the properties are old with big lots. [REDACTED] The developer can spent less money to get all the cheap properties. Low cost for getting the entire [REDACTED] lot but high profit for selling town homes and apartments. <p>Please think it over.</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>

		<p>[REDACTED]</p>
2018/03/16 8:47		<p>Let only citizens buy the property. Don't force our kids to move away from us to the easter suburb.</p>
2018/03/16 8:50		<p>If there is the potential to change the strategy from providing owners the ability to create more than one dwelling where previously it was only allowable for a single dwelling we would like to express that we do NOT want to create more dwellings from land zoned for single family homes. North Vancouver + Vancouver are excellent options for families who are looking for these kinds of neighbourhoods. We feel increased density will take away from the character of West Vancouver which is more like a small town and very community oriented-particularly in Gleneagles.</p>
2018/03/16 8:58		<p>IF WEST VANCOUVER WANTS TO GET ITS RESIDENTS OUT OF THEIR CARS AS THEY GO ABOUT THEIR DAILY BUSINESS AND ACTIVITIES, IT NEEDS A MUCH MORE EFFECTIVE (MORE ROUTES; MUCH MORE FREQUENCY OF SERVICE) NORTH/SOUTH INTRA COMMUNITY TRANSIT SYSTEM FOCUSING ON A CENTRAL HUB AROUND COMMUNITY CENTRE/MUNICIPAL HALL/AMBLESIDE & DUNDARAVE BUSINESS CENTRES. THE EXISTING TRANSIT SERVICE HAS EVOLVED AS AN EAST/WEST, INTER COMMUNITY TRANSPORTATION SERVICE, ORIENTED TOWARDS THOSE IN WALKING DISTANCE OF SEA LEVEL. THERE IS NO EFFECTIVE SERVICE UP AND DOWN THE HILLSIDE INTO HIGHER ELEVATIONS WHERE MUCH OF THE NEW DEVELOPMENT IN WEST VAN HAS AND IS TAKING PLACE.</p> <p>I LIVE ON THE [REDACTED] BRITISH PROPERTIES [REDACTED]. I CAN DRIVE TO THE PARKING GARAGE ON THE COMMUNITY CENTRE SITE IN 10 MINUTES. ASSUMING THE BUS IS ON SCHEDULED (ONE HOUR FREQUENCY) AND THE PARK ROYAL CONNECTION IS TIMELY, IT TAKES ME ABOUT ONE HOUR BY BUS AND ARRIVAL TIME MAY OR MAY NOT MATCH THE CLASS OR EVENT TIME AT THE COMMUNITY CENTRE OR ICE ARENA OR LIBRARY. I.E.) THE BUS IS NOT A REALISTIC ALTERNATIVE TO THE CAR.</p> <p>AS AN ALTERNATIVE TO BUS TRANSIT ROUTES, WEST VAN MIGHT CONSIDER SPONSORING OR REGULATING AN ELECTRIC VEHICLE RIDE HAILING SERVICE TO PROVIDE A MORE FLEXIBLE INTRA COMMUNITY TRANSPORTATION SERVICE.</p>

		<p>P.S. ALSO NOT THAT UNLIKE ALMOST ALL OTHER METRO VANCOUVER COMMUNITIES WHICH HAVE FIXED, VERY HIGH INVESTMENT TRANSIT ROUTES (IE, SKYTRAIN, EVERGREEN LINE, SEABUS, ETC.) WEST VAN'S BLUE BUSES ARE A COMPLETELY "MOBILE" TECHNOLOGY AND ROUTES CAN BE ALTERED TO WHEREVER RIDERSHIP IS TO BE ENCOURAGES AND SERVED. ALSO DEVELOPMENT NEEDN'T BE RESTRICTED TO A FIXED TRANSIT CORRIDOR AS IT CAN BE REROUTES TO MEET NEW DEVELOPMENT RIDERSHIP.</p>
<p>2018/03/16 9:20</p>	<p>[REDACTED]</p>	<p>WEST VANCOUVER NEEDS TO AGGRESSIVELY INCREASE THE OCCUPANCY DENSITY OF THE EXISTING HOUSING STOCK OVER THE NEXT 5 YEARS TO INCREASE VACANCY RATES AND IMPROVE AFFORDABILITY IF IT IS TO AVOID THE COMPLETE HOLLOWING OUT OF THE COMMUNITY AND THE FINAL DEMOLITION OF THE LOCAL SMALL BUSINESS ECONOMY. YET THIS OCP DRAFT FOCUSES ON A 25 YEAR TIME HORIZON AND LIMITED, RESTRICTIVE CONSIDERATION ON A CASE BY CASE OF NEW HIGHER DENSITY DEVELOPMENT MODELS. TOO LITTLE, TOO LATE!</p> <p>IN ORDER TO ENCOURAGE INNOVATION AND MORE TIMELY MARKET DRIVEN RESPONSE TO DENSIFICATION, THE OCP HAS TO BE MORE ENCOURAGING OF COMPREHENSIVE MULTI FAMILY ZONING AND EVEN DISTRICT WIDE DEVELOPMENT ACTION, RATHER THAN NARROW, SPECIFIC DEVELOPMENT CORRIDORS WHERE THERE IS ALREADY CONSIDERABLE INERTIA OR INFILL MODELS LIKE COACH HOUSES WHICH HAVE NOT BEEN EFFECTIVE SOLUTIONS.</p> <p>FOR EXAMPLE, I DON'T THINK COACH HOUSES ARE AN ATTRACTIVE ECONOMY OPPORTUNITY GIVEN THE LAND VALUES IN WEST VAN. ALSO THEY ONLY PHYSICALLY WORK IN PARTS OF THE COMMUNITY WHICH HAVE LANES FOR MULTIPLE PROPERTY BOUNDARY ACCESSIBILITY. THEY DON'T WORK IN THE WESTERN HALF OF THE MUNICIPALITY OR ABOVE THE HIGHWAY WHERE THERE ARE NO LANES AND WHERE LARGER LOT SIZES ARE AN ECONOMIC BARRIER TO SMALL COACH HOUSES. YOU SHOULD ENCOURAGE SECONDARY SUITE EXTENSIONS (FREE STANDING INFILL) ON LARGER LOTS IN BP, SAY, THUS OVERCOMING BUILDING CODE BARRIERS TO SECONDARY SUITES INSIDE EXISTING HOMES AND ALLOWING FOR LARGER (THAN COACH HOUSES) SECONDARY SUITES WHICH ARE MUCH MORE ECONOMICALLY ATTRACTIVE TO CURRENT PROPERTY OWNERS AND MUCH MORE ATTRACTIVE ACCOMODATION FOR YOUNG FAMILIES, SAY I.E. LIKE [REDACTED] SOUTHBOROUGH DRIVE PROJECT</p>
<p>2018/03/16 9:31</p>	<p>[REDACTED]</p>	<p>The population projection ("hockey stick" up and to the right") is completely unfounded. I think the trend is likely to continue down, particularly if there is not a much more aggressive plan to increase density and affordability of the current housing inventory. The continued growth and penetration of investment ownership of West Van property plus the increasing market share at part-time/second home residency will inevitably cause a continuing population decline.</p> <p>I live [REDACTED] British Properties, [REDACTED]</p> <p>When I moved into my property 40 years ago, the population of that block</p>

		<p>was 43 residents. Today the population is 20, including [REDACTED] people who reside there only part-time. [REDACTED] This is a blatant example at a community in population decline.</p>
2018/03/16 9:49	[REDACTED]	<p>We disagree with the newly drafted official community plan issued on Feb 13 about the rezoning plan of ambelside and the new building of apartment ,etc. West Vancouver residents have been under the pressure of traffic through both bridges. More population will make it worse</p>
2018/03/16 10:31	[REDACTED]	<p>As a local realtor who has senior clients that have downsized from their house but still wanted to live in West Vancouver, we are super excited that the City has considered to densify the Taylor Way Corridor. We've been having trouble looking for affordable apartments for over few years now and they are super frustrated because the price just keeps going up. Pls keep up the good work and we look forward for the city to allow apartments and even affordable living in that area. Thanks!</p>
2018/03/16 11:40	[REDACTED]	<p>I support densification along the Taylor way corridor, along with increasing the boundry west of Taylor Way along Anderson Cres. inclusive of Eden place and 8th street. This will improve housing options for different family types as most of the current lots are huge and currently only provide housing for one family. This should also include rental dwellings for the work force, and couples/single families.</p>
2018/03/16 11:53	[REDACTED]	<p>I support in the densification along Taylor Way Corridor</p> <p>I would like to see an increase the boundary west of Taylor Way along Anderson Crescent inclusive of Eden Place and 8th St.</p> <p>I am concerned about the diminishing population and affordability and encourage multi family home and condo development with additional units in order to achieve affordable prices through smaller units which will enable younger generations to enter the market and engage in and develop the community as a whole.</p> <p>I am in support of rental dwellings which will enable the local work force to not have to live far away due to lack of inventory and affordability and be able to live in the community which they are providing services in.</p>

2018/03/16 12:26	[REDACTED]	<p>To whom it may concern.</p> <p>[REDACTED]. I have lived in West Vancouver my entire life and have strong opinions to support densification along the Taylor Way Corridor, specifically increasing the boundary West of Taylor Way along Anderson Crescent.</p> <p>At Capilano University the topic of affordable housing is a great concern to us young adults and we talk about it almost every day. It comes across as a no brainer that by reducing land size and offering smaller units, that this would be a cheaper alternative to having to buy an entire house.</p> <p>I am frustrated that even though I was born and raised in West Vancouver and will never have the opportunity to raise my family here because of investors purchasing large plots of land in order to build their single family mansions. I fear that I will never be able to afford to raise my family here. I would like to see West Vancouver have my generation in mind when coming to a decision on this matter, as I strongly support the idea for densification along Taylor Way Corridor and to increase the boundary west of Taylor way along Anderson Crescent inclusive of Eden.</p> <p>Thank You, [REDACTED]</p>
2018/03/16 13:18	[REDACTED]	<p>I fully support the densification of the Taylor way corridor in conjunction with the south-east side of Sentinel Hill. Our community desperately needs more high-density housing for seniors and young families. West Vancouver has amazing public facilities but young families cant afford to live here and enjoy them. With Evelyn Place development and the Taylor Way corridor, it makes sense to densify the south-east side of Sentinal hill</p>
2018/03/16 13:38	[REDACTED]	<p>I would like to express my support of densification along Taylor Way including increasing the boundary west of Taylor Way inclusive of Anderson Crescent, 8th Street and Eden Place.</p> <p>As a West Vancouver resident and property owner for [REDACTED], I am concerned with the community's ability to accommodate our aging population with affordable opportunities to downsize.</p> <p>I believe that concentrated development on this land west of Taylor Way could help achieve the many objectives expressed in the Draft OCP through densification and diversity of housing types, sizes and costs.</p>
2018/03/16 13:41	[REDACTED]	<p>I support expanding the LAP boundary for the Taylor Way Corridor to include Anderson Crescent, 8th Street and Eden Place.</p> <p>Having read the Draft OCP, I agree that we need to meet the needs of current and future generations through more diverse housing types, sizes and costs. I believe that redevelopment and densification of the Taylor Way Corridor (extending to the proposed boundary of Anderson Crescent, 8th Street and Eden Place) could significantly and expeditiously advance many key objectives and visions included in the Draft OCP.</p> <p>I particularly support rental dwellings and smaller units to enable younger generations to live in and work in the community. As well, the close proximity of this parcel of land to both a major commercial centre (Park Royal) and transit corridors (Marine Drive and Taylor Way) also aligns with the OCP objectives of reduced vehicle dependency and increased transit ridership.</p>

2018/03/16 14:56	[REDACTED]	<p>Would like to see the [REDACTED] zoned for duplexes/ townhomes . Homes on the south side currently back on to duplexes and this would accomplish density issues. Close to retail,schools and public transportation.</p>
2018/03/16 16:42	[REDACTED]	<p>I'd like to express my support for the densification along the Taylor Way corridor outlined in the 2018 Draft OCP. In addition, I am in favor of increasing the boundary of this zone west of Taylor Way (along Anderson Crescent, inclusive of Eden Place and 8th St).</p> <p>The diminishing population in West Van is concerning to me (especially the missing generation of young adults) and it's obvious that housing affordability, availability, and options are a direct cause. I'd like to see high density multi family home and condo development in order to achieve affordable prices by producing smaller units which will enable younger generations to rent or enter the market.</p> <p>West Vancouver is in desperate need of rental dwellings which will enable the local work force to live in the community which they are providing services in.</p>
2018/03/17 18:14	[REDACTED]	<p>Great report. Like almost everyone in my [REDACTED] circle [REDACTED] friends, we're actively planning the next stage in our lives. We adore our Ambleside location, however, as there are no town-house, duplex, or triplex options in the community, we're likely to re-locate to Lower Lonsdale or Kitsilano. While the vision for increased density described in the OCP is bold and exciting, the zoning changes need to be enacted in the next 2 or 3 years to have an impact on my generation of WV residents. Slower than that and we will reluctantly go elsewhere.</p> <p>Note, in the 20 years I have lived in WV I have seen only ONE (!) visionary, semi-affordable housing development that would meet our needs after we sell our single family home. [REDACTED]. Let's encourage more of that scale development.</p> <p>Thanks!</p>
2018/03/17 23:37	[REDACTED]	<p>Very well done!!!</p> <p>I think you should significantly up the target % for creating townhouses and other forms of alternative housing. There are many areas in west van that have become run down due to poor house maintenance and poor landscape maintenance. New row housing would be far more attractive and obviously help with the steep cost barrier to living in west van. West van will continue on its trend to becoming an old folks place and a place for wealthy immigrants if the housing issue isn't aggressively challenged. We have put this issue off for far too long because residents resist change and yet most dont realize that this nimby attitude is creating more change than they realize (in the makeup of the community in its trending towards wealthy immigrants). Thus we need not just a small shift in our housing make up but a large change. Strong leadership from council is needed on this issue</p>
2018/03/18 0:18	[REDACTED]	<p>If we have to choose either one monster house or four duplex multi-families, I'd say that we do need more duplex homes rather than an ugly monster house.</p> <p>Some people really don't like duplex as they don't like middle-class neighbours living the city. It's selfish and ridiculous. Do not make West Vancouver a place only for wealthy families. We do need more moderate dwellings for not only downsizing demands but youth couples.</p>










2018/03/19 9:14	[REDACTED]	<p>I have read the Draft Official Community Plan and would like to acknowledge how well feedback from the public during the consultation process was captured. I attended many of the events and was pleasantly surprised by the appetite of the community for positive change to address the serious issues facing the community that are described so well in the Key Trends section of the Draft.</p> <p>I have a couple of comments to make:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 2.2.9 Rather than "seek to etc." I would suggest the words "enable the transfer of etc." -2.2.10 I am sure that you will receive strong negative feedback regarding this section i.e., suggesting that the Municipality stay firm regarding any development above the 1200 foot contour. I would like to state firmly that it is important to retain this flexibility in order to give the Municipality a strong position when working with British Properties on the Cypress Village Development. Perhaps you consider adding wording as a preface to the effect of "While respecting the entreaty of the Upper Lands Working Group to limit development above the 1200 foot contour, consider etc. -I would like to see a strong statement regarding the necessity of public transit for Cypress Village -I would also like to see a statement requiring the creation of a certain number of jobs in the Cypress Village planning area (rf. Burnaby around Metrotown) -2.4.15 Add "crosswalks" after "arterial roads" <p>I would like to thank you for the dedication, patience and extreme professionalism of staff throughout this process and I would like to congratulate you for so successfully addressing the Key Trends outlined in the introduction to the Plan in the Community-Wide Directions of the Draft Plan. It will be a positive guide for the future development of West Vancouver.</p>
2018/03/19 9:23	[REDACTED]	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No. of duplexes needs increasing (substantially) 2. Other housing options needs increasing substantially for seniors & young families 3. Other housing options needs increasing substantially for workforce. 4. Climate change is the challenge of our time 5. Reinstigate "panhandle" lots (that used to be legal) to increase housing units 6. Protect heritage houses by density transfer (to distant sites if necessary) (e.g. Gordon Smith residence) 7. Increase no. of accessible units by increasing site coverage to permit exterior elevator installation in houses. 8. p. 31 Yes! Emphasize Ambleside as the municipal town centre. Important foil for Pk. Royal 9. p. 36 Introduce traffic calming measures in speed-way areas like the 2200 & 2300 blocks Marine Dr. 10. p. 36 Add more park & ride facilities 11. p. 40 & 42 Sections 2.5.19 and 2.6.18 appear inconsistent & confusing. Please clarify 12. p. 42 Careful about green roofs. They have higher costs for structure and maintenance, shifting municipal drainage costs to private owners. 13. p. 47 Increase transit frequency at busy times at Park Royal (heading across bridge) 14 p. 50 Map 15 should show the Ferry bldg Gallery 15. The draft OCP is otherwise excellent!

2018/03/19 9:31	[REDACTED]	<p>1. Based on recent OCP public consultation, it is clear that our community needs to adapt to present and future housing needs and at a much faster pace than before.</p> <p>2. A healthy housing "eco system" should provide "cradle to grave" options allowing people to remain within the district. i.e. We need more multifamily housing options.</p> <p>3. Most seniors do not want to downsize from a large house straight into a small apartment so the next best thing would be to increase Duplex homes. i.e. Create new Duplex Development Areas. Or increase the areas of existing ones.</p> <p>4. We need to optimise existing housing. ie. how can we get more utility out of the existing stock?</p> <p>5. We need to embrace new technology that can help reduce traffic e.g.; Allowing car sharing services like Uber.</p> <p>6. In this era of the internet, Local businesses need more support to help them to continue to be the backbone of the community.</p> <p>7. We need to explore ways to improve the development process once it enters Municipal Hall Bureaucracy. E.g. What are the main causes of delays and expenses?</p> <p>In conclusion, I think the community planning department at Municipal hall has come up with a well-researched and well-presented OCP draft report which we fully support.</p> <p>Yours faithfully, [REDACTED]</p>
2018/03/19 9:34		<p>1. I feel strongly about property rights-in that the British Properties property owners should be able to build as they please.</p> <p>2. I feel it should be easier (faster) to get permits to build along the stream/rivers.</p>
2018/03/19 9:45		<p>Seriously consider either building or converting a house into 3 units (basement main floor and upper floor). These are not duplexes or attached houses. Same size as detached houses. They have these in Victoria. One unit per floor. House developers contribute more to District amenities. Street parking for residents & guests. I strongly agree with the "respecting character & protection heritage" section.*</p> <p>Page 19. Ambleside Town Centre should be no more than 600-700 units. This draft does not include the new towers to be built at P.R. plus purposed 3-4 towers on FIRST NATIONS LAND ON WATERFRONT AT P.R. (near dog park & pitch & putt). Too many people in a small area of Ambleside, P.R., Taylor Way. Transportation & parking is a huge issue that has to be addressed before development begins. The seawall Ambleside Park, John Lawson Park etc. is already overcrowded at peak times as it is an attraction for people all over the lower mainland and as population in greater Vancouver increases so will the demands put on our natural resources...and people (most of them) living outside the community will be visiting by car within at least the next 10 years. Local area plans (p. 19) must be presented to those local area residents (2.1.14) by drop box mail (physical mail), e-mail, N.S. news & meetings to ensure all residents have an opportunity to input & feedback prior to finalizing the detailed plans. I strongly agree with all aspects of "advancing housing affordability, accessibility and sustainability". Seriously consider re-developing the existing old Municipal Hall to have a 10-12 storey apartment block on top-3 floors Municipal and 9 stories residential.</p>

		<p>*This could be senior accessibility and lower cost housing as we already own the property. ENVIRONMENTAL PLAN. It is essential that underground water management be a critical part of any new development. New house construction is impacting water issues as foundations are dug deeper & they are hitting underground creeks & streams. Existing infrastructure is impacted. Range of housing types is essential. DON'T APPROVE DESIGN LIKE THAT ON [REDACTED] VERY UNATTRACTIVE FOR THIS COMMUNITY.</p> <p>*NO MORE THAN 3 STOREYS ON MARINE DRIVE</p>
2018/03/19 10:01		<p>In general, this OCP Draft looks good, and we agree with most of it.</p> <p>2.1 Existing neighbourhoods: - NOT in favor of coach houses, prefer subdivision of existing lots; better re-sale value. - we ARE in favor of more duplex and triplex and townhouse zoning along all of Marine Drive corridor, including Cypress Creek area.</p> <p>2.2 Future neighbourhoods: - W. Van should accept more high-density development in support of R.G.S. because it is preferable to build housing on hillsides & not on agricultural land. - New subdivisions should be small lots only (e.g. 60' x 120') - 2.2.7 - 2.2.16 sounds extremely complicated! Good luck with this.</p> <p>2.3 Local Economy: - 2.3.7 We need a public boat launch replacement between Ambleside and Dundarave. - 2.3.10 Definitely in favor of boutique hotels in town centres.</p> <p>2.5 Municipal Operations and infrastructure: - 2.5.9 Ban the sale & use of plastic bags - 2.5.13 Continue policy of maintaining pedestrian trails on top of sewage systems, e.g. in Caulfeild. Use to connect cul-de-sacs.</p> <p>2.6 Natural Environment: - 2.6.5 Balance tree retention...with consideration for safety from danger of over-mature trees or dead trees. - 2.7 Parks & Trails - 2.7.15 Make advancement of Spirit Trail a top priority and re-claim encroachments by private owners on to road & rail easements.</p> <p>2.9 Community Health and Cohesion: - 2.9.1 Optimize use of existing recreation facilities by converting under-used tennis courts to pickleball courts.</p>
2018/03/19 10:10		<p>Most importantly, those of us who have chosen to live in the "Ambleside Town Centre" areas are here because we highly value the views, access to the Seawalk, cycling, W.V. Community and Aquatic Centre, SAC. So far, we've been able to pay for it! The character of Ambleside should remain a residential area with limited height of ALL building of 6 storeys. Do NOT give "in lieu of " concessions to developers wanting to add height.</p>

		<p>Heritage areas must be kept and Marine Drive businesses don't need to be removed because they're old. They give character and variety to the community. Boutique hotels, nightclubs, lots of (some are [unitelligible] and full community events) outdoor, noisy night shows, and other tourist attractions are not wanted nor necessary here.</p> <p>I applaud plans for safe cycling and pedestrian routes (they make us healthier, keep cars off the streets) and had hoped WV could complete our part of the Spirit Trail cycling and pedestrian bridge over the Capilano River as previously planned, rather than have a "stop-gap" measure of using the present way too narrow Wardance Bridge. Find a way to complete plans for the entire trail. These measures would mean a lot to all recreational and work cyclists and walkers of ALL Ages and be far safer than portions of the trail in WV now. I also applaud use of schools after hours for community programs. This has always been an under used resource.</p> <p>There must be preserved and new community space, green space, trees, views for all who have already chosen to live here on newcomers. Increased density must be placed in areas that do not spoil the present character of Ambleside. Please consider quality of life when you make these plans. This is not downtown Vancouver-"canyon city"-nor do we ever want it to be! Thank you.</p>
2018/03/19 10:49	[REDACTED]	<p>Hello I have been a home owner [REDACTED] for [REDACTED]. Our block backs onto Duplex zoned properties [REDACTED]. The newest duplex [REDACTED].</p> <p>I see in the new OCP Plan the "Local Area Planning Boundaries" end at 23rd and Haywood. [REDACTED] it should have been the first to be considered for duplexes, triplexes and/ or coach houses. [REDACTED] already have that zoning in our back yards and surrounded by commercial, schools and churches. The up side is it is walking distance to the Village, Recreation centre and transportation. It would make absolute sense to include [REDACTED] in the Local Area Planning Boundaries and be considered for diverse housing zoning. Thank you [REDACTED]</p>
2018/03/20 17:22	[REDACTED]	<p>[REDACTED] I often consider options to live independent of my parents however, despite the fact I absolutely would love to find a residence in West Vancouver as I prefer to live close to my parents and I have a part time job in West Vancouver, currently the housing options in West Vancouver are impossible to afford. As the Draft plan pointed out, there are too many big houses that are exclusively for single family. In the future I would love to see more apartments and residences with increased capacity to cope with the high housing demands in West Vancouver.</p>

2018/03/21 12:26	[REDACTED]	<p>[REDACTED] residents of West Vancouver. [REDACTED] Kitsilano, [REDACTED] would not like to see the same thing happen here. We are not at all against revitalization of the neighbourhood, recognizing that a drop in population and aging buildings make it a necessity. However, there are other ways of doing this than the approach that seems ubiquitous throughout the Lower Mainland, and in our opinion, completely inappropriate for West Vancouver. Nothing but Grosvenor-style "luxury residences", chain restaurants, cookie-cutter condos with shops below.</p> <p>Many, if not all, of the small business owners here will be driven out, as we have seen in many other areas. We make a point of shopping locally and getting to know the business owners. We like their products and personal service. Some are recent arrivals from North Vancouver, where they have been driven out by high rents and redevelopment. We value their presence here & do not want to see the same thing happen. The same thing has happened in Vancouver, so why would the outcome be any different here if the same model is used. Deep Cove is suffering the consequences of an excess of day trippers. The very reasons many residents live there are being destroyed, so their continued residency may become untenable. Valuing our community and small business owners, as well as the beautiful parks and amenities in West Van, is not standing in the way of revitalization. It is calling for more thought and creativity to be put into the proposal. Please do not destroy the many positive things this community is known for in the name of "progress".</p> <p>It is worth reading the excellent letter from [REDACTED] published in the March 14 issue of the North Shore News.</p> <p>Back to the drawing board, please. best regards, [REDACTED]</p> <p>P.S. Under Category please put us down for "all the above listed"</p>
2018/03/21 16:23	[REDACTED]	<p>Nowhere in this document is there mention of poor air quality and increased pollution from machinery, industry, and traffic due to increased development and urbanization, both locally and in the surrounding areas; or the dangers and consequences to human health, and the subsequent social and financial tolls this is taking on our population. West Van needs to make this a priority and can take a multi-faceted approach. We need strong policies and bylaws that mitigate pollution, we need to take strong stands against polluting activities and in and around our community, and West Van needs to lead by example and make some hard choices now that will reap benefits for years to come. West Van Parks Dept. could begin by eliminating the use of gas-powered weed whackers and leaf blowers by municipal workers, and a bylaw could be introduced to extend this ban to include commercial landscaping companies. West Van should be looking to other jurisdictions for ideas on pollution reduction, as well, and could be a leader in sustainable and environmentally forward practices, for the sake of the health and well-being of its citizens. Protecting the right of all citizens to live in a healthy environment crosses all categories of the OCP and should be its primary mandate, and all decisions made should be in keeping with that principle. A proposed addition to the section Enhancing Community Health (paragraphs 2.9.10 - 2.9.13) should read: "Support community health with regards to air quality by reducing emissions and mitigating air pollution".</p>
2018/03/22 15:00	[REDACTED]	<p>Hi, we live in [REDACTED] West Vancouver but we prefer to live in apartment.</p>

2018/03/22 15:04		<p>2.1.7 (6) Give due notice to the entire neighbourhood before approval of rezoning and redevelopment, lack thereof has, in the past, led to very contentious meetings. Senior staff take note!</p> <p>2.1.8 Add: Ensure that infill houses, duplexes etc. respect neighbourhood character.</p> <p>2.4.20 Movement of goods/people to serve W. Vancouver: TAYLOR WAY Intersection: What action/negotiations with the Highway Dept. will council initiate?</p> <p>2.4.24 Air quality/noise pollution: Seel a re-direction from Transport Canada of flight corridors for aircraft from all Valley air operations over the North Shore as well as "take off" direction for harbour float planes. Non-stop air traffic over North and West Vancouver is becoming intolerable. It specifically affects the existing and proposed ne developments and areas of Clyde, Taylor Way, Ambleside and Cypress.</p>
2018/03/22 15:31		<p> grew up in Westvan,  ran a  business here.</p> <p>We are now retirees living in an apart. In Ambleside which we both like. Ambleside has a lot of charm and beauty and little has to be done to enhance it. We would like to keep the village look and we think holiday makers should be encouraged to stay longer so as to leave money behind. We are would go for a small Otherwise not in ffavor of a 4 storey Hotel and does not have to be on the waterfront but otherwise NOT in favor of anything over 3 stories. We don't need another Governor. Do we really need to density this area?.. There also a need for Lower Speed Limits coming thru Ambleside as this is a small town for west van retirees and there are thousands living here</p> <p>More rest stops for people to congregate and take in the surroundings. Promote Native Arts and Heritage and even a small workshop where anative person they  He's excellent can make and sell to the tourist? Build a small round roofed bandstand on the grass near the beach side waterfront where local bands can play and children can play in it for fun thruout the year.</p> <p>These are some of our suggestions.</p> <p>Yours truly, </p>
2018/03/23 11:51		<p>Hello,</p> <p>As a resident of Horseshoe Bay I am concerned about the increase of traffic that will be created with the new housing development by Sewell's. It is already chaotic in the summer and on long weekends.</p> <p> I would like to see the frequency of the bus service increased. Waiting 30 minutes for the 250 bus is unacceptable. Increasing both bus routes may also encourage younger people to seek employment in this area.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
2018/03/23 17:12		<p>We love our neighborhood! Yet we definitely feel the financial pressures increasing every year living here as a young family and house owner. We support the subdivision plan to increase the density and make the housing more affordable in beauties Gleneagles.</p>

2018/03/24 11:39	[REDACTED]	I think that it is important to protect forested areas in the DWV. Old forests are great in the upper lands and stream sides - but not in neighbourhoods. The trees fall down.
2018/03/24 22:23	[REDACTED]	Hi I want to bring my comments to your attention about the lack of condos and houses available for people to buy, especially for people that want to move closer to shops and amenities. I am definitely for more high rises, condos, townhouses, more and higher density. It would help with taxes and bring more income to local businesses. Lack of housing is making people move away from West Van. Also there should be more bus services available above the highway. Also should let people cut down trees, if they are on their own property. [REDACTED]
2018/03/25 20:14	[REDACTED]	Options for housing diversification are imperative for WV. Secondary suites, laneway homes, townhouses, row houses, condominium units and apartments in the Taylor Way and Marine Drive corridors are a great options to address housing for local workers, down sizers and younger generations. To improve our business community and increase the health of our local businesses, mixed use projects and business areas beyond Marine Drive should be developed. Better transit for people working late and longer hours of operation would help get us away from the "sleepy hollow" was are now know as. Transit to and from Marine Drive from the Upperlands will help match the new B-Line with this developing area. Taylor Way and Marine Drive by-pass lanes and HOV lanes from the Upper Levels Highway to the Lions Gate Bridge should be considered.
2018/03/25 23:12	[REDACTED]	Not enough time allowed for public feedback (March 29 deadline is not sufficient). Pg 16, Item 2.1.7 - I disagree (except with the 5th bullet item about reviewing form & character to support siting and designs that respond & contribute to neighbourhood context and character); we should protect adjacent property values and views. Pg 19, items 2.1.12 and 2.1.13 - I disagree with both these. In part because impact on traffic is too great, but also I fail to understand how these numbers were determined or why they are included in a "high-level" document. Pg 19, item 2.1.16 - I disagree with the use of bonus density as a means of attempting to create affordable housing. The only way to create affordable housing is if the District owns and rents. Pg 26, item 2.2.3 - I disagree with development over 1200 feet; this will open the door to go higher. Pg 32, item 2.3.11 - I disagree with increased density by "bonus". Pg 35 - Transportation - Traffic congestion is not actually addressed - the 2 bridges need upgrading and a 3rd crossing added. Pg 36, item 2.4.23 - I disagree. Why should we pay for the "fuel" of low

	<p>emission vehicles (this should not be subsidized by the community at large)</p> <p>I essentially agree with all of the following comments from another citizen [REDACTED] as outlined below:</p> <p>Firstly I am concerned with the short time the draft plan has been published and the short submission date for comments - March 16 now amended to March 29. Many residents have no idea what this plan might mean for them. I think that there needs to be at least three months of review and many community meetings before plan goes to council for approval.</p> <p>I think the focus group meetings that were held this summer tended to drive people to certain conclusions and has given the Planning department some unfortunate feeling that in fact we all want more development (related construction) and density - fewer single family homes and a lot more townhomes and apartments.</p> <p>While I think that we do have citizens nearing retirement who want these types of properties I believe that there are plenty of apartments available - the gap perhaps is larger three bedroom plus apartments and low rise townhomes or coach houses (duplex, triplex developments). The idea of strong demand from younger citizens is I think misguided as it seems unfortunately that such apartments, townhouses or coach houses would remain unaffordable to most of them. I know that most of friends' children do not live in West or North Vancouver as it is just too expensive for them.</p> <p>Most people I talk with are concerned about traffic gridlock on the North Shore and if there are to be increases in density want to understand how it impacts there neighbourhood and traffic.</p> <p>The other issue they are concerned about is neighbourhood character and how this has been eroded over many years with very little concrete action to try to resolve.</p> <p>Affordability is also a concern but I fear there are no easy solutions to this one- recent steps taken by BC NDP may help a little here but not enough to make West Vancouver affordable any time in the near future , if ever. (recent developments Grosvenor, Cressey, Horseshoe Bay and planned development on Marine Drive bear this out- increased density is not creating affordable homes).</p> <p>The 53 page draft plan contains a huge amount of motherhood and apple pie but very little that deals with traffic issues and very little explaining why the need for increased density and the impact on traffic and neighbourhoods of such increases. The plan also has very little to say on preserving neighbourhood character.</p> <p>Some more specific thoughts and questions where it would have been really useful for some member of Council or Planning department at the ADRA meeting to answer. So I am hoping by writing that I will get answers.</p> <p>Pages 3-6 try to explain the increased population forecast which I believe is the driver in the draft OCP for the need for increased density. Given that our population has been flat to declining I am not sure why we are now forecasting the population of West Vancouver to start rising again? I almost feel the draft OCP needed to justify increasing density and population growth</p>
--	---

is what was required. This seems to be a critical assumption and think needs to be well thought through as much of the rest of the plan depends on this assumption. We need to understand the demographics of the forecast population growth surely to determine the type of housing they may need or want or could afford.

Page 7 & 8 deal with Housing affordability and diversity- Firstly nowhere in this draft OCP do we define what our definition of affordability is - affordable to B.C. citizens at large, those who already own homes and are downsizing, younger people in B.C. ? With very high land prices more diversity of housing will not necessarily make our housing affordable except to foreign investors or a wealthy minority of the BC population. We have built Grosvenor one 7 floor and to be built one 6 floor building and have under construction Cressy a 20 story . We also have the Horseshoe Bay development and also under plan The Residences on Marine -from \$1.9 million to \$2.75 million. None of these would be affordable at all to the vast majority of B.C.residents and likely only affordable to those with inheritances, downsizing from an existing home or foreign investors. So increased density will not provide affordable housing only housing that is marginally more affordable than a single family home.

Employees of businesses here will still have to commute to West Vancouver as even the higher density smaller homes will remain unaffordable to most if not all- so what we need is to make it easier for those employees to travel to the North Shore by transit and road!!! This begs discussion re adding lanes to our bridges or a third crossing.

Page 10 where we are in the process- as stated above I think the first three phases and the discussions led by planning surprisingly led participants to the solution that planning was directing residents to- I am not convinced that in many instances this is really what residents of West Vancouver are looking for.

Page 15- 2.1.1 - I think the concept here is valid but wording a little unclear- my read is that draft OCP is saying throughout most of West Vancouver larger lots will be able to be subdivided and also coach houses built - what is not clear are actual minimum lot sizes (assume 33 foot) or minimum lot size where coach House could be built. Are we also saying that basement suites would be allowed anywhere as well?

Page 15 & 16 2.1.4 to 2.1.7 This seems to be what is defined as the Marine Drive Transit Corridor which you are defining essentially going along Marine Drive from Park Royal all the way to Horseshoe Bay- all along this corridor Triplexes, Duplexes and townhouses should be permitted - these would be up to three stories - I am sure many residents of single family homes along this corridor would have concerns re the developments and impacts on views , traffic etc. Not sure I have understood this properly though?

2.1.7 seems to essentially permit Council to spot zone certain sites- I realize that Council wants flexibility but I think that spot zoning re Grosvenor (with a very split Council) did not set a good precedent to grant Council this flexibility- (was pushed through with the vast majority of residents opposed.) Not surprisingly this has created a low level of trust among residents. It would therefore be better if Council had a 75% or better still 100% majority to approve such cases should they arise.

	<p>2.1.8 - this really is the only small section (two small paragraphs) that talks about respecting neighbourhood character. For most residents I think this is a major priority and therefore ideas to protect neighbourhood character should be spelled out in more detail and given more prominence in the draft OCP. This has been a major concern for most residents for many years and very little action has been taken by our Mayor or Council. In the meantime we continue to see many monstrosities built that have a very negative effect on existing long time residents' quality of life.</p> <p>2.1.13 - Ambleside Town Centre - the plan proposes 1,000 -1,200 new units or about a 25% increase!!! Seems quite high. I note that 2.1.14 looks at confirming area of Ambleside Town Centre which seems a larger area than would be currently zoned for townhomes and apartments etc? The second point states "Determine densities, heights, building forms that respond to neighborhood context and character"- what does this really mean? I residents want to know where high rises can be built and townhomes, duplexes etc and how that may impact them. They would also like to know the maximum number of stories for such dwelling types. Not clear to me here? The same questions re types of buildings allowed and number of stories apply to other areas such as Horseshoe Bay and Cypress.</p> <p>Next paragraph states "Prioritizing mixed-use and apartment forms in core areas and ground oriented multi family forms (eg townhouses ,duplexes) to transition to adjacent single-family neighbourhoods" Again using the Ambleside Town centre Map I think residents want to understand where Apartments can be built and to what height , where townhomes can be built and to what height and where duplexes etc can be built- this is not clear to me from reading the plan.</p> <p>Section 2.1.16 re Advancing housing affordability, accessibility and sustainability- all sounds good in principal but who is going to pay for subsidies and how do you determine who is worthy and who is not? Affordable to whom? It is interesting that we had some lower rental housing and Council approved demolition and building of Cressey Apartment tower with units selling well over \$3 million each?</p> <p>2.1.20 re Use of District Owned Lands to create affordable housing There is a clear cost to taxpayers and how do we decide who is to benefit therefrom? Again affordable to whom?</p> <p>Planning of the new Cypress West Neighborhoods-starting at 2.2.7 -all sounds good but should we not determine what we will do with additional traffic- are there plans to add another link to the Highway? If not we are creating a traffic problem at the Cypress Bowl junction? We are of course in any event adding to the Upper Levels Highway Gridlock. I think this development should be deferred till we have solutions completed that relieve the gridlock that we have currently.</p> <p>2.3 Local Economy and Employment- All sounds good but very general statements that need an action plan and specifics to determine what , if anything, the Municipality can actually do. The focus on more retail and restaurants sounds wonderful but think of Amazon- Retail stores are struggling unless they can create a real experience that makes people want to visit. We also have many restaurants that struggle already- will adding more really help? With no growth in population in West Vancouver customer growth will have to come from attracting visitors from elsewhere in Lower</p>
--	--

	<p>Mainland- this will add to traffic gridlock and discourage further those who may consider coming.</p> <p>Our businesses and employers on the North Shore struggle today to get those willing to commute to North Shore to work. We are unlikely to be able to make it affordable for employees to live here so we need as a priority to make it easier for those employees by transit and road to get here!</p> <p>2.3.10 Supporting tourism and visitors- Again sounds good but how do you execute - also need to improve transit and road access to North Shore if you want to attract tourists and visitors. The Evening Entertainment sounds again wonderful but who are the customer base? We have an ageing population so not sure who we are catering to? Have we good feedback from our residents that they want this? Cypress Park is great but again it is attracting huge volumes of traffic and therefore this brings us back to the inadequacy of our road systems and transit.</p> <p>2.4 Transportation and Infrastructure - Surprising to me that we start off with walking and cycling? We are an ageing population living on the side of a mountain- is this really our top priority and that of our residents? I hope we are not following Vancouver by adding endless bike lanes and creating further traffic gridlock.</p> <p>Yes it would be good to have improved transit to connect communities and to other parts of Lower Mainland and not just downtown- not really sure of need for transit along Marine drive within West Vancouver nor who would use it- the demand I think is to make it easier to get to other Municipalities in lower Mainland (on and off North Shore)</p> <p>Expansion of the Ferry Terminal should be resisted without the Province investing in improved transit and road access (third crossing or additional lanes on our bridges)- The Ferry traffic is already a major contributor to the Gridlock on the Upper Levels and our bridges.</p> <p>2.4.12 Enhancing road network and sustainability I support but there is no real mention of what ought to be the very top of the list- A third crossing or additional lanes to our bridges- we need to get the Provincial and Federal Government to realise that the most significant volume of traffic to and from the North Shore is through traffic to Ferries, Squamish and Whistler and visitors to Grouse Mountain and Cypress Park- It is highly unlikely that those through travellers would use transit. It is also highly unlikely that Construction workers would use transit either.</p> <p>2.4.21- Prioritize sustainable transportation options and seek to reduce auto dependency in private and public development projects- a great goal but how do you actually get construction workers out of their cars? We need some concrete ideas here such as ensuring on all major developments that developer stores tools on site and provides compulsory ride sharing from say Burnaby and other locations.</p> <p>Bike sharing , car and ride sharing ? Have you actually asked residents if they would use that? I cannot see the demand for that now or in the medium future.</p> <p>Provide infrastructure for electric vehicles- do we really want to subsidize Tesla owners?</p>
--	---

	<p>Again our clear priority needs to be firstly improved road systems including more lanes of traffic to get on and off the North Shore and across the North Shore. Improved Transit to other Municipalities would be next.</p> <p>2.6 Parks and Environment- I think fair to say one of the joys of living here in West Vancouver is our Parks and access to the waterfront- lets keep that but also when we want to expand areas of plantings in our Parks be conscious of maintenance- I think often we cannot maintain adequately existing planted areas. We do need also improved Parking at Lighthouse Park.</p> <p>2.8 Social Well being- Section seems to be largely all Motherhood and Apple Pie- yes all worthy but how do you action and what are costs versus benefits.</p> <p>In general as taxpayers we have seen significant increases in our taxes and added billings for utilities- It is incumbent on our Municipal Government to manage costs and staffing demands very carefully to ensure the services are really meeting community wants and needs and to assist making living in our community more affordable. I am not convinced that enough attention paid to managing costs.</p> <p>In summary on speaking to many of my friends and acquaintances I think Residents priorities are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Traffic challenges and gridlock - we need a solution for residents, employees of our businesses and those passing through our community 2) Neighborhood character and concrete actions to address which is long overdue. 3) Provision of more housing options that fit nicely and architecturally into neighbourhoods- but definitely not large and very expensive high rise development 4) More affordable housing but I think recognised that there is no easy solution that is not very costly.
2018/03/26 2:38	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Concerns with public engagement on Draft OCP, including: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The time frame for public feedback (originally 4-weeks) is not nearly long enough; b. 2-week extension to deadline (to March 29) is still not enough, it also coincides with spring break (note – public given 2 months for feedback on Interim Tree Bylaw and while a difficult issue, arguably the OCP is far more complex, but only allowed 6 weeks); c. Staff refuse to meet with groups of citizens (e.g. ADRA hosted meeting) only with individuals or stakeholder boards of directors. (Note - Interim Tree Bylaw are hosting 4 education sessions to answer questions and collect comments before closing public input); d. No opportunity for citizens to hear and learn from others questions/comments, including stakeholder boards. The public is not provided with the results of staff's research. Community feedback must be made available to the public. (Example – At a presentation to CHAC, D. Hawkins said planning team went out to where seniors congregate and spoke to seniors. Where did staff go to reach out to seniors? Who/how many did staff talk to? What did you ask them and what were the responses?) This information must be provided before closing public input. e. No opportunity for public input on any revisions to the draft, except at a

Public Hearing. (An important and complex document such as the OCP, in all likelihood, will require more than a few "tweaks" to get right. The last OCP required a number of "back and forth" with the public before finalizing.)
f. Town Hall meeting planned AFTER deadline for public input.

2. The Draft excludes Squamish Nation land (IR#5), yet the Regional Growth Strategy (RGS) includes Squamish Nation lands in its projections for WV. The Squamish have a master plan which envisions significant residential development (which conceivably could meet most if not all of WV's housing needs) – this must be considered if we are to make informed decisions about WV's future, particularly relating to housing and traffic congestion.

3. Pg 4 indicates WV's population is expected to increase by ~10,000 people by 2041, however this is not supported by current trends. WV has historically gone through demographic cycles where population has decreased. What are projections for increase in population based on? Build it and they will come? What are the demographics and needs of this anticipated population increase? Per Urban Futures report (pg 26), adding a total of 10,682 residents over a 30-year period, would represent faster growth than was experienced over the past 30 years. Also, the Draft does not indicate how ~5,000 new housing units could be accommodated by 2041, it just provides some numbers.

4. Quality of life is of utmost importance but only briefly mentioned. The Draft does not identify specific quality of life factors (such as privacy, views, access to daylight, etc.) or say HOW we will protect them. QoL needs to be defined in measurable terms so we may monitor progress – are we going in the right direction?

5. Pg 5 ...our housing stock has limited options for seniors to downsize. I disagree with this statement. How can you substantiate this claim when there are over 1,000 units of multi-family strata or rental housing currently approved or under construction? Particularly as the Urban Futures report indicates that 61% of WV households are mortgage free. What hasn't been addressed is seniors that need to move into assisted living. (Note – Vancouver Coastal Health units are open to whole region – how to ensure WV seniors are accommodated?)

6. Pg 7 - Housing affordability and diversity.
The idea that adding more housing and smaller homes will be relatively more affordable/attainable than our housing stock today is not supported as evidenced by current and recent development (Grosvenor, Cressey, The Residences on Marine, Sewells, Evelyn by Onni, etc.)

7. Pg 8 – Climate Change does not address water shortage or storm drain capacity.

8. Pg 10 – OCP Review Process. It is not clear how public input will help refine this draft into a final proposal for Council's consideration. Will this be based on the most "mentions" received? The least objections? And why will public input only "refine" and not change or shape the final proposal?

9. I don't like or agree with the vision statement (pg 13 – What is our vision for an even better WV?) Define what a "complete, connected and inclusive community" is; what is a "vibrant economy"? This terminology is subjective and should be omitted. The vision statement should say something about

quality of life.

10. WV does not have a Housing Policy, yet as per Staff's Demographic, Housing and Employment Projections report (June 2016): the future population of West Vancouver will be determined in a large part by its housing policy and land use decisions.

(The 2012 Housing Action Plan is the closest thing we seem to have, but it's not a policy.)

11. The Draft does not define the goal(s), and quantitative metrics (measurable targets) for assessing attainment of them.

a. Pg 14 Objectives are not quantifiable or measurable, nor is it indicated how we will achieve them.

b. No base line numbers are provided – don't know what you're measuring from.

c. Housing & Neighbourhoods – build more diverse housing types, sizes, costs and tenures. Diversity is not an objective and I understand Staff will consider ANY new housing to be "diverse".

d. Transportation – By 2041, we aim to (have) 25% more people walking, cycling and taking transit. Why are you only measuring these 3 modes when objective is to improve transportation for ALL modes of transit?

e. Parks & Environment – protect our natural systems and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Why are we only measuring GHG emissions when protecting our natural systems is also listed as an objective?

f. Social Well-being – By 2041, we aim to (have) 20% greater participation in services & programs. Which services and programs?

12. The Draft does not provide an accompanying narrative to the policy statements to provide background and rationale and explain what is new and different from the policies outlined in the 2004 OCP. (This information is needed before public comment closes.)

13. Does the table of contents "themes" represent the OCP priorities? The Draft omits key themes (Section 2 – Community-Wide Directions) such as Arts & Culture, Neighbourhood Character, Commercial Neighbourhoods and Municipal Lands. It is not enough to interlace policy statements on these important topics throughout the 5 identified themes. The missing components are significant enough to deserve their own topic sections. (Case in point: the public has been anxious to comment on a location for a new Arts building, but are bounced back and forth between Parks & Recreation – who say this is a land use decision, and Planning staff – who say site-specific planning is not within the scope of the OCP.)

14. The Draft plan talks about Transportation but says very little about traffic congestion – a main priority for many – or about the projected impact of increased density on traffic congestion.

15. Pg 16, Item 2.1.7 - I have concerns with this. We should avoid site-specific (spot) zoning.

2nd bullet "Considering sites or assemblies that present a degree of physical separation from..." – change "degree" to a defined and retained boundary.

4th bullet "...apartment buildings to a maximum of three storeys" – need to specify height.

I agree with the 5th bullet item about reviewing form & character to support siting and designs that respond & contribute to neighbourhood context and character and would like to see this mentioned more in the Draft plan,

		<p>including in commercial areas.</p> <p>16. Pg 19, items 2.1.12 and 2.1.13 -- I disagree with both: The Marine Drive LAP was completed prior to the Draft OCP and in response to 3 development applications. There is nothing that supports or establishes how the allocation of these numbers (at 2.1.12 and 2.1.13) was determined. There has been no discussion with the public about the distribution of new housing units. These numbers have no basis in land availability or neighbourhood character. Allocation of area specific numbers (even estimates) do not belong in a high-level document. Is this a policy document or a land use plan? Is policy to build 1,000-1,200 new housing units in Ambleside?</p> <p>17. Pg 19, item 2.1.16 and Pg 32, item 2.3.11 - I disagree with the use of bonus density in the absence of a framework defining what bonus density is acceptable and in what circumstances -- there needs to be some metrics attached. By and large density bonuses have only given us more luxury condos. I would like to see other options besides bonus density.</p> <p>18. Pg 26, item 2.2.3 - I disagree with development over 1200 feet. This is contrary to public sentiment as established through the Upper Lands Working Group.</p> <p>19. The Draft Plan is full of words like "consider" or "explore" and short on action verbs. It does not provide a clear strategy (for example, a strategy that provides housing options for down-sizing seniors). It does not provide the clarity and certainty one needs to have a level of comfort and understanding about future development in WV. I have quite a few more comments, but have not finished formulating.</p>
2018/03/26 10:11	[REDACTED]	<p>I strongly object to the inclusion of 2.2.3. The work that it anticipates has already been done by the Upper Lands Working Group. They have already looked at whether it would be appropriate to develop lands above the 1200' limit and recommended not to.</p> <p>I strongly support the Upper Lands Working Group decision in their report and oppose reopening the issue for staff to revisit that decision as is being proposed in 2.2.3.</p> <p>I strongly object to considering and increase in OVERALL density below 1200' particularly because of the implications on density trading. If there is good reason to densify an area like Cypress Village, it would be better to transfer density and acquire land ownership for the public from other areas, like west of Eagle Creek, instead of increasing overall density.</p> <p>I have more comments that will be sent by email.</p>
2018/03/26 11:03	[REDACTED]	<p>I am concerned about the Ambleside area as that is the area where I live. I enjoy the area as it exists now and do not want to see the area lose its village charm and feel. The area south of Duchess Avenue should remain at a three storey maximum in height. I do encourage new developments that respect this height restriction. They will add new forms of residential living as well as commercial uses on the street level. The parks and pedestrian walkways should be respected as the seawall and the surrounding park areas are a key feature of the area.</p>

2018/03/26 11:06	[REDACTED]	<p>The draft OCP is too conservative from many people's view including myself. It is also unfair to many families in West Vancouver who want a change.</p> <p>Using Ambleside Town Centre Plan as an example, it is drawn way too small. In such a small and compacted area, new built and old aged houses co-exist. How can we ensure that 1200 new families can be accommodated.</p> <p>There are people who like the change and people who dislike. But regardless, land use change affects potential land value. So it's unfair for people who live in same tiny city but could not benefit of such changes.</p> <p>[REDACTED] Sentinel Hill. It's just about 5-minute drive to everywhere in West Vancouver - Park Royal Shopping Mall, Community Centre, Library, and restaurants and grocery stores along Marine Drive. Why can't the City consider making this area into a bigger Ambleside plan? Sentinel Hill has more old- aged houses which mean lower cost and east adopted approach to make the OCP changes.</p> <p>Sentinel Hill is just an example. What I want to suggest is to draw bigger areas for the OCP, such as 22th street to the east, and #1 highway to the south to be new Ambleside-Sentinel Hill Plan. Not only that more affordable houses could be expected in a balanced yet tiny Ambleside-Sentinel Hill area, relief pressure of traffic at Marine Drive and 13-21 street, but also be fair to every West Vancouverer.</p> <p>I welcome the new OCP and upcoming changes. I hope there will be more affordable apartments and townhouses built in every suitable and convenient area - with no age restriction. West Vancouver needs diversity of housing to keep and attract younger generations and families to live here, and together make the city more robust and energetic.</p>
2018/03/26 17:28	[REDACTED]	<p>We believe you have done a wonderful job on the OCP amendments and understand we need more units and options. Please be aware that often we live in an area because of the area and we do not want to lose the wonderful ambience created by the current residences. As you have noted any changes to single family zoning should be done carefully along with further resident input.</p> <p>Thanks you</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>
2018/03/26 17:28	[REDACTED]	<p>I agree with the content of the draft OCP, which is very well presented, but have a few questions/comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 2.1.20: A map showing surplus District-owned lands would be helpful. - 2.2.1, second bullet: Maximum or minimum of 2.5 units per gross acre? - 2.3.10: Why only support B&Bs and short term rentals in heritage buildings? Customers won't care if the units are heritage or not. Should only allowed in specified Zones. - Map 11 shows a future pedestrian/bike bridge over the Capilano River, from Keith Road to Klahnie Park. This I have heard of. However, 2.4.12, third bullet, mentions a Clyde Avenue - Klahanie Park road crossing, which Map 12 shows as connecting to the Lions Gate Bridge. This is new to me and would be a disaster for Clyde Avenue. It could make sense if the road skirted the bridge ramps and connected Taylor Way with the new town centre in North Van. - 2.7: Is there a distinction between "valuable parks" and other parks?

		- 2.9: There is no mention of the new Community Arts Centre, planned for Ambleside. This seems to be a major omission.
2018/03/26 17:36	[REDACTED]	<p>We live in Ambleside and encourage you to keep all possible parking along Argyle ave. For the following reasons</p> <p>1) Ambleside retailer do not have sufficient parking for their customer base and in order to prosper they require more not less parking.</p> <p>2) West Vancouver is a large geographic municipality and for all the residents to enjoy our waterfront we require parking which is convenient. We are fools to believe West Van residents will take transit to walk the sea wall.</p> <p>Thank you</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>
2018/03/27 11:46	[REDACTED]	<p>I strongly disapprove of the proposal of changing lower Ambleside all the way to Inglewood into a multi-dwelling /high density zone. It changes the entire character of the neighbourhood, and is a terrible idea - unfair to homeowners who have lived and paid taxes in this neighbourhood. It infuriates me how Dunderave can be left untouched, but why Ambleside is proposed ago change all the way to Inglewood? I can see Fulton, where there are already a number of high density dwellings, but Inglewood? Come on, planners, do better for your residents.</p>
2018/03/27 15:51	[REDACTED]	<p>Thank you so much for addressing the limited housing options in West Vancouver. We need diversity in housing! I am totally in support of the measures described in (2.1) of the OCP, specifically action to enable and promote smaller homes on smaller lots, and infill housing to include coach houses, townhomes and more. If anything, stretch these boundaries as far as possible! I would also urge that going forward, for any new developments, strict limits are placed on lot and house size, and that diverse and affordable housing options are included in all new projects.</p> <p>Many thanks for your efforts on this!</p> <p>Regards, [REDACTED]</p>
2018/03/27 18:09	[REDACTED]	<p>Hello;</p> <p>[REDACTED] My comment to the proposed changes is ...that it is about time!</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>I have noticed growth and revitalization in many areas other than West Van - Port Moody, Coquitlam, lower Lonsdale, Cambie corridor come to mind.</p> <p>I think it is important that our young people including nurses, teachers, police officers etc. can have a chance to live here. I think the towers at Park Royal will be a welcome addition as that location is near transit and close to downtown.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>
2018/03/27 20:37	[REDACTED]	<p>I don,t like the idea of increasing density. We came to west vancouver for its quietness, safety and natural beauty. With more high rise , condo, town homes, it could lead to congestion and conflicts. Please don,t make west vancouver burnaby. Thank you.</p>

2018/03/28 8:30	<p>Would like to see more public washrooms along Marine Drive so that businesses do not have to allow pedestrians to use their facilities - too much clean up & disruption to business</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Would like to see more community friendly activities close to the parks & Marine Drive to draw people here -Would like to see a "Steveston" type pier so that people would visit during the spring, summer & fall more regularly -Would like to see West Van businesses get first opportunity to showcase their businesses at festivals like Harmony Arts. We pay taxes & rents all year but other food trucks & companies are right in the middle of the action, getting the majority of business. -allow permits for food businesses to have "side walk" sales in front of their stores on Marine Drive. -Create more art walls, art streets, more beautification away from only Bellevue & the beach. -Encourage scenic walking & running routes along other streets - have a visual marker representing points of interest. -Make Ambleside and Dundarave more of a community - with outdoor patios with umbrellas, etc like Edgemont Village.
2018/03/28 8:32	Parking!
2018/03/28 8:33	Parking is urgent.
2018/03/28 8:35	<p>██████████</p> <p>We need parking! We lose customers every day because they can't park.</p>
2018/03/28 8:37	<p>██████████</p> <p>We need parking! Our customers will not stop if there is no parking!</p>
2018/03/28 8:39	<p>Parking is the problem. As a merchant we cannot stay in business. Relators/office workers/etc are taking spaces and moving their cars every two hours. Put in PAID parking.</p> <p>Like 4th, like 10th, like Stanley Park - No one complains but they do come and use our seawall and beaches as parking is FREE here. You will lose the tax base of business if this continues!!</p>
2018/03/28 8:46	<p>As a business owner in Ambleside ██████████ it is clear to me that long term planning is not a strength for West Van District. Unfortunately for too long you have listening and been swayed by a very loud minority ██████████</p> <p>██████████ affects the economics of their community.</p> <p>The clear answer to the future of Ambleside is density, without it the business community will disappear. Allowing more building will answer many of the concerns of business owners such as a provide more parking (a very serious concern), increase customer traffic and attract a younger more diverse demographic.</p> <p>As the new Grosvenor Building is set to open I am excited to see how the landscape on Marine Dr. has changed. The shanty town that once stood there has been replaced by something that gives Ambleside some excitement, animation and ██████████ appeal, none of which we have seen in the area for far too long! I imagine what the other side of the street could look like, how great it would be to finally realize Ambleside's full potential instead of relying on it's ancient past. Please consider DENSITY. Thank you!</p>

2018/03/28 8:54	<p>I think this is one of the better OCP that I have seen in [REDACTED] W. Van - it is easy to read, clear, good maps etc. I personally think that the market place should determine the housing - not the government. My concern now is for those that live in Ambleside. [REDACTED] - my first condo Ambleside is an interesting place to live - no upscale feeling [REDACTED] - heavy mix of rentals & owners, mixed nationalities, mixed ages, etc. the stores, sidewalks, roads also a mix of poor & slightly improved.</p> <p>The draw for me [REDACTED] was being able to walk to the ocean, walk to get my groceries, medical help etc. & hopefully this will be my last move - if I am lucky.</p> <p>When the council is considering higher & higher density for this area I hope that they will think about those that have made this area their home long before it was so desirable. Most of these people are elderly, limited income etc. more noise, construction, loss of view etc. is not going to enhance their remaining years.</p> <p>The density of Ambleside should include the thousands of people we have to deal with from about April to end of Sept - we can't stop people from coming to the beaches, playing field, concerts etc. but we are the ones that have to accomodate them.</p> <p>Please close off ARGYLE behind the Silk Purse (at least from April till the end of Sept) - it is too dangerous - someone is going to get seriously hurt!</p>
2018/03/28 11:08	<p>No hotels! This is a residential community, not a resort! p. 6 Our population is aging - Stats Canada indicates that in 2017, 16% of the population is under 14. In West Van, it is 14%, so compare with the Canadian population, not the 1961 population of under 14. Looks like social engineering at work. Along with W.V. N. V. City, White Rock, and Port Moody have lower dev may be because there is limited land... duh.</p> <p>Smaller households in Ambleside should not be a mystery - as people age, they lose their partner and downsize. RRIF rules affect income.</p> <p>How do you reconcile an aging population with increased cycling? Do you really expect that cycling will reduce traffic? Old people will not be cycling our hills. Infrastructure and traffic needs addressing first! Basic laws of supply and demand influence housing costs. How will the large number of low paying jobs allow for people to live closer to work? Eagle Island should not be exempt from development. Empty houses would fill need for population growth without any development. Businesses are closing or moving due to high rents that needs addressing. It is not only expensive to live here, but to do business here. Paving over Ambleside will increase GH gases. Leave greenspace around new builds. Parking is a nightmare in Ambleside unless for bank, supermarket or pharmacy. Just because Marine Drive is a bus route, it should not be a tunnel of highrises. Wayfinding is a good idea - check out Europe - tall signposts with directions and distance. How is livability and quality of life measured? I do not want W.V. to resemble Dubai or even the West End. Views are important to quality of life and property values. Allowing bonus height is unacceptable; will have some fights over again over variances. No more Grosvenors by air it is a monstrosity and is only half built. [REDACTED] These are not for "missing middle". Keep low heights on Marine - don't turn us into N. Van Marine tunnel. Consult with citizens. We are not a planning textbook, and should not be forced to adhere to planning dept's idea of what is "best". No bonus density.</p> <p>1000-1200 new units in Ambleside is excessive. Spread it out. Will ruin community. No buildings on waterfront. We have lowest mil rate in Metro - don't keep financing municipality with development fees; is not sustainable. Will zoning change to expand area of multifamily dwellings? We need to</p>

		<p>know the vision. Considering moving, not because I cannot afford it or housing is not meeting my needs, but the ongoing construction/road closures/noise is becoming unbearable. Lack of rentals and expensive housing is not unique to W. Van. We cannot afford subsidized housing, as nice as that sounds. Unlikely both partners in a family will work where they live - not realistic expectation.</p> <p>Brick & mortar stores are dying. Malls are struggling across N. America. People are buying online. Emphasize services. This is not the 1980s. Increased density has not lowered prices e.g. Horseshoe Bay. This is a misguided assumption. Have not seen a single bike on "bike lane to nowhere" from 13th to Taylor Way via Clyde/Keith. Total waste of money. Need to consult with citizens before slavishly following City of Van philosophy.</p> <p>Land prices biggest part of housing costs. Need good R.O.I. for rentals. Not realistic to have affordable housing.</p> <p>Diverse housing options needed in Caulfeild/shopping ctr. area. Language open to wide interpretation - review, encourage, consider, support means nothing.</p> <p>Use of transit related to income. 36. Sounds nice, but unrealistic. P. 39 - emerging utility needs eg. water are critical - before 1200 more units</p> <p>p. 2 Slow growth and high prices are related to little developable or available land - supply and demand; there is little that can be done about that. Rows of highrises do not increase affordability. Look at current developments in WV and elsewhere.</p> <p>Have any studies been done about desired housing options. This is anecdotal.</p> <p>Most ageing apartments/condos are well kept. Replacing them will reduce affordability. Look at Cressey on Marine.</p> <p>p. 66 - 2.1.8 Yes, control the likes of homes on consolidated lots and building up property site to improve view at expense of neighbours.</p> <p>P. 19/20 No bonus density.</p> <p>Don't sell District lands for rentals, development, etc. Lease it.</p> <p>Storm drains are overloaded now. Paving over green spaces and increasing density will exacerbate infrastructure issues.</p> <p>p. 33 Need to coordinate with Squamish Nation on development. Green buildings should have costs borne by owners/developments, not by reducing livability of current residents with bonus density.</p> <p>Costs will be recouped in energy savings.</p>
2018/03/28 11:14	[REDACTED]	<p>Horseshoe Bay cannot live with BCFerry when they say that Vancouver Island ferries will stay in the three berths. BCFerry put 10,000 cars into our Trans-Canada highway each DAY. There is no reason to put the Nanaimo ferries in the Horseshoe Bay. They have 5 berths in Tsawwassen and can put 2 new berths. Trans-Canada highway cannot use West Vancouver or North Vancouver. We would like to have the Sea & Sky highway into West and North Vancouver. The #1 Highway can be used from Langley with a new road close to White Rock to be #99 and #1 and use the #17 to Tsawwassen Ferry Terminal.</p> <p>I have to show that I hate the Trans Mountain pipeline use a freight in our port plus in our West Vancouver coast. They should use the new highway from Langley to Tsawwassen (the new #1) and use the new Superport #2.</p>
2018/03/28 11:15		<p>I totally agreed to build more low-rise and high-rise in both Ambleside Town Centre and Taylor Way corridor. It will attract more people to move to West Vancouver if they worked in downtown.</p>
2018/03/28 11:17		<p>I lived in West Vancouver [REDACTED] I wish the city in West Vancouver can build more condos. I want to downsize my house. I want to live in a</p>

2018/03/28 13:18	[REDACTED]	<p>condo because it is more easily to manage. I can save more money for my retirement. Please build more affordable condos in West Vancouver.</p> <p>I am [REDACTED] a long term resident of the North Shore [REDACTED] and a former resident of West Vancouver [REDACTED]. I am writing in support of the draft OCP. I have attended some of the previous committee meetings and consultation on the draft OCP. I plan to attend future meetings involving the OCP and will speak to Council on this topic.</p> <p>My comments relate to Housing and Neighbourhoods. I support the subsections in 2.1.1 - 2.1.23. I believe more rental units are needed in West Van and that there should also be protection of the existing rental stock. As these units age the units become more affordable.</p> <p>[REDACTED] my Mother [REDACTED] moved into a rental apartment in West Van [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] the rental vacancy rate had dropped below 1% and there is a serious housing crisis. Other long term residents would like to downsize but are often unable to find a suitable housing option in the District.</p> <p>The OCP is encouraging more diversity in housing options which will help maintain a healthy community.</p> <p>Reduced parking requirements should also be encouraged in future developments. This can improve affordability and encourage use of public transit.</p> <p>I look forward to the next steps in moving this OCP forward to approval during the current term of this Council.</p> <p>Respectfully Submitted [REDACTED]</p>
2018/03/28 16:50	[REDACTED]	<p>I support the zoning changes to 1300 block to 21st block. I do believe there are more opportunities for cluster developments that tie in with services and schools. Anything around Pauline Johnson School from 22nd to 21st up to Kings and down to Marine Drive should be zoned multi-family. Also everything east of the rec center from Fulton Avenue to Marine Drive.</p> <p>We are now one of the only communities in the Lower Mainland that is losing population due to the price changes of properties in the past 10 years. By not focusing on multi family and affordable housing we have stopped the flow of families into West Vancouver and in fact many families are leaving West Vancouver because there are many streets in West Vancouver that sit empty or have residents who use the homes as vacation properties or don't have kids. The family lifestyle has been what West Vancouver always was the envy of other municipalities.</p> <p>I have primary school children in the public system and I can see what is coming....with no new families...schools will have to close. We are already filling up our empty spaces with kids from Vancouver and North Vancouver.</p> <p>Times have changed throughout the Lower Mainland as the price of real estate has increased and West Vancouver has not kept up with the changes.</p> <p>We need zoning changes the OCP. All artillery roads like Taylor Way, 15th Street, 21st Street should also be zoned multi-family.</p> <p>Please pass the proposed changes.</p>

1. Concerns with public engagement on Draft OCP, including:
 - a. The time frame for public feedback (originally 4-weeks) is not nearly long enough;
 - b. 2-week extension to deadline (to March 29) is still not enough, it also coincides with spring break (note – public given 2 months for feedback on Interim Tree Bylaw and while a difficult issue, arguably the OCP is far more complex, but only allowed 6 weeks);
 - c. Staff refuse to meet with groups of citizens (e.g. ADRA hosted meeting) only with individuals or stakeholder boards of directors. (Note - Interim Tree Bylaw are hosting 4 education sessions to answer questions and collect comments before closing public input.);
 - d. No opportunity for citizens to hear and learn from others questions/comments, including stakeholder boards. The public is not provided with the results of staff's research. Community feedback must be made available to the public before deadline for input. (Example – At a presentation to CHAC, D. Hawkins said planning team went out to where seniors congregate and spoke to seniors. Where did staff go to reach out to seniors? Who/how many did staff talk to? What did you ask them and what were the responses?)
 - e. No opportunity for public input on any revisions to the draft, except at a Public Hearing. (An important and complex document such as the OCP, in all likelihood, will require more than a few "tweaks" to get right. The last OCP required a number of "back and forth" with the public before finalizing.)
 - f. Townhall meeting planned AFTER deadline for public input (should be before deadline for public comment).

2. The Draft excludes Squamish Nation land (IR#5), yet the Regional Growth Strategy (RGS) includes Squamish Nation lands in its projections for WV. The Squamish have a master plan which envisions significant residential development (which conceivably could meet most if not all of WV's housing needs) – this must be considered if we are to make informed decisions about WV's future, particularly relating to housing and traffic congestion.

3. Pg 4 indicates WV's population is expected to increase by ~10,000 people by 2041, however this is not supported by current trends. WV has historically gone through demographic cycles where population has decreased. What are projections for increase in population based on? Build it and they will come? What are the demographics and needs of this anticipated population increase? Per Urban Futures report (pg 26), adding a total of 10,682 residents over a 30-year period, would represent faster growth than was experienced over the past 30 years. Also, the Draft does not indicate how ~5,000 new housing units could be accommodated by 2041, it just provides some numbers.

4. Quality of life is of utmost importance but only briefly mentioned. The Draft does not identify specific quality of life factors (such as privacy, views, access to daylight, etc.) or say HOW we will protect them. QoL needs to be defined in measurable terms so we may monitor progress – are we going in the right direction?

5. Pg 5 ...our housing stock has limited options for seniors to downsize. I disagree with this statement. How can you substantiate this claim when there are about 1,000 units of multi-family strata or rental housing currently approved or under construction? Particularly as the Urban Futures report indicates that 61% of WV households are mortgage free. What hasn't been addressed is seniors that need to move into assisted living. (Note –

Vancouver Coastal Health units are open to whole region – how to ensure WV seniors are accommodated?)

6. Pg 7 - Housing affordability and diversity.

The idea that adding more housing and smaller homes will be relatively more affordable/attainable than our housing stock today is not supported as evidenced by current and recent development (Grosvenor, Cressey, The Residences on Marine, Sewells, Evelyn by Onni, etc.)

The Draft plan should provide criteria for assessing the impact of past and anticipated growth on affordable housing; and show the current supply-demand for affordable housing and the supply-demand for affordable housing with anticipated growth. It should recommend actions for resolving the shortage of affordable housing and provide the factual basis for the effectiveness for each action.

7. Pg 10 – OCP Review Process. It is not clear how public input will help refine this draft into a final proposal for Council's consideration. Will this be based on the most "mentions" received? The least objections? And why will public input only "refine" and not change or shape the final proposal?

8. Pg 13 – I don't like or agree with the vision statement. Define what a "complete, connected and inclusive community" is; what is a "vibrant economy"? This terminology is subjective and should be omitted. The vision statement should say something about quality of life.

9. WV does not have a Housing Policy, yet as per Staff's Demographic, Housing and Employment Projections report (June 2016): the future population of West Vancouver will be determined in a large part by its housing policy and land use decisions.

(The 2012 Housing Action Plan is the closest thing we seem to have, but it's not a policy.)

10. The Draft does not define the goal(s), and quantitative metrics (measurable targets) for assessing attainment of them.

a. Pg 14 Objectives are not quantifiable or measurable, nor is it indicated how we will achieve them.

b. No base line numbers are provided – don't know what you're measuring from.

c. Housing & Neighbourhoods – build more diverse housing types, sizes, costs and tenures. Diversity is not an objective and I understand Staff will consider ANY new housing to be "diverse".

d. Transportation – By 2041, we aim to (have) 25% more people walking, cycling and taking transit. Why are you only measuring these 3 modes when objective is to improve transportation for ALL modes of transit?

e. Parks & Environment – protect our natural systems and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Why are we only measuring GHG emissions when protecting our natural systems is also listed as an objective?

f. Social Well-being – By 2041, we aim to (have) 20% greater participation in services & programs. Which services and programs?

11. The Draft does not provide an accompanying narrative to the policy statements to provide background and rationale and explain what is new and different from the policies outlined in the 2004 OCP. (This information is needed before public comment closes.)

12. Does the table of contents "themes" represent the OCP priorities?

The Draft omits key themes (Section 2 – Community-Wide Directions) such as Arts & Culture, Neighbourhood Character, Commercial Neighbourhoods and Municipal Lands. It is not enough to interlace policy statements on these important topics throughout the five identified themes. The missing components are significant enough to deserve their own topic sections. (Case in point: the public has been anxious to comment on a location for a new art building; but are bounced back and forth between Parks & Recreation – who say this is a land use decision, and Planning staff – who say site-specific planning is not within the scope of the OCP.)

13. The Draft plan talks about Transportation but says very little about traffic congestion – a main priority for many – or about the projected impact of increased density on traffic congestion. The plan should set forth the congestion level of service deemed acceptable then show current congestion for major intersections and the congestion for major intersections with anticipated growth. The plan should recommend actions for resolving congestion and provide the factual basis for the effectiveness of each action.

14. Pg 16, Item 2.1.7 - I have concerns with this. We should avoid site-specific (spot) zoning.
2nd bullet "Considering sites or assemblies that present a degree of physical separation from..." -- change "degree" to a defined and retained boundary.
4th bullet "...apartment buildings to a maximum of three storeys" -- need to specify height.
I agree with the 5th bullet item about reviewing form & character to support siting and designs that respond & contribute to neighbourhood context and character and would like to see this mentioned more in the Draft plan, including in commercial areas.

15. Pg 19, items 2.1.12 and 2.1.13 – I disagree. Housing unit numbers (even as "estimates") should be removed from this document (including on pg 15 – Regenerating our neighbourhoods with an estimated 300-400 new sensitive infill units; and Expanding missing middle (e.g. triplex, townhouse, mixed-use) options with an estimated 300-350 new units.)
The Marine Drive LAP was completed prior to the Draft OCP and in response to 3 development applications.
There is nothing that supports or establishes how the allocation of these numbers (at 2.1.12 and 2.1.13) was determined.
The housing unit estimates do not appear to be based on analysis of data-based growth trends and projections.
There has been no discussion with the public about the distribution of new housing units.
These numbers have no basis in land availability or neighbourhood character.
Allocation of area specific numbers (even estimates) do not belong in a high-level document.
Is this a policy document or a land use plan? Is policy to build 1,000-1,200 new housing units in Ambleside?
Putting housing unit numbers (even estimates) in this high-level document moves beyond what we've been talking about (objectives and policies) and focus ends up on "how do we meet these estimates". These numbers (even as "estimates") will be used by developers to leverage their applications and staff will be inclined to support those applications based on the "suggestions" provided in the OCP.

16. Pg 19, item 2.1.14 – Prepare local area plans by: Confirming

boundaries and new unit estimates through local area planning processes should be changed to CONSIDERING boundaries through the local area planning processes.

17. Pg 19, item 2.1.15 – Pending adoption of local area plan, consider proposals within the local area plan boundary by: ... This entire bullet (2.1.15) should be eliminated – it is not a policy and is so broad it opens the door to any rezoning application to come forward (NOT the specificity the public has been asking for) and allows for development before we've finished Part 2 of the OCP.

18. Pg 19, item 2.1.16, Pg 20, item 2.1.17 and Pg 32, item 2.3.11 (and wherever else bonus density is mentioned) – I disagree with the use of bonus density in the absence of a framework defining what bonus density is acceptable and in what circumstances – there needs to be some metrics attached. By and large density bonuses have only given us more luxury condos. I would like to see other options besides bonus density.

19. Pg 19, item 2.1.17 – I disagree with reducing off-street parking requirements. Lack of parking is a common complaint, even in residential neighbourhoods it's a problem for visiting guests to find street parking.

20. Pg 31, item 2.3.1 – Emphasize Ambleside Municipal Town Centre as the heart of WV with commercial land uses such as: Retail, service and restaurants centred on a vibrant, urban, "main street"; – Omit "vibrant" and "urban", vibrant is too subjective and urban is at odds with seaside village character of Ambleside.

21. Pg 31, item 2.3.4 – Regenerate Dundarave and Caulfeild Village Centres with small-scale, street-level retail, service and restaurants, secondary office use, and mixed residential and commercial uses. Include Ambleside village.

22. Pg 31, item 2.3.6 – Expand commercial and mixed-use zones to broaden economic opportunities and stimulate employment growth. I disagree with this. WV is purposely a predominantly residential community. Also, your population profile estimates indicate there will be a 72% increase in seniors and only 20% in older adults and 9% younger adults. The expected demographics suggests people will be retiring from the work force as they age, so commercial space requirements should reduce.

23. Pg 31, item 2.3.7 – ...provide for ancillary and secondary marine related uses at marinas. What do you have in mind? Would this allow for a bistro at the Hollyburn Sailing Club? There isn't public support for commercial structures on the waterfront.

24. Pg 33, item 2.3.18 – Support small business. It is not the District's responsibility to assist start-up businesses. I think the District would do better to support existing small businesses by improving sidewalks and lighting, encouraging businesses to beautify commercial areas, improving parking and exploring creative solutions to keep lease rates in check (like keeping the commercial area strictly commercial as the City of Vancouver has done with Denman and Davie streets).

25. Pg 33, item 2.3.19 – Consider opportunities to support economic objectives on District-owned lands. I need more information, what might this

		<p>mean/look like?</p> <p>26. Pg 26, item 2.2.3 - I disagree with development over 1200 feet. This is contrary to public sentiment as established through the Upper Lands Working Group.</p> <p>27. Pg 39 – Water Conservation. The Draft does not provide criteria for assessing water supply adequacy. Need to show the current drought-period water supply and demand and how that will change with anticipated growth. The Draft also needs to show how recommended actions for resolving water supply deficiencies and provide the factual basis for the effectiveness of each action.</p> <p>28. The Draft Plan is full of words like "consider" or "explore" and short on action verbs. It does not provide a clear strategy (for example, a strategy that provides housing options for down-sizing seniors). It does not provide the clarity and certainty one needs to have a level of comfort and understanding about future development in WV.</p> <p>This is as far as I've managed to get. I haven't had time to go over the remainder of the Draft in detail.</p>
2018/03/29 7:24		I support subdivision and gentle densification. We absolutely need to create housing diversity in West Vancouver; the life of the community is at risk if we don't.
2018/03/29 9:41		<p>West Vancouver is losing population and we need to help that by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) increase the FSR so more towers and properties can be built. 2) bringing tourism and attractions to the city and therefore provide Hotels, hubs, restaurants, etc 3) allowing more residential, rental and commercial areas on Marine Drive and Bellevue and making those places the hub. Specially hotels and attractions.
2018/03/29 9:44		<p>West Vancouver population is decreasing and the jobs too. To help that we need:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) INCREASE the FSR so that more and bigger buildings can be built to offer housing. 2) bring tourism and attraction and support that by building HOTELS, restaurants, hubs, etc
2018/03/29 10:07		West Vancouver isn't capitalizing on it's potential. We need to increase FSR to increase housing, rentals and population and we need to attract tourists by putting boutique hotels and attraction spots, restaurants, hubs, etc
2018/03/29 11:03		with foresight and persistence there is an opportunity to incorporate and utilize the railway (former BCR, currently CN) line that runs through WV. This could provide a convenient and efficient travel option for commuters to board a commuter service along the rail line and travel to the Sea Bus terminal to commute to downtown Vancouver's central business core and also link to the Sky Train for continued commuting to municipalities outside the downtown Vancouver core

2018/03/29 12:09

The OCP process has provided a very welcome opportunity to provide input and I thank Council for extending and supporting this initiative. Their conclusions are still vague at this point but there seems little doubt that Council would like to increase density in the areas which already have the highest densities. If one translates the vague numbers and ideas to concrete buildings, traffic and likely affordability the measures suggested do not, (unfortunately), seem likely to improve land use, create a better living environment or indeed encourage business to locate to our denser areas. Doing new or different things is always harder and may alienate a different and perhaps vocal minority within the community. It does seem though that this is an important point in the development of the District and we really should look at alternatives that emphasise our values and our considerable attributes to the benefit of all. We have 90%, (plus), of our available land tied up in expensive single family homes, some very large. We need to ask if a 6,000 sq ft single family home is really that different to a quadplex of the same size and style? Why this might be so, and should the OCP care?. We need to evaluate the impact of adding all expansion to specific neighbourhoods that comprise a small portion of our total, versus spreading out the density by infilling between single and multifamily homes, and mandating a more reasonable size for new development. There is clearly a tipping point where adding density destroys neighbourhoods and it seems we could well be close ... and of course we also seem to have ambitions to add more commercialisation to the waterfront at the same time.....

Before looking in detail at what is suggested and trying to suggest alternate approaches it is likely useful to look at our major issues and how/why they have developed.

a)Housing affordability

The rising land costs have made building affordable homes difficult. At one time, (not too long ago), Ambleside was a place where one could find condominiums at reasonable prices, what is being built now seems to start at \$1500 a square foot if one is very lucky. Horseshoe Bay, as well, used to provide reasonable housing for seniors and young families. The latest new development there turns out to be anything but affordable, with prices at around \$1000 a square foot. One cannot expect a young family to live in 400 square feet of space, nor can one expect that they can finance a 1.5 million dollar "starter home". Unfortunately we have continued to make decisions that take us in exactly the wrong direction. We have lots of land, but the tendency has always been to try and cram more into the already dense areas which already have very high land costs and at the same time to use land wastefully to build low density suburbs. Taking the so called flexible zoning approach that was shoehorned into the OCP by a previous Council, the current Council has managed to approve buildings in a low density zone that are close to double that allowed in the denser, so called apartment zone in Ambleside. Such zoning flexibility hands developers who manage to assemble larger properties a wonderful payday, and, as a result, landowners believe they can get more for their land by waiting rather than conforming to the current OCP. Unfortunately these developments typically house very large apartments, so the actual people or unit density is low, and the cost per square foot is such that very few people working within Ambleside could even think of affording them. Such developments solve none of our real problems, and their approval is one of the major factors driving the increase in housing costs in Ambleside/Dundarave; they will also encourage the future demolition of smaller more affordable rental units. The new buildings often offer retail or restaurants at ground level, these draw additional, non local,

non commuting, traffic to the area and will make large demands on parking often with little provided for them by the developer. Someone will have to pay the capital and service costs of the additional parking and one has to believe that larger facilities should pay these costs so as to maintain a level playing field with existing business.

b)Traffic density and the environment

Congestion is now a major problem in the Metro Vancouver area. West Vancouver has made some particularly unfortunate planning decisions that have lead to the concentration of District wide facilities in a very small proportion of our land base, on the very edge of the District. The Park Royal mall lies on a major pinch point for most commuters. The mall expansion and condominium developments, over the past 10 years or so, have lead to considerably increased non commuting traffic being added to the normal flow. (The fact that the mall is separated by 6 lanes of traffic and that there is no pedestrian under or overpass does not help). We have continued to add residents along the same Marine Drive corridor in Ambleside and Dunderave where the secondary retail and business areas are concentrated. As mentioned in the previous paragraph, newer developments aim to add retail and restaurants to ground floors which attracts additional non commuting traffic. We have also seen fit to locate our library and main recreation centre on the same stretch.

At the same time as "densifying" with large expensive units in Anbleside, we have also built a considerable number of very large, (and extremely low people density), developments above the Upper Levels with little in the way of facilities or neighbourhood employment opportunities. This has created considerably more traffic down 15th Street and Taylor Way for those residents to commute, shop, make use of services etc, again in the same Park Royal/Ambleside/Dunderave areas.

Council needs to look very carefully at how close the existing Marine Drive and Taylor way routes are to capacity. As we approach full capacity, small increases in volume lead to increasingly large increases in congestion; adding just a few more trips per hour has the potential to create huge queues. The latter is important, not just because of the frustration involved, but because pollution from automobiles is much higher in stop and go traffic than when moving steadily. Finally it is well established that one should not place extensive developments along already busy roads. It is especially important to avoid continuous high buildings on the side of such roads since they trap much more of the pollution. (These buildings also create large continuous shadows through the winter months, as well as unduly restricting view corridors in both directions). The health issues related to living along busy roads, have been identified and confirmed, one can see horrible examples of this sort of development along busy streets in metro Vancouver and the start of this in West Vancouver. Fairly recent studies have mapped pollution in the Vancouver area, including the Ambleside/Park Royal corridor; we need to study these, and update the data before moving to densify the Marine Drive and Taylor Way corridors further. (It would have been a very good idea to have done this when money was being thrown at "Ambleside Now" and the Grosvenor development which offends on all of the above counts).

c)Parking

It seems strange to talk about a parking problem when one refers to local shopping neighbourhoods that, by definition, should provide good pedestrian access and adequate parking. Unfortunately we already have a situation where the local retail areas have a chronic shortage of parking. Pedestrian

access can also be challenging because of traffic volume and speed. The problems in our core contribute to the popularity of the low rise, parking and pedestrian friendly Park Royal Village which poses a serious threat to maintaining a vibrant centre in Ambleside. We have allowed this situation to develop in Ambleside and to a lesser extent in Dundarave. The reasons are many, but if our population is not increasing even as we add housing units, then we need to be building a different type of housing to accommodate young people, families and yes seniors on limited incomeand the environment has to be pedestrian friendly.

Demographics

Adding to our current issues, we will have a large number of the baby boomers retiring over the next 10 years. It would seem sensible for them to have opportunities to stay within the District, but be able to move to smaller accommodations. To make this possible we, (ideally), have to provide pedestrian friendly "village centre type environments" so that when they give up their cars they can still live an independent life style. Ideally of course the cost of these accommodations should be equal to or lower than that of the single family homes on the West side of the District that they will likely vacate in retirement. The alternative is to try and service these people in their current homes and that seems unlikely to be feasible within the current scheme of things.

Each of the basic problems discussed above influences the decisions each one of us makes on a daily basis, the problems also tend to augment each other. As an example, not having affordable housing drives younger families and people working in West Vancouver outside the District. These people then commute back to West Vancouver, adding to the traffic and the parking problems. As another example, the rising land costs are undoubtedly related directly to the expectation of increased density that developers believe is possible in Ambleside/Park Royal/Dundarave. Such policies then form a positive feedback loop which makes building reasonable cost accommodation in pedestrian friendly clusters extremely unlikely unless we stop doing what we are doing and take a more considered view of things..

All of the above issues are amenable to improvement through the OCP but I see relatively little attempt to address them. Nothing on traffic, very little on affordability. The solution apparently is to add density to Marine Drive, Taylor Way, Horseshoe Bay and the new "mountain village". So how does this help, other than comply to some random number pulled out by the RGS? Will these be low cost units? Will the people living in these units be able to shop, work, play locally, or will they be adding again to the traffic woes? We should remember that West Vancouver has been adding units in most years over the last decade, and as we do this population continues to drift down, again, we need to do something different.

I would like to say, (again), that I very much appreciate the effort underlying the OCP initiative. I agree that now is the time to make fairly radical changes to how we think about lifestyles, values, communities, and how we can use a new OCP to move ourselves forward. My hope for West Vancouver is that we capitalise on our natural surroundings, that we manage to break out of the typical metro Vancouver planning mode, and that we move to a concentration upon the creation and preservation of several independent village style locations across the District. What I mean by a village style location is an area which is pedestrian friendly, (and likely by definition through traffic unfriendly!), that contains most of the necessities, (shopping

and services), within walking distance. We should strive to add educational facilities to these, and we should seek to compete for employment opportunities in these areas. Most importantly, the location and style of any increased units should allow their cost to be affordable.

it is fairly obvious that the basis of such neighbourhoods already exist in West Vancouver and we could consider encouraging areas which have not blossomed in the past. Unfortunately, some of the older centres such as Ambleside and Park Royal are suffering from the affects of traffic, overbuilding, and overly expensive new housing; likely Dundarave will be next. For most residents it seems the questions is how can we modernise, accomodate more population in an affordable manner, and still retain a healthy environment? The answer, provided we are really considering current residents, rather than a different target group, is categorically not to build more monstrous \$2000-\$3000 per square foot condo buildings along Marine Drive and Taylor Way, nor does it seem that adding considerably more commercial and recreational activity along the waterfront will be positive for local residents. So what might work?

a) Why not start to recreate the village environments through traffic calming. One would normally expect that traffic regulations would be more stringent in areas of high population density, especially if there is a high proportion of either children or seniors. We have added low speed zones in the West of the district while traffic moves much too fast through high population shopping zones in Ambleside, Dundarave and Park Royal. The answer to this in many European towns has been to banish traffic from these zones comletely. The latter requires the building of parkades on the outskirts of the regions. A less invasive approach is to allow only public transit through these zones and the least pedestrian friendly approach is to simply regulate local traffic speed at a much lower level, say 30km/hr. The imposition of such a limit on Marine Drive or Taylor Way would likely not impact Lions Gate traffic which at best has one lane in each direction on the bridge at a maximum of 60km/hour to service all Marine and Taylor Way traffic bound to or from Vancouver.

b) Instead of providing \$2000-\$3000/sq ft condos along Marine and Taylor Way that have negative impacts on traffic, parking, pollution and general affordability, why not concentrate on smaller, lower cost, infill projects in these areas and start to acquire land around other potential "village centres" where costs can be more easily controlled and suitable low cost accomodation provided.

c) Lets think hard about the influence of further commercialisation of the waterfront. We are not starting from an industrial site as is the case in Lower Lonsdale or False Creek/Granville Island; they perhaps have an excuse for just paving everything over. Lets also think about other pieces of waterfront rather than just Ambleside Beach and the seawall,from Sandy Cove, Caulfield Cove, Cypress, Lighthouse, Eagle Harbour, Gleaneagles, to Whytecliffe. We can do tasteful things there too that open them up to more general use.

d) Lets think about providing resident only parking zones in Ambleside and Dundarave in the same way as Vancouver does in the West end to avoid similar problems.

e) Lets decrease the amount of development of large areas of low density

		<p>housing with no local facilities and require that the some of the necessary facilities are available or are built as part of the development.</p> <p>f) Lets consider the addition of a cost for developments which do not include affordable housing. Lets consider a reduced rate for rental housing.</p> <p>g) Lets severely limit the use of flexible zoning and give more certainty to both residents and developers. This also, (perhaps most importantly). would help discourage speculation in raw land.</p> <p>h) Lets take a serious look at traffic and pollution along all major arteries with some analysis of the sensitivity of these routes to increased activity. This is likely to be complicated by the influence that future road taxing schemes might have on the most congested areas. We do though need to have a solid comprehensive model rather than looking at traffic on a development by development basis, (without in some cases even knowing the type of facilities that may eventually be accomodated), and guessing about pollution levels in specific areas.</p>
2018/03/29 12:13		<p>Transit</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Please add more buses, especially 250 -Please improve ventilation in the bus, it is too hot inside <p>Housing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Please provide options for visitors to stay in West Van <p>When we have relatives or friends over from another region, we want them to stay in a motel or hotel however there is none in West Van</p>
2018/03/29 12:16		<p>NO MORE!!!!!!</p> <p>I AM ABSOLUTELY AGAINST MORE DENSITY IN WEST VANCOUVER ANYWHERE NEAR THE WATERFRONT OR AROUND PARK ROYAL. THESE AREAS ALREADY HAVE TOO MUCH TRAFFIC CONGESTION AND THE NEW RESIDENTIAL BUILDINGS AROUND AMBLESIDE INTERFERE WITH OUR ABILITY TO ENJOY THE QUIET BEACHES AND WATERFRONT. DENSITY, LACK OF PARKING, AND TRAFFIC CONGESTION HAVE NEARLY RUINED WEST VANCOUVER.</p> <p>I'VE BEEN A RESIDENT HERE FOR OVER 50 YEARS AND I SAY NO MORE!</p> <p>NO MORE.</p>

2018/03/29 12:33	[REDACTED]	<p>It is obvious to residents that the issues of housing density and transportation and infrastructure are linked. The draft plan proposes an increase in density, via various means of increasing housing, while suggesting that the new residents will walk more, ride bicycles or take buses. Realistically, new residents will also drive. The current transportation corridors are more than overloaded, and from 2 pm in the afternoon, drivers wait in long lines, taking at least 30 minutes, to access either the Lions Gate Bridge or 2nd Narrows Bridge. I believe that the concepts you have outlined in the Transportation and Infrastructure section are missing the obvious points that we are a bedroom community to the rest of Metro Vancouver, and that we need to have another crossing, or greater access to enhanced crossing services, if you wish to add more residents to West Vancouver.</p> <p>Also, with respect to the Ambleside Local Area Plan, Policy BF-C 4.7 "Manage Argyle Waterfront in a manner which complements and enhances the Ambleside Village Centre" - we say NO to any arts and cultural facilities on the waterfront, particularly NO to a new building in the 1600 block of Bellevue Avenue. The purpose in assembling property and creating waterfront parkland has always been to promote access to the waterfront. Arts and cultural facilities have crept into the space as the District has acquired private homes and "temporarily" renovated them for arts groups. I note that Navy Jack house was renovated, then subsequently taken down, so no longer exists as a potential arts facility. (It would be interesting to find out how much that exercise cost the taxpayers.) In addition to the rising sea level, which has several times created flooding within the currently used buildings, we face the prospect of large portions of Ambleside Park being returned to the Squamish Nation for their development and use. So, leave the waterfront alone, and ensure that no buildings are inserted into the area. There are lots of options for placing arts and cultural facilities on higher ground, away from the waterfront, perhaps next to Kay Meek or other already established venues.</p>
2018/03/29 12:46	[REDACTED]	<p>we need to boost our economy by increasing our population and also our tourism and attractions. We can do that through increasing the FSR, building more and taller buildings and adding HOTELS for tourists.</p>
2018/03/29 13:11	[REDACTED]	<p>Comments on OCP Part One Draft</p> <p>This is not a public-friendly document (53 pages of technical planning language). It needs a 3-5 page plain language Summary identifying key values, issues, stated objectives, the policies that will protect those values, address the issues and achieve the objectives. As this is a document that is supposed to facilitate "change" we need to see the key policy changes from the 2004 OCP.</p> <p>Land use is but one aspect of housing planning...where is our comprehensive Housing Policy document that gives land use the appropriate integrated framework for housing land use guidance?</p> <p>Introduction</p> <p>Population, Household and Employment Forecasts: The population forecasts (page 3) provide the foundation for estimated gross housing unit requirements and the housing/land use strategy in this document. I have concerns regarding the reasonableness of these forecasts.</p> <p>According to the Regional Growth Strategy, the GVRD has been adding</p>

about 37,000 persons/year during the past 30 years and is forecast to add about 36,200 per year to 2041. DWV added about 172 persons/year 1981-2011 and the OCP is forecasting annual additions doubling to 356 persons/year 2011-2041, resulting in a 2041 population of 54,000. What can you point to in this OCP document that would justify that kind of jump in DWV population growth, especially when DWV has the highest housing costs in the region?

If however, like the GVRD, we added population at about the same rate as the past 30 years, we would have a 2041 population of about 48,500, an increase of 5160 persons. Or, if you follow the population trend line in the chart on page 5, you end up with just under 50,000 persons in 2041, an increase of about 6700. In either case, the expected population growth is substantially lower than the 10,000 persons assumed in the OCP.

Planning staff informed Council that this was a Scenario population forecast methodology. That methodology usually describes alternative plausible outcomes but this document goes forward with housing requirement estimates based on the highest Scenario, with no explanation of the alternatives. To get informed public input, residents should have been made aware of this.

With the high Scenario chosen, the OCP forecasts that population per household ratio will decline from 2.55 to 2.47. That assumption seems reasonable, given the expected demographics. If you follow the OCP Scenario, DWV requires about 5000 units. But, if you apply that forecast ratio to the trend line population increase of 6700, DWV would only need about 2700 new housing units...not 5000. And, if you add population at the same annual number as the previous 30 years, DWV will need only 2100 new units. The Cypress Village proposals alone offer a range of between 1800 and 3800 housing units, under their alternative Scenarios.

The OCP further indicates that 72% of their expected additional 10,682 population will be seniors and 20% older adults. But it forecasts that the employment to population ratio will increase from 33% to 38.5%. Why? The expected demographic suggests people will be leaving the workforce due to age...therefore, that ratio should decline.

Housing Affordability and Diversity:

If this OCP is expected to deliver affordable housing for our apparent priority target groups (downsizing seniors and young families), affordability must be defined, and clearly shown how those housing priority target groups can be affordably accommodated with this OCP. Otherwise what are we densifying for...to provide housing for speculators or offshore buyers, to increase municipal tax dollars, to provide jobs for the GVRD construction industry? Without defined priority housing target groups, an assessment of affordability and a resultant clear strategy to achieve affordable solutions for those target groups, we are just building for the sake of building with a scattergun "increased diversity" approach that risks unacceptably altering the valued character of both commercial and residential neighbourhoods.

It is commonly accepted that an affordable purchase price for housing is up to 5 times annual household income. The average DWV HH income is about \$80,000 which places an affordable purchase price at about \$400,000. Given current the average market price for a SF house is around \$3,000,000 and

for condos between \$1750 and \$3000/sq.ft., a 1000 sq.ft new condo unit would cost between \$1,750,000 and \$3,000,000. So, to purchase a SF house or condo at current market prices would require an annual household income of between \$350,000 and \$600,000. Please provide your definition of affordable housing in this OCP and, with an affordability analysis, explain how this OCP will facilitate the development of housing for our priority downsizing seniors and young families.

Most of the urban economists analyzing the housing situation in the GVRD agree that we cannot "build to affordability". Vancouver, Surrey, Coquitlam, North Vancouver City have been building at record pace over the past decade but that has had no impact on prices. Studies have shown that GVRD densification on main transit routes and around stations during the past 5 years has actually reduced affordability and increased the "empty house" problem. Densification without affordability does not resolve the housing issue nor will it improve the DWV demographic.

The most affordable rental housing in DWV today is the "aging apartment building" in the Ambleside and Park Royal areas. One building in Ambleside has just completed a major renovation and remodeling, and is offering good sized rental units at competitive rentals. Please explain what incentives this OCP has to encourage owners of these buildings to modernize their rental units suitable for downsizing seniors or supportive housing.

DWV has opportunities to provide a housing complex for young families, downsizing seniors and supportive housing together on community owned land at 15th/16th and Esquimalt/Fulton; and 22nd and Gordon. Where is the strategy to achieve these integrated objectives? This OCP should reflect a review of the Delbrook School area development and provide a framework for DWV development on municipal land in DWV that supports our housing priorities.

Council has been advised that: "The most significant change in housing supply would be the increase in the number of apartment units over the next thirty years. The projected shift towards multifamily development, particularly apartment units, would imply greater land use efficiency." While this approach may speak to efficiency, where have DWV residents indicated that land use efficiency was a priority in meeting the community's housing needs or objectives?

DWV currently has 25% home-based employment but the OCP forecasts that only 10% of additional employment will be home-based. This is not consistent with current and expected social reality and trends. The chosen high population and reduced home-based employment forecasts lead to an exaggerated estimate of future commercial space requirements in support of mixed use development.

The OCP indicates that residential densification in our commercial centres will result in residents living, working and playing within walking distance. Please provide information on the number and % of current residents at Park Royal, Ambleside and Dundarave that actually work in those centers. Retail and service merchants complain that they are unable to find employees but the OCP assumes that there is a lack of employment opportunities in DWV. Please explain the contradiction. Also, since most of our economic base is in the relatively low paying retail and service sectors, and the most recent apartment development approved in Ambleside is selling for \$1950/sq.ft and

up, please explain how these employees will be able to reside close to their work in our retail/service centers.

Targets to 2041:

Given our current housing mix (Figure 4), please define what "30% more diverse housing" means and how you expect to confirm its achievement. Do you have a desired "diverse" housing mix? Can you confirm that mix is consistent with the needs/desires and affordability of our priority housing groups?

While local merchants are currently complaining about the difficulty finding employees, there is no demonstrated strategy for providing "affordable" housing, and since the forecast population increase will contain 72% seniors, increasing the jobs to resident ratio seems like a formula for further job vacancies and / or increased workforce commuting to DWV.

Housing and Neighbourhoods:

2.1 This OCP is presented as a high level policy document. Therefore, it should not contain estimated new housing units in neighbourhoods, without doing the detailed neighbourhood character and land use capacity assessments required to derive those estimates, especially given the vagaries of the population and housing need forecasts presented earlier in this document.

2.1.3 define "economic viability of the building form"

2.1.4 From Taylor Way to Horseshoe Bay?

2.1.5 The most recent mixed use development units approved in the Ambleside commercial center are selling for from \$1950/sq.ft. and you expect buyers to work in the Ambleside retail and service sector...the lowest paying sectors of the economy. Please present your analysis that shows the reasonableness of this justification for mixed use in DWV.

2.1.6 Please explain how "residential uses can be compatible with community use"?

2.1.7 This OCP, Part 1 and 2 cover the whole of the DWV, no? So any proposal will be already covered by a policy in this plan, no? We do not want to get back into a spot zoning nightmare.

Note: I really appreciate this OCP references to neighbourhood context and character and believe that this should be paramount to any development activity in both residential and commercial neighbourhoods. Please examine the Box on p.13...what do we value? Grosvenor blew Ambleside out of the water and has presented us with a tremendous, but not insurmountable, challenge to restore and strengthen the potentially unique Seaside Village (call it town if you insist) character of the center as an inviting contrast to PR.

2.1.12 As said, this is a high level document based on controversial population and housing need forecasts. It should not have specific housing unit estimates in our neighbourhoods until the proper analysis in LAPs can be demonstrated.

2.1.14 Missing middle ground oriented apartments/townhomes should be considered in core areas eg. as exists on NE corner of Marine and 19th... very compatible with Village character... not every development needs to be mixed use. Your policies must ensure that we don't allow Marine Drive DWV to become a twin of Marine Drive new mixed use developments in

North Van. Please explain why the rationale used for Davie and Denman mixed use restrictions should not apply to Ambleside.

2.1.6 We need to put a definition, a description of alternative incentives and some parameters on "bonus density. Also need to define "underutilized site"

2.1.7 Same bonus density comment. "Close to transit" spoken or unspoken seems to imply Marine Drive. A strategy that improves transit in other areas of the community...a route that runs around schools, churches other community amenities that may receive some densification, would be more beneficial to the overall community than forcing everything and bonus densifying on Marine Drive.

2.1.20 Agree that we must assess and make more effective use of municipal lands to address affordability for our priority housing target markets (seniors, young families and supportive housing).

Boundaries:

I lived in Ambleside [REDACTED] The eastern boundary is 11th Street, not 13th, and while you might cut it off at Inglewood, I would suggest you take it up to Mathers so you can strategically include areas around/ in the vicinity of Ridgeview, West Vancouver High, and Pauline Johnston schools...our greatest assets for young families...for duplex or other appropriate multi-family development.

General Strategy:

I don't think that adopting the general GVRD strategy of densifying in/around commercial centers and main transit corridors is likely to be appropriate for DWV. In DWV we have only 1 transit corridor so the vast majority of the densification will be apartments and mixed use development along a Marine Drive "channel"...primarily in Ambleside and Park Royal...with constant transit service running back and forth. Yet, all these developments will still have resident parking at similar levels to the current. Hardly a traffic, liveability nor quality of life solution.

I would like to see an integrated housing and transportation strategy around our high quality schools that is more dominant and better thought out for community benefit than the densification along transit corridors in our commercial centers, that is the foundation of this OCP document. While their may be an item in the document, it is not the foundational strategic element that it should be to bring young families to the community.

Another foundational problem with this OCP is that it is based on the assumption that DWV is an "urban" municipality (check the definitions). It is not...and I firmly believe that if the public was asked that direct question you would get a resounding rejection. Just because some are willing to accept the title Town Center, instead of Village Center for Ambleside, does not offer a license to assume the DWV is "urban" and it should not be planned as such.

Local Economy

Where is the economic development strategy that must precede its inclusion in this land use document? Economic development is not fundamentally a land use issue. Where is the Economic Development Strategy that has gone through a rigorous, collaborative, public conceptualization and assessment

approved by Council? Without that, the following land use elements in this document are speculative.

Regarding the economic ideas in this document...I will add my input this speculation.

2.3.1 People do not choose to live in West Vancouver for its "vibrancy", (syn...spirited, lively, high energy, vigorous, sparkling etc.)....quite the opposite. There are a number of places in GVRD that speak to those characteristics...DWV does not/should not try to compete with or match that atmosphere. We are not a lively "urban" area!! We have the benefit of living close to an urban area, to enjoy its experiences when we want them, but we have the luxury of being able to leave that urban area and return to our calmer, environmentally connected, uncrowded, relaxed, well-serviced community to enjoy our 25+ diverse restaurants, our unique local merchants and services, our very liveable scale, and our quiet, safe neighbourhoods. We have our unique qualities...the qualities that we value. Just look at the box on p.13 and see what we Value. The economic development challenge is to strengthen the viability of our local economy by strengthening, leveraging and selling these qualities... unique Seaside Village character, waterfront, beach and forest hiking experiences, local merchants, liveable scale that completely contrasts with the vibrant, high energy urban areas that surround us. These need to be respected and showcased to strengthen the scale, pace, character and connectedness of our Village centers...not give us an "urban main street"!!

2.3.2 Park Royal is a Regional Shopping Center attracting customers from Squamish to Deep Cove and the West End. The emphasis is on international fashion and other chains, and now, entertainment with over 1 million sq.ft of rentable commercial space. With this regional draw, it is a prime source of potential affluent customers for Ambleside and Dundarave, without overly densifying those centres with residents. But we must present a unique contrast to PR. Again the economic development challenge is to provide and market a uniquely different experience to PR and leverage their customer draw.

2.3.6 Do not overdue the mixed-use strategy and destroy the fundamental attraction of the area. Do you see Marine Drive NV as a successful mixed use strategy to strengthen the commercial sector. I don't think so...please do not go down that sterile path.

2.3.9 Update built form guidelines to what? We need a digital, visual 3D model that clearly shows the character that we are aspiring to in Ambleside Center, and it certainly is not Grosvenor. A developer should have to fit their design into the model village as part of the approval process and have it evaluated by the public and a DRC with a relevant mandate and teeth to ensure its expression of the aspired character. Emphasis needs to be on scale, boutique, local charm, village character and contrast to other communities around us.

There is one foundational concept that you have to get out of your minds...DWV is not URBAN and it will be one of the last communities in GVRD, if ever, to be viewed as urban!!!

For most residents, that still work "downtown", DWV is a sanctuary...a place you begin to feel and relax with as you enter Stanley Park from Georgia, that

continues to reinforce itself as you cross the Lions Gate Bridge, and that firmly settles in as you approach your home in this quiet, seaside/mountain environmentally connected, community on the outskirts of urban Vancouver and at the entrance to the Howe Sound hinterland. Your challenge, as long term DWV Community Planners and Development Strategists, is to fight through the \$\$\$\$ and strengthen that identity for the residents and for the enjoyment of visitors who we would love to share it with.

2.3.10 I could support a reasonable tourism oriented element in our overall DWV-wide economic development strategy, as I recognize the economic value of an export base approach, but that would only be a supportive, not dominant, part of an economic strategy for Ambleside. Where is that overall development strategy? How does Ambleside fit? Where is the agreed policy framework? Where are the measurable objectives and expected results? These need to be agreed by the community before we start discussing boutique hotel(s) in Ambleside and the land use implications.

2.3.11 Absolutely not...if there is a market for tourism accommodation we do not have to "incentivize" it and definitely not through "density bonusing". You are using "density bonusing" as a blunt tool throughout this Draft like we are in an already dense "urban" environment with nothing to protect, ignoring the critical importance of charm, scale and character in the future development of our centers. The document has such a fondness for "density bonusing" that we need a thorough community discussion of the various incentives available and a framework agreement that specifies the situations in which each might be most suitable...that must include a community amenity policy framework that ensures any funds gained will be put to agreed priority community uses.

2.3.13 This approach should be integrated with a way-finding "Community Art" strategy...with our strong artist community, we could be the Community Art Capital of Canada. Spectacular introductory art pieces at the entrance to DWV on the MD/Taylor Way intersection, along the waterfront and seawall, and in our commercial centers with Community Art Trails...all trails could lead to an artists conclave and community facility at Keewick.

2.3.15 We have recently approved a BIA for the Ambleside/Dundarave area. I totally agree that we needs to work in partnership but I would like to see what the property owners in that jurisdiction are prepared to do...I have seen nothing that makes me optimistic. Why have we not yet seen any evidence that they are willing to invest in the beautification of Ambleside. We need to start that partnership and we need to see that they are prepared to put skin in the game to support the communities interests.

2.3.16-21 The ideas are fine and I support in principle, but specific proposals must be individually assessed.

Transportation and Infrastructure:

I agree with measures to support the improvement of all modes of transportation. Reducing GHGs is admirable and there are transportation trends throughout the world that are rapidly going in that direction. I believe this document puts too much faith in the idea that extreme densification along Marine Drive and in our centers will do much for the walking/cycling Live-Work-Play idea, and matched by a B-Line to North Vancouver, will make a significant contribution to relieving traffic congestion. Instead of

		<p>diving ahead with this strategy, we need a study of the demographics and mobility habits of residents currently living along MD in the PR/Ambleside/Dundarave corridor and an estimate of how that would likely evolve in the future.</p> <p>Rather than basing our whole development and densification strategy on this Transit transportation based densification strategy, I would like to see an explicit housing strategy to encourage young families around our schools and a transportation intensification strategy that helps to bring residents from those connected areas down to our commercial centers and beyond by public transit.</p> <p>I am exhausted...so that is it. As you can see, this is a complex document and the public needs a further interactive process on the next draft to arrive at a comfort level with our OCP policies that can guide LAPs.</p>
2018/03/29 13:27		<p>West Vancouver's businesses are dying. We need more affordable rentals and housings to bring in the work force and we also needs more livelihood and tourists. We need business offices but we can't have them because prices are too high. We also need hotels to accommodate tourists to thrive the business and increase business and population</p>
2018/03/29 13:31		<p>Our economy is not healthy. Business are closing and population is decreasing. We need housing incentives. Higher FSR and more affordable rentals to drive the business up and bring in the employees from within West Vancouver once the population increases due to the changes I mentioned like increasing FSR, affordable rentals, etc.</p> <p>We also need to bring tourists, make hotels and attractions to help business and population of West Vancouver.</p>
2018/03/29 13:49		<p>Low population and dying business cause the city not to progress. We need more housing and rentals and at more affordable prices. also we need more tourists to bring and spend money in the city. Hotels, apartments, etc.</p>
2018/03/29 13:49		<p>I am writing in favour of sections 2.1.1 and 2.1.2 of section 2.1 "existing neighbourhoods. I am currently living [REDACTED] in West Vancouver. As such I have a [REDACTED] realistic perspective regarding the above sections and how it could further benefit the community. [REDACTED] i.e. my rental unit in my main house. I my case I would prefer to subdivide my existing property rather than stratify which would add an additional layer of complexity such as the strata property act. By subdividing the main house would gain the separate rental unit back which provides additional housing in the community. Subdividing would provide several additional benefits to me as well as the community. Allows me to stay in West Vancouver [REDACTED] Potentially allows my children to reside in West Van. Adds another home to the existing property.</p> <p>I would be pleased to work with staff at a future date to assist in the details of implementation.</p> <p>I am also submitting a hard copy similar to this.</p>
2018/03/29 13:55		<p>it is important that we bring life to West Vancouver in the business and population. We need to increase FSR and also bring more rental units and hotels for tourists. Restaurants, hubs and more active lifestyle.</p>
2018/03/29 14:00		<p>I have noticed that we need more affordable prices for housing and rental and therefore make the businesses thrive and become better. In order to do that we need to increase FSR to have more places to live and rent and also build Hotels to bring tourists and tourist attractions.</p>

2018/03/29 14:03	[REDACTED]	West Vancouver is losing businesses and population because it has expensive prices and not enough low housing and rentals. By increasing FSR we can help that. Also by brining revenue via tourists and that requires building hotels, etc
2018/03/29 14:05	[REDACTED]	we need incentive and easement on giving permits to build high-rises and rentals to bring more people to West Vancouver and grow the economy and small business and offices. We also need to bring tourists by building hotels and tourist attractions.
2018/03/29 14:10	[REDACTED]	I have noticed that businesses and population are suffering due to high prices and lack of residences. Increase FSR can help. Also bringing revenue through tourists and building hotels.
2018/03/29 14:13	[REDACTED]	as a person who lives and works in West Vancouver, I'm in direct influence of the negative effect lack of housing and lack of businesses has on the city. We need to increase FSR and bring businesses back by generating revenue through tourists, building hotels and more.
2018/03/29 15:26	[REDACTED]	<p>Publicity and outreach of the OCP could be strengthened. Many people are not online and do not receive the local newspaper. Their participation has been limited by this. Both the Community Engagement Committee and Communications could be utilized to help publicity, outreach and education, and input formats. I have been involved in this process from the beginning and do not yet feel I have a thorough or complete understanding of this document. The generality of it leaves too much room for interpretation.</p> <p>We would benefit from provisions to limit spot-zoning. This would include the removal of 2.1.1.5 from page 15 and 2.1.1.6 from page 19.</p> <p>All numeric housing unit targets in Section A should be removed. At NO time have citizens been afforded the opportunity to discuss, analyze, promote or challenge these numbers. They are not yet related to land availability or neighbourhood character. They do not belong in a "high-level" very general document. If numbers are a requirement of the Local Government Act they can be estimated in Local Area Plans.</p> <p>I would like to see a return and strengthening of view and view protection provisions initially found in all previous OCP's and many other district documents dating back many, many decades. These should be expanded to apply to all residences in West Vancouver.</p> <p>This would include continued acknowledgment and utilization of West Vancouver's unique and beneficial topography (South water-facing mountainside) to allow for preservation and enhancement of views and daylight for almost all – not just the very few on the immediate waterfront.</p> <p>Missing are maps and lists of all publicly owned lands, their current use, built form (if any) and zoning. These should be included.</p> <p>As the District website indicates the OCP is supposed to project "where community facilities will be located" we would benefit from information about a location of an Arts centre and potential uses of public lands.</p> <p>Missing are detailed components that will accurately measure and manage both current and projected:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parking • Historic/cultural resources • Housing - (include metrics for affordable, family, supportive, seniors & rental - size, type, tenure, cost)

- Flooding/area sea level rise
- Streams, lakes, rivers & tidal waters
- Fresh water supply
- Storm water/erosion
- Private and public views and view corridors
- Privacy
- Noise
- Air Quality
- Green Space
- Schools
- Recreation, park facilities/congestion
- Support of small independent shops and services
- Traffic Congestion ***

.....and how EACH will be impacted by projected growth.

***Base on levels of service – please note this does not refer to transit service, rather it refers to road capacity as per the Transportation Research Board, <http://trb.org> that includes letter grades – i.e. a “fail” would include two or more green light cycles to get through a traffic light, or, taking twice as long to travel during rush hour compared to say 10 am or 2 pm. – This capacity manual is U.S. based. I have not found a Canadian equivalent. I have been unable to determine if or how West Vancouver utilizes such data. Each of the above (bullets) must include measurable baselines, targets, recommended actions for achieving targets, and the factual basis for the effectiveness of each proposed action.

Each of the above should be linked to overall quality of life and should be prioritized by citizens. Each component should clearly demonstrate how citizen quality of life will be preserved or enhanced.

The OCP should clearly indicate the impact of each proposal on quality of life factors and citizens should be given the opportunity to choose options that best preserve or enhance their quality of life.

Furthermore, I agree with all the following points made by another citizen:

1. Concerns with public engagement on Draft OCP, including:
 - a. The time frame for public feedback (originally 4-weeks) is not nearly long enough;
 - b. 2-week extension to deadline (to March 29) is still not enough, it also coincides with spring break (note – public given 2 months for feedback on Interim Tree Bylaw and while a difficult issue, arguably the OCP is far more complex, but only allowed 6 weeks);
 - c. Staff refuse to meet with groups of citizens (e.g. ADRA hosted meeting) only with individuals or stakeholder boards of directors. (Note - Interim Tree Bylaw are hosting 4 education sessions to answer questions and collect comments before closing public input.);
 - d. No opportunity for citizens to hear and learn from others questions/comments, including stakeholder boards. The public is not provided with the results of staff's research. Community feedback must be made available to the public before deadline for input. (Example – At a presentation to CHAC, D. Hawkins said planning team went out to where seniors congregate and spoke to seniors. Where did staff go to reach out to seniors? Who/how many did staff talk to? What did you ask them and what were the responses?)
 - e. No opportunity for public input on any revisions to the draft, except at a Public Hearing. (An important and complex document such as the OCP, in all likelihood, will require more than a few “tweaks” to get right. The last OCP required a number of “back and forth” with the public before finalizing.)

f. Townhall meeting planned AFTER deadline for public input (should be before deadline for public comment).

2. The Draft excludes Squamish Nation land (IR#5), yet the Regional Growth Strategy (RGS) includes Squamish Nation lands in its projections for WV. The Squamish have a master plan which envisions significant residential development (which conceivably could meet most if not all of WV's housing needs) – this must be considered if we are to make informed decisions about WV's future, particularly relating to housing and traffic congestion.

3. Pg 4 indicates WV's population is expected to increase by ~10,000 people by 2041, however this is not supported by current trends. WV has historically gone through demographic cycles where population has decreased. What are projections for increase in population based on? Build it and they will come? What are the demographics and needs of this anticipated population increase? Per Urban Futures report (pg 26), adding a total of 10,682 residents over a 30-year period, would represent faster growth than was experienced over the past 30 years. Also, the Draft does not indicate how ~5,000 new housing units could be accommodated by 2041, it just provides some numbers.

4. Quality of life is of utmost importance but only briefly mentioned. The Draft does not identify specific quality of life factors (such as privacy, views, access to daylight, etc.) or say HOW we will protect them. QoL needs to be defined in measurable terms so we may monitor progress – are we going in the right direction?

5. Pg 5 ...our housing stock has limited options for seniors to downsize. I disagree with this statement. How can you substantiate this claim when there are about 1,000 units of multi-family strata or rental housing currently approved or under construction? Particularly as the Urban Futures report indicates that 61% of WV households are mortgage free. What hasn't been addressed is seniors that need to move into assisted living. (Note – Vancouver Coastal Health units are open to whole region – how to ensure WV seniors are accommodated?)

6. Pg 7 - Housing affordability and diversity. The idea that adding more housing and smaller homes will be relatively more affordable/attainable than our housing stock today is not supported as evidenced by current and recent development (Grosvenor, Cressey, The Residences on Marine, Sewells, Evelyn by Onni, etc.) The Draft plan should provide criteria for assessing the impact of past and anticipated growth on affordable housing; and show the current supply-demand for affordable housing and the supply-demand for affordable housing with anticipated growth. It should recommend actions for resolving the shortage of affordable housing and provide the factual basis for the effectiveness for each action.

7. Pg 10 – OCP Review Process. It is not clear how public input will help refine this draft into a final proposal for Council's consideration. Will this be based on the most "mentions" received? The least objections? And why will public input only "refine" and not change or shape the final proposal?

8. Pg 13 – I don't like or agree with the vision statement. Define what a "complete, connected and inclusive community" is; what is a "vibrant

economy"? This terminology is subjective and should be omitted. The vision statement should say something about quality of life.

9. WV does not have a Housing Policy, yet as per Staff's Demographic, Housing and Employment Projections report (June 2016): the future population of West Vancouver will be determined in a large part by its housing policy and land use decisions. (The 2012 Housing Action Plan is the closest thing we seem to have, but it's not a policy.)

10. The Draft does not define the goal(s), and quantitative metrics (measurable targets) for assessing attainment of them.

a. Pg 14 Objectives are not quantifiable or measurable, nor is it indicated how we will achieve them.

b. No base line numbers are provided – don't know what you're measuring from.

c. Housing & Neighbourhoods – build more diverse housing types, sizes, costs and tenures. Diversity is not an objective and I understand Staff will consider ANY new housing to be "diverse".

d. Transportation – By 2041, we aim to (have) 25% more people walking, cycling and taking transit. Why are you only measuring these 3 modes when objective is to improve transportation for ALL modes of transit?

e. Parks & Environment – protect our natural systems and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Why are we only measuring GHG emissions when protecting our natural systems is also listed as an objective?

f. Social Well-being – By 2041, we aim to (have) 20% greater participation in services & programs. Which services and programs?

11. The Draft does not provide an accompanying narrative to the policy statements to provide background and rationale and explain what is new and different from the policies outlined in the 2004 OCP. (This information is needed before public comment closes.)

12. Does the table of contents "themes" represent the OCP priorities? The Draft omits key themes (Section 2 – Community-Wide Directions) such as Arts & Culture, Neighbourhood Character, Commercial Neighbourhoods and Municipal Lands. It is not enough to interlace policy statements on these important topics throughout the five identified themes. The missing components are significant enough to deserve their own topic sections. (Case in point: the public has been anxious to comment on a location for a new art building; but are bounced back and forth between Parks & Recreation – who say this is a land use decision, and Planning staff – who say site-specific planning is not within the scope of the OCP.)

13. The Draft plan talks about Transportation but says very little about traffic congestion – a main priority for many – or about the projected impact of increased density on traffic congestion. The plan should set forth the congestion level of service deemed acceptable then show current congestion for major intersections and the congestion for major intersections with anticipated growth. The plan should recommend actions for resolving congestion and provide the factual basis for the effectiveness of each action.

14. Pg 16, Item 2.1.7 - I have concerns with this. We should avoid site-specific (spot) zoning.
2nd bullet "Considering sites or assemblies that present a degree of physical separation from..." -- change "degree" to a defined and retained boundary.

4th bullet "...apartment buildings to a maximum of three storeys" -- need to specify height.

I agree with the 5th bullet item about reviewing form & character to support siting and designs that respond & contribute to neighbourhood context and character and would like to see this mentioned more in the Draft plan, including in commercial areas.

15. Pg 19, items 2.1.12 and 2.1.13 – I disagree. Housing unit numbers (even as "estimates") should be removed from this document (including on pg 15 – Regenerating our neighbourhoods with an estimated 300-400 new sensitive infill units; and Expanding missing middle (e.g. triplex, townhouse, mixed-use) options with an estimated 300-350 new units.)

The Marine Drive LAP was completed prior to the Draft OCP and in response to 3 development applications.

There is nothing that supports or establishes how the allocation of these numbers (at 2.1.12 and 2.1.13) was determined.

The housing unit estimates do not appear to be based on analysis of data-based growth trends and projections.

There has been no discussion with the public about the distribution of new housing units.

These numbers have no basis in land availability or neighbourhood character.

Allocation of area specific numbers (even estimates) do not belong in a high-level document.

Is this a policy document or a land use plan? Is policy to build 1,000-1,200 new housing units in Ambleside?

Putting housing unit numbers (even estimates) in this high-level document moves beyond what we've been talking about (objectives and policies) and focus ends up on "how do we meet these estimates". These numbers (even as "estimates") will be used by developers to leverage their applications and staff will be inclined to support those applications based on the "suggestions" provided in the OCP.

16. Pg 19, item 2.1.14 – Prepare local area plans by: Confirming boundaries and new unit estimates through local area planning processes should be changed to CONSIDERING boundaries through the local area planning processes.

17. Pg 19, item 2.1.15 – Pending adoption of local area plan, consider proposals within the local area plan boundary by: ... This entire bullet (2.1.15) should be eliminated – it is not a policy and is so broad it opens the door to any rezoning application to come forward (NOT the specificity the public has been asking for) and allows for development before we've finished Part 2 of the OCP.

18. Pg 19, item 2.1.16, Pg 20, item 2.1.17 and Pg 32, item 2.3.11 (and wherever else bonus density is mentioned) – I disagree with the use of bonus density in the absence of a framework defining what bonus density is acceptable and in what circumstances -- there needs to be some metrics attached. By and large density bonuses have only given us more luxury condos. I would like to see other options besides bonus density.

19. Pg 19, item 2.1.17 – I disagree with reducing off-street parking requirements. Lack of parking is a common complaint, even in residential neighbourhoods it's a problem for visiting guests to find street parking.

20. Pg 31, item 2.3.1 – Emphasize Ambleside Municipal Town Centre as the heart of WV with commercial land uses such as: Retail, service and restaurants centred on a vibrant, urban, “main street”; – Omit “vibrant” and “urban”, vibrant is too subjective and urban is at odds with seaside village character of Ambleside.

21. Pg 31, item 2.3.4 – Regenerate Dundarave and Caulfeild Village Centres with small-scale, street-level retail, service and restaurants, secondary office use, and mixed residential and commercial uses. Include Ambleside village.

22. Pg 31, item 2.3.6 – Expand commercial and mixed-use zones to broaden economic opportunities and stimulate employment growth. I disagree with this. WV is purposely a predominantly residential community. Also, your population profile estimates indicate there will be a 72% increase in seniors and only 20% in older adults and 9% younger adults. The expected demographics suggests people will be retiring from the work force as they age, so commercial space requirements should reduce.

23. Pg 31, item 2.3.7 – ...provide for ancillary and secondary marine related uses at marinas. What do you have in mind? Would this allow for a bistro at the Hollyburn Sailing Club? There isn't public support for commercial structures on the waterfront.

24. Pg 33, item 2.3.18 – Support small business. It is not the District's responsibility to assist start-up businesses. I think the District would do better to support existing small businesses by improving sidewalks and lighting, encouraging businesses to beautify commercial areas, improving parking and exploring creative solutions to keep lease rates in check (like keeping the commercial area strictly commercial as the City of Vancouver has done with Denman and Davie streets).

25. Pg 33, item 2.3.19 – Consider opportunities to support economic objectives on District-owned lands. I need more information, what might this mean/look like?

26. Pg 26, item 2.2.3 - I disagree with development over 1200 feet. This is contrary to public sentiment as established through the Upper Lands Working Group.

27. Pg 39 – Water Conservation. The Draft does not provide criteria for assessing water supply adequacy. Need to show the current drought-period water supply and demand and how that will change with anticipated growth. The Draft also needs to show how recommended actions for resolving water supply deficiencies and provide the factual basis for the effectiveness of each action.

28. The Draft Plan is full of words like “consider” or “explore” and short on action verbs.

It does not provide a clear strategy (for example, a strategy that provides housing options for down-sizing seniors).

It does not provide the clarity and certainty one needs to have a level of comfort and understanding about future development in WV.

2018/03/29 16:08	[REDACTED]	<p>I am in support Policy 2.1.11 in the new draft OCP which would prohibit secondary suites (whether attached or detached) on Eagle Island.</p> <p>I support the fact that Eagle Island has been excluded from Policy 2.1.1 (i.e. not shaded in yellow on Map 1) as I do not support subdivision of lots on Eagle Island.</p>
2018/03/29 16:29	[REDACTED]	<p>I am totally against this plan in phase 4.</p> <p>This will completely change West Vancouver for the worst, and I have spoken to a lot of my neighbours and they agree.</p> <p>This will make traffic congestion even worse and more unbearable. Please! Go back to the drawing board.</p>
2018/03/29 16:30	[REDACTED]	<p>This is a bad plan for West Vancouver People here don't want this much density- they want the traffic issues solved</p>
2018/03/29 19:05	[REDACTED]	<p>[REDACTED] Gleneagles [REDACTED] local school and recreation centre [REDACTED] and have chosen this location [REDACTED] for its [REDACTED] character, green streetscapes and semi-rural feel. I believe that these quiet, green, low density neighbourhoods are an important part of the character of West Vancouver, contrasted with the small scale urban and suburban feel of the eastern part of the district (Ambleside etc) and the small commercial nodes such as Horseshoe Bay and Dundarave.</p> <p>Ours is one of the smallest lots in the Gleneagles neighbourhood at approximately 0.3 of an acre. Interestingly, the Gleneagles neighbourhood remains much more affordable than central West Vancouver and is increasingly populated by young families, including those moving from the City of Vancouver seeking more affordable, family friendly living.</p> <p>We are not supportive of the intent in the OCP to "Amend neighbourhood subdivision standards to enable development of smaller houses on smaller lots in existing detached residential areas." (2.1.1) As the first provision in the 'Housing and Neighbourhoods' section of the OCP, I take this to be an important point of emphasis in the plan. Standards to allow smaller lots may be a very appropriate measure in the parts of the District with a more suburban character, but I feel that this has the potential to destroy the character of the Gleneagles neighbourhood. (I would also highlight that houses such as ours in the original Gleneagles subdivision have provisions on title that preclude subdivision of less than 1 acre.) Those pockets in nearby neighbourhoods where subdivision has occurred reflect substantially altered streetscapes and loss of privacy to residents.</p> <p>If the intention of the policy is to increase affordability, I think care needs to be taken around a simplistic assumption that subdivision increases supply and therefore lowers price and increases affordability. In practice, subdivision in a "luxury" market such as West Vancouver tends to lead to very high end "luxury" new housing stock, each unit of which is typically priced higher than the original single family home that it replaces. So, while housing supply might increase, affordability for families declines. This trend can anecdotally be seen in other examples of increasing density in the community. As an example, two bedroom apartments in the new Sewells Horseshoe Bay development are priced and are selling an approximately the same market price that I might expect to achieve for my 3,200 square foot family home. Allowing smaller subdivision would most likely drive developer</p>

		<p>acquisition of lots in neighbourhoods that remain more affordable (in relative West Vancouver terms) and - I feel - is unlikely to support community.</p> <p>I believe that a differentiated approach to subdivision standards may be the answer and that the OCP would better serve community objectives in identifying those neighbourhoods where neighbourhood subdivision standards could be changed to allow smaller lots without significant damage to neighbourhood character. In my opinion this would typically be in neighbourhoods with more urban and sub-urban character.</p> <p>I would emphasize that I appreciate that all neighbourhoods need to evolve and that I am supportive of other provisions in the plan to increase density in ways that are more sensitive to neighbourhood character - namely the policies to allow greater provision for coach houses and allowing both coach houses and basement suites on a single lot.</p> <p>I make these comments as a West Vancouver resident, but also drawing on my career perspective in the municipal arm of the BC Provincial Government, in national government overseas and as a Cambridge economist.</p>
2018/03/29 22:04	[REDACTED]	<p>The addition of more housing units and types of housing is critical to the sustainability of our community. Increased density, particularly in proximity to transit must be a priority. The ability to sub-divide or create strata ownership is fundamental to ensuring large single family lots can be re-purposed to highest and best use. Not everyone needs a full yard but everyone can benefit from more housing options in walkable neighbourhoods. A mix of young families, singles, mature couples and seniors benefits everyone.</p>
2018/03/29 22:15	[REDACTED]	<p>West Vancouver needs more density, different forms of housing, smaller and more affordable housing and we can give up the significant wasted land typical of single family lot forms.</p> <p>Affordability is key so stratification of housing is imperative to enable people to gain equity...the key to long term financial viability and future retirement. [REDACTED] Mews is an excellent example of smaller more affordable housing types. Even this example is beyond the financial means of so many in the community so I would proposed even further densification.</p>
2018/03/29 22:57	[REDACTED]	<p>I hope West Vancouver won't copy Burnaby. We have the most beautiful view in the world, I don't want destroy it. Maybe the health industry is more suitable than shopping mall in Westvancouver. People can take the plastic surgery here instead of going to South Korea.</p>
2018/04/03 12:10		<p>I am writing in favor of sections 2.1.1 & 2.1.2 of the 2.1 existing neighbourhoods.</p> <p>I am currently living in a coach house in West Vanc. which may give me a realistic unique perspective as well as sell serving. I have already added housing to my neighbourhood, however by being permitted to subdivide my existing property it would permit an additional home of a rental unit in my main house. Subdivision or stratification is good for me for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Allows me to stay in W.V., [REDACTED] -Allows my children to possibly live in W.V. -Potentially adds an additional home for someone to live in W.V. <p>In my case it would be preferable to subdivide the existing property rather than stratify which adds an additional layer of complexity such as strata property act.</p>

2018/04/03 12:14		We have a property that is 1.3 acres, which would be well suited for townhouses. This would be great for first time/families to be part of a neighbourhood that was created in the late 1950/early 1960 in Eagle Harbour. We are near transit, schools, Caulfeild Village, Eagle Harbour Beach.
2018/04/03 12:17		Please consider the housing crisis in W.V., the OCP as it is currently written will not fix the problem fast enough. Please consider a parking plan that replaces before it removes. Lastly, consider the immediate need to redraft the Ambleside Local Area Plan.
2018/04/03 12:21		Great first steps in draft but very concerned this will not build the community W.V. desperately needs - it was loud & clear at the OCP sessions that diverse housing is NEEDED - this draft OCP is a timid approach. Be bold planners and write this OCP to allow increased density - keep our community here & encourage youth to move here. Consider allowing much higher density in Ambleside. Please consider a parking strategy - replace parking before removing & recognize the importance of increased parking in our commercial areas. As a business owner in Ambleside I am very disappointed to see the old Ambleside local area plan attached to the draft - please consider the immediate need to develop a new area plan & connect all current documents (waterfront, OCP & ALAP) to ensure the ability to build the resilient community West Vancouver needs. Please hear the support you have from residents & businesses to plan faster in order to fix the current housing issues in W.V. The Community needs you to be more ambitious now!
2018/04/03 12:32		Help us - existing home-owners - to densify. Change the restrictive FAR rulings to allow more ground-level suites - particularly in areas near transit. Encourage partnerships: make it easy for organizations with underutilized land to partner with a not-for-profit organization that wants to build housing. Encourage, inspire & reward creativity: lay out "pocket neighbourhood" solutions for residents to pursue... possibly on land owner or assembled by the municipality. Relax the demand for extra parking for ground-level/additional suites. Not everyone has or needs a car. Your goals for 300+300+500+1,700+1,000+500+200 new units (@ market [unintelligible]? or subsidized?)=4,300. What will be built to accommodate the rest of the 14,000 newcomers who are projected to arrive in 23 years (by 2041)? Perhaps we won't need that many as our "population" is declining :) Using the principle of "if you build it they will come" - has any thought been given to creating a spectacular mixed-use village - or mixed prices? Funded by an empty house tax (once W. Van gets provincial approval for such a tax)?

SECTION III: EMAILS TO STAFF

Some residents provided their feedback directly to staff via email, emails received are presented on the next page:

From: [REDACTED]
To: [OCP Review project](#)
Cc: [Peter Lambur](#)
Subject: OCP feedback
Date: February-17-18 1:22:19 PM

I agree with infill options. Currently coach houses are approved on a case by case basis. It is my understanding only four have been approved to date. While I am interested in this option [REDACTED] I find the current process daunting and more complicated than it should be. I have the land, my house is small. I believe I meet all the requirements. On trying to research it I found I needed a development permit, although the land is already developed land with utilities and access. I need a building permit, which I can see. I also needed to be vetted by a land and development, and someone mentioned I might also need a rental permit although this would be to house my family, not to rent, I would probably still need it. I think there should be one permit. It should be basic and focus on the priorities e.g. safety, building codes, also building size and adaptability to the neighbourhood as these seem to be concerns. It should not require a lot of things that have no real relevance to the situation e.g. Topographical survey of the whole lot, when only a very small corner of it is being used. It's as if you are trying to fit a new process into an existing formula. People are turned off. Our kids have to move to other jurisdictions and you wonder why the population is declining!? I was told I needed someone to guide me through the process. That is just added expense and if it is true just shows how cumbersome and unworkable the situation is. I contacted one company, [REDACTED] who were recommended and have done a lot of infill housing in Vancouver. They said they didn't wish to deal with you again, as the one project they had been involved in was a nightmare. They lost their shirt on it and we're not prepared to do that again. If an experienced firm can't succeed, how can the rest of us. This needs to be addressed quickly, long before 2041.

Another concept I agree with is the idea of smaller lots. [REDACTED] I suspect that if one of us wanted to divide our lot, so [REDACTED] could [REDACTED] build a house there would be a lot of objection, not necessarily from the neighbourhood, but from the municipality and yet why should rules change [REDACTED]

I see an OCP is a guideline. Currently there is far too much room for subjectivity, even with current area specific policies. Is that because the district bylaws don't reflect the OCP? Agreeing on a direction is fine, but it has to be workable and objective, not subjective.

Sent from my iPad

Sent from my iPad

From: [REDACTED]
To: OCP Review project
Subject: WV OCP
Date: February-20-18 11:40:56 AM

To whom it may concern

I am a long time resident of WV. I am impressed by the apparent change in the District's vision of housing in WV. The previous "no change" and "status quo" approach that has prevailed for the past 30 to 40 years has had a significant negative impact on housing options and affordability in the District. I want to live in a vibrant diverse community. I do not want to live in a community that only offers housing options that are not affordable to people that actually live here.

[REDACTED] children are unable to afford to live in WV due to the lack of smaller "affordable" housing. It is absolutely critical that innovative approaches to be introduced so as to allow both young people and long time residents the ability to live and stay in WV. In this regard, I fully support the section in the draft OCP document that correctly identifies one of the key issues that is plaguing the District.

"Over the life of this plan, a focus on housing diversity can deliver smaller homes—including more market and non-market rental—that are relatively more attainable than our housing stock today and that better matches our evolving needs"

In line with this key objectives and deliverable of the OCP, consideration should be given to allowing a greater number of 33 foot lots in the Ambleside and Dunderave areas. These areas below the Upper Levels Highway are close to transportation routes and are in close proximity to retail services and community amenities. The number of 66+ lots that could be subdivided is low in number thereby having a minimal impact on transportation. This is this same approach that the DNV has recently adopted [REDACTED]

Regards

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [OCP Review project](#)
Subject: Community plan and urgent care
Date: February-24-18 1:47:18 PM

I have just read your draft report on West Van and its future. I did not see anything specific about the possibility of adding an Urgent Care health facility in West Van. I think this might be a good thing to advocate government for in order to:

1. Add more employment here
2. Have options in case of an earthquake, or a traffic accident on major arterial routes (Hwy 1, Marine Drive which has limited access to North Van)
3. Provide quick service and less driving for emergency vehicles, saving lives
4. Reduce the waiting times at LGH

What do you think?

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [OCP Review project](#)
Subject: Draft Official Community Plan - comment
Date: February-26-18 12:34:37 PM

Hi there,

Below is the second email I am sending regarding the 2018 planning but I have not received anything back from you.

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] est Vancouver.

[REDACTED]

We had a chance to talk to most of owners [REDACTED] and we had a good and positive outcome for idea of rezoning [REDACTED]

Once those big size lots have a chance for subdivision, most neighbours and I will no longer be interested in building a large size houses .

I believe smaller size houses will be more desirable and appealing in very near future rather than large huge sizes homes in our neighborhood ,,

With that said smaller lots would accommodate smaller houses.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

I genuinely hope that the district will take the proposal into consideration 2018 OCP. I'm looking forward to get feedbacks from the district.

Please let me know the district's thoughts on this proposal of rezoning [REDACTED]

Looking forward hearing back from district in near future.

Yours truly,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

West Vancouver, BC

[REDACTED]

Kind Regards,

From: [REDACTED]
To: OCP Review project
Subject: 2017-18 OCP Draft Review Comments
Date: February-28-18 8:41:47 PM

Dear Mr Hawkins; first of all, thank you and your team for producing such a succinct and insightful planning document. Among other things, the OCP Review Draft dated 180213 provides sobering comment on the future demographics of West Vancouver. The dominant segment of the population is forecast to be of pensionable retirement age and therefore likely facing a fixed income future, possibly relatively asset rich but also likely cash poor. The Plan envisages significant improvements in public infrastructure, and social and recreational services as well as perhaps public housing albeit with some hopes of private sector partnering and possibly contributions by senior levels of government when regional benefits are present.

The municipality's revenue base currently consists chiefly of property taxation and user charges which will be increasingly bound by those fixed incomes. The prospect of significant growth in the planned commercial sector is relatively small and tax revenue growth from that source will be commensurate. The recently published 5-year Financial Plan already shows a gradual depletion of reserves. This constrained scenario raises the crucial question of the affordability of any Plan proposals.

Page 52 of the Draft mentions the statutory requirement for an accompanying financial plan which does not seem to exist at present. To my mind the feasibility of the OCP, however appealing in concept, is contingent upon an affordable financial plan. I feel it is misleading therefore to raise the prospects of improvement without knowledge of the likely costs and benefits of the various potential components, and the means of financing those costs, and more importantly revealing the increased burden likely to fall on residents, ideally both in terms of a do-nothing scenario and various levels of improvement.

At the very least, I suggest expectations should be managed by strengthening the above mentioned paragraph on Page 52 to emphasize the need for demonstrated feasibility in cost/benefit analysis of the emergent investment programs and their operating costs. Best regards,

[REDACTED] West Vancouver,
[REDACTED] Canada

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: [REDACTED] OCP policy 2.1.4
Date: March 09 10 11:50 AM
Attachments: [REDACTED].doc

Hello Tina!

Thank you for taking the time to discuss with me earlier this week regarding the West Vancouver OCP draft plan and specifically the [REDACTED] where I live and have discussed the draft with neighbors.


The draft indicates infill opportunities for our block with notation for 300-500 sensitive infill units (in point form):

- 2.1.1 - smaller houses on smaller lots
- 2.1.2 - supply of coach houses - stratified
- 2.1.3 - duplex housing

While this is good in helping to move towards objectives of response to unaffordable and limited housing options, I would like to request for consideration [REDACTED] and possibly surrounding areas if feasible to be included in policy 2.1.4 (in point form):

- Expanding missing middle (triplex, townhouse) options with estimated 300-500 new units
 - o Request for rowhomes as this would be a housing type not currently offered and excellent for young families or downsizers providing some yard space and a unique character
- Considering proposals for sites adjacent to 'neighborhood hubs' such as schools, places of worship, parks

[REDACTED] As noted on page 7 of the OCP draft: '1/4 of our school students commute into West Vancouver every day' - more 'affordable' stock can be provided in very close relation to the highly sought after WV schools



- o Having a Rowhome development with CACs for sidewalks and lighting would also provide a safe and bright [REDACTED] walkway that joins to [REDACTED] for the rest of the neighborhood - currently [REDACTED] is quite dark at night with lights primarily coming from residences if they leave them on

[REDACTED] can align with the objective of 'Expanding missing middle options with estimated 300-500 new units' while minimizing impact to properties in the surrounding area and further north, while helping with a newer neighborhood appearance for the [REDACTED] which leads to the proposed similar middle housing options.

I would appreciate consideration for the 2.1.4 policy for this area and appreciate all the time and effort you spend on hearing and working with the community to reach common objectives. [REDACTED]

Regards,
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: OCP Review project
Subject: Submission on the OCP Draft Plan
Date: March-06-18 12:48:11 PM

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] I am heartened to see a draft plan set for discussion with our community which respects the work of those working groups (as well as a number of others) in an effort to try to put together a foundation for our community's plans for the next twenty years. For a number of years, our community has become more vocal about the need for true progress in the variety and number of housing options, increased economic opportunity, as well as more coordinated transit and traffic solutions. This Draft, which spells out plans for the next twenty years, will provide an excellent start to the conversation we need to have, and set in place real solutions and policies so that our community can be one which welcomes our future rather than be afraid of it!..

In looking at the component parts of the draft, I would comment on them as follows:

1-Housing and Neighbourhoods

I am very pleased to see in this Draft a variety of proposals which would, if implemented through policy, offer the community over the next twenty years a variety of mechanisms which can be used to increase both the availability, and supply of a variety of housing, as well as also affect in a positive way, the actual affordability of that housing for families wanting to live in our community. This includes provisions such as a wider use of infill housing throughout the District, greater flexibility for homeowners when they consider adding coach houses to their property, as well as incentives to build duplexes, and a push to target the building of much needed supportive housing for seniors and the disabled, potentially with the assistance of partner non-profit agencies. Additionally, the draft also recognizes the significance of maintaining a robust rental stock in our community. To do that, it argues for limiting permissions for current rental properties to be stratified, as well as suggesting bonus density provisions be applied, if a developer is planning on building additional rental units.

It is also important to note that the draft also talks about the need to respect current neighbourhoods, and their character, with measures which would review and control any development in single family neighbourhoods so that the context, character and natural features of the neighbourhood can be preserved.

2-Future Neighbourhoods

As [REDACTED] of the [REDACTED], it is particularly satisfying to see that many of the recommendations made by our group have made their way into the draft. In particular it is good to see that our call for a firm line of prohibition on all residential development above the 1200 foot line has been upheld. Further protection of those lands will also be enhanced by allowing for density transfers to be used as a way of maximizing development in allowable areas, while limiting any developments in areas which will need on going protection. In addition our suggestions for the thorough planning of a new Cypress Village town centre concept have also been included, ensuring that it meets the needs of a growing community, while also respecting environmental and physical considerations.

3-Local Economy.

The survival of West Vancouver is dependent on a strong local economy. A new OCP needs to be a catalyst for incentivizing and promoting a vibrant commercial sector as we plan for the future. Measures which would enhance our current commercial nodes (such as Park Royal, Ambleside, Horseshoe Bay), as well as re-generating Dundrave and Caulfield Village are included in this Draft. These would include provisions which would allow potentially for a greater use and flexibility in the use of space in each these centres, dependant on the context of each one. Imagine, the potential of a boutique hotel in Ambleside or Horseshoe Bay!!

4-Transportation and Infrastructure.

It is sometimes argued that because our current traffic situation is so chaotic at times, and in certain places (such as Taylor Way and the east end of the Upper Levels) therefore we should put an end to all development until we resolve the chaos. That is not a solution. It only exacerbates the problem. We have a traffic problem because of our poor arterial road designs, undeveloped connectivity to regional transit, as well as under use (if not total lack) of any ride share instruments (such as Car to Go). If we do not get on to finding solutions for these issues, a cut in development will only continue to choke our community as those who do not live in our community, or those who come in to service our community, continue to use our limited transportation infrastructure. The Draft calls for developments in each of the many needed fronts. It calls for improvements in service area and connectivity to regional transit, as well as looking for ways to add to our arterial infrastructure, such as the addition of the low level road connector which could bypass the Lions Gate bridge. It also calls for greater development of walking and cycling paths, promotion of ride share possibilities, as well as enhancing our infrastructure for low emission and electrical vehicles in order to minimize the effects of carbon heavy transportation modes on our environment.

5-Parks and Trails

The character of our community is beautifully defined by our natural surroundings. Our trails and parks are what connects us to the marvellous environment in which we live. The OCP draft punctuates that relationship by calling for active management and enhancement of our existing trail and park network.. Additional dedication of park space, as well as increased trail connectivity is also called for. Both measures are indicative of a pro-active, sensitive approach to this issue embedded in the Draft recommendations.

6-Social Well Being

[REDACTED], it is always re-assuring to see policies and directions which will continue to enhance that successful enterprise, as well as look for additional ways to engage our community. The Draft includes a variety of strategies to do so with a particular note being made about ensuring that any strategies take into account our "demographic diversity". By this it notes that our community now, and in the future, is increasingly diverse in age, ethnic origins, as well as physical and mental abilities. Future planning for a healthy community must understand that in order to provide services to such diversity of clientele, it needs to also find ways of ensuring it reaches the needs of that diversity by instituting programs such as wider use of translation and cultural adaptation services, activities which recognize adults dealing with dementia, greater opportunities for youth, and child care services, as well as increasing partnership projects, and activities with our First Nations neighbours. Such initiatives are needed to ensure an inclusive community, as well as a healthy, prosperous one.

There are many additional details included in the draft which I have not mentioned in this brief survey look at it.. As I stated at the beginning, it is the purpose of this draft to continue a conversation begun sometime ago as we design our preferred future. It is important for each of us to participate in that conversation. It is also equally important, for this conversation to result in some specific direction, policies which will ensure an excitement about that future and its possibilities. It is my belief that this OCP draft goes a long way in doing exactly that."

[REDACTED]
February 23/2018

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [OCP Review project](#)
Subject: Input to official community plan
Date: March-06-18 8:35:53 AM

1. Boundaries for Ambleside Town Centre plan-the boundaries as drawn do not have flow for the commercial/ retail/ residential interface - the plan should link the Park Royal through to Ambleside- suggest including the blocks from Fulton down to marine and east to Park Royal be all looked at as one section. Too disjointed as drawn. Gaps with the town centre boundaries and Marine drive corridor may lead to "balkanization" of the land, not a smooth transition.

2. Would love to see some pocket neighbourhoods as a way to provide mixed, multigenerational affordable housing with a community focus- but no provision for this in the official community plan. In order to be affordable it needs to be done in areas where there are large lots at "west Vancouver reasonable prices". Rather than large developer assembled plots-which defeats the affordability goal, one or two large lots can support 4 to 8 smaller homes- and be undertaken by owners, perhaps under some design guidelines. Ambleside not a good candidature with its many small lots that would require assembly and high cost. But to encourage community based living, ideally it would be walking distance or close to amenities. Options include:

- Cedardale- big lots and convenient placement
- upper Ambleside- a few huge lots
- Adjacent to major arterial roads- Taylor Way?
- Marine drive- Alamont fronting on Marine so as to not impact on larger lots within the enclave?
- lots that back onto the highway and/or railway tracks- allow the garages against that border and smaller home in front
- Lower Stevens Drive- easy access to transit?
- Are there some areas in Horseshoe Bay that could work for this?

Worried that this form of liveable housing cannot be developed affordably unless some creative leadership is shown.



3. Levering off of resources such as the DFO research facility to attract industry such as technology and research firms is a great idea- but we need an incubator facility and a variety of office space to accommodate this economic opportunity.

Regards



1

2

3

4

5



From: [REDACTED]
To: David Hawkins [REDACTED] OCP Rev. project [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: OCP comments
Date: March-06-18 7:36:11 PM

Hi David,

First of all, I really appreciate for the great job that you've all been doing for OCP and the meeting [REDACTED] understand it better and generally.

We did see a positive effort in order to have more affordable and diversified housing in the neighbourhood. I would say it is a good trend and it is the right choice. No matter of the downsizing demands for seniors or the rental demands for young families who would like to live in our beautiful community, they're all seeking nice, new and decent "missing middle" dwellings, not those over 60 yrs old small bungalows. If the community starts complaining the housing price, it's the time we should work together to increase the supply dwelling units, instead of just allowing it forcing people to move out of the beautiful neighbourhood.

Even if 5000 dwelling units increase is not a target by 2041, I believe it will be the realistic housing demand sooner or later. In that case, may I suggest the district would be more supportive for rezoning opportunity for the properties out of the four areas in the red boundary? The reason I said so is that some owners inside the boundary just want to build a new detached house to live. Other than it, some owners may not be happy to see multi-family around their properties. In my opinion, we should be more open-minded as far as the specific site fairly close to facilities and transit. People's always saying it's convenient if below highway. Obviously most people wouldn't be comfortable to see an exaggerated mansion in Ambleside, Dundrave or Queens neighbourhood regardless of ethnicity. If there must have mansions in the city, shall we keep them above highway? The district may not have to restrict people not to build mansion in the area below highway if rezoning or subdivision application would be supported strongly than before according to the coming OCP. In that case, less people would complain as we're going to keep the neighbourhood character. All the neighbourhood will be happy to see that happen especially renters. I never saw an owner of a mansion would like to rent a suite for \$1800 monthly.

Thanks again for taking time for my two cents.

Your Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [OCP Review project](#)
Subject: Comments in favour of the Proposed OCP
Date: March-07-18 3:46:46 PM

I would like to commend the staff and Council on creating what is a fantastic piece of work.

To be consistent with the questions asked of an online comment option, I both live and work in West Vancouver – [REDACTED]. I have lived in West Van almost uninterruptedly since [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] love the walkability of the neighbourhood. [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

To create a new OCP is a difficult and often political piece of work. I would encourage the thoughtful adoption of the plan without undue delay. We long fight out the smallest of details and as a consequence get mired in a culture of no change. We need to be bold and move forward. We cannot see our population shrink, our children move away (as mine has done), and continue to watch the gentle decline of the community we love.

As a resident [REDACTED], I recognize that some of the change that is coming may not be in my very best interest. View corridors will change, traffic will likely increase and, perhaps even, the lineups to get coffee may grow. But these are small sacrifices if we create a vibrancy, a sense of belonging and safety as more people on the streets and in our neighbourhoods actually increase confidence rather than deplete it.

I would encourage you to act on the gentle densification options available with in-fill homes and larger projects where they most make sense. Please address the “missing middle”. I would further encourage you to push for everything that Translink can possibly provide for us, including more frequent service and less crush on the buses. We will use them if it is easy. Please bring us boutique hotels so others can enjoy our community and support our businesses. Please let Cypress Village become a true village with a larger population that could support not only a coffee shop but restaurants and a place where people can work. There is a dire shortage of good office space in West Vancouver that I know from personal experience and I would love to see a community where people could build businesses right here rather than cross a bridge to work. Any opportunity to create a larger tax base should be explored.

You are on the right track as regards Social Well-Being and, as the demographic shifts continue, we need to be responsive to the changes and build inclusion.

I would close by saying it is always easier to say “no” than “yes”. “No” sounds safe but is actually the opposite. You will doubtless hear from more people who operate out of fear rather than hope for a different West Vancouver. Please remember that many of the apathetic voices support what you stand for, and would embrace the changes proposed. For those of us who decide to put pen to paper (or fingers to keyboard!), know that there are doubtless many other supporters out there as well.

Yours truly,

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [OCP Review project](#)
Cc: [Michael Smith](#); [Mary-Ann Booth](#); [Craig Cameron](#); [Christine Cassidy](#); [Nora Gambioli](#); [Peter Lambur](#); [Bill Soprovich](#)
Subject: Draft OCP "Regeneration" of Existing Neighbourhoods section 2.1
Date: March-08-18 7:22:24 PM

Dear Sir / Madam,

I was at Gleneagles Community Centre today where West Vancouver District staff were on hand to discuss the Official Community Plan Review and what those amendments might mean [REDACTED] in Gleneagles. [REDACTED] I was so shocked at the changes being proposed which would allow for the subdivision of existing detached residential areas where such subdivision would not currently be permitted. In the words of one of the members of staff – an owner with a lot that would permit, say a 7,000 sq ft home that would now not be considered for subdivision would be able to be subdivided into two homes plus potentially two coach houses (after the Draft OCP has passed and been implemented). While this may sound like a developer's paradise, it would completely change the character of West Vancouver, known for its low density, beautiful gardens, extensive green space and quiet, quaint neighbourhoods. As this would fundamentally change the municipality and I cannot believe this isn't being put to a referendum.

As we still have until March 16th to have our say, I would like to communicate that we **oppose** "regenerating" the neighbourhoods of West Vancouver that are currently comprised of **detached single family** dwellings to allow for **more dwellings** or **increased density** or other "regeneration" to add housing units or reduce the green space we now enjoy.

Our opposition includes the addition of the following in the OCP:

2.1.1: "Amend neighbourhood **subdivision standards to enable the development of smaller houses on smaller lots in existing **detached residential areas.**" We strongly oppose this.**

2.1.1 Update zoning provisions to increase the supply of coach houses ("detached secondary suites") in existing detached residential areas

2.1.3 Expand opportunities for duplex housing

2.1.7 Consider proposals within neighbourhoods for site-specific zoning changes

2.1.9 Protect buildings, structures and landscapes on the District's Heritage Registrar by:

- allowing the conversion of **single family homes into multifamily use**
- allowing infill options on the same lot
- encouraging protection through bonus density

2.1.13 Create capacity for 200 – 300 new housing units in Horseshoe Bay

- *This kind of density is inappropriate for this location. Horseshoe Bay is not an urban area like Ambleside and Taylor Way where people can very easily get around and commute downtown*

by foot, bike, bus, taxi. Although people in Horseshoe Bay walk around when they are at home in the neighbourhood, they need to have cars to get to work, groceries, etc. Most people in this area have two cars despite the car-sharing companies in the area as it is a reality of life out here. This increase in density would likely add 400 – 600 new cars in Horseshoe Bay on top of the multi-family developments now under construction. That amount of traffic increase is not realistic for the limited access / egress. And allowing for the development of housing that doesn't accommodate realistic parking requirements is a poor solution.

Our neighbourhood [REDACTED] currently is filled with [REDACTED] who intend to live and age here. [REDACTED] on our street along with the young families pushing babies in strollers is it is a low density, green neighbourhood and [REDACTED] school, the community centre, the local trails or beaches or going to shops and restaurants in Horseshoe Bay. Many of the houses [REDACTED] were formerly cottages [REDACTED] winding streets, beautiful gardens, lack of sidewalks, lots of trees and green space. [REDACTED] is a hub for the neighbourhood as is the community centre. In the summer, the beaches are the gathering place and there are many young families along with many seniors that walk to the beach and enjoy the water together.

The planning department's website states: "West Vancouver is a community with a high quality of life, unmatched natural setting and valued community amenities. Our processes ensure that any change respects and enhances what is primarily a residential community and adheres to relevant legislation."

Doubling (or more) the number of detached dwellings would change the whole neighbourhood. There would be far less green space which provides so much of that "high quality of life" and "unmatched natural setting" referenced on the planning department's website. And being able to take a pleasant stroll to the "valued community amenities" which we now enjoy will no longer be the same when we have double the people, double the cars so double the noise and traffic. With the young families and older people no longer out for walks on the roads you lose the "meeting on the streets" which creates the wonderful character of the neighbourhood that exists today.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: OCP Review project
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Eagle Island
Date: March-09-18 2:08:05 PM

Hello,

My name is [REDACTED]
I am in total support of section 2.1.11 in the proposed community plan.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]

2.1.11 Support the small island character of Eagle Island by prohibiting attached or detached secondary suites (i.e. basement suites or coach houses).



-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: March-09-18 2:44 PM
To: David Hawkins [REDACTED]
Subject: Proposed Draft Plan Official Community Plan

District of West Vancouver

Re: Section 2.1 11

I am writing in support of the proposal outlined in Section 2.1 11 - which supports the small island character of Eagle Island by prohibiting detached secondary suites.

[REDACTED] am well aware of the complications of added housing with limited support resources. Although I am not in opposition to the construction of coach houses in West Vancouver, they are simply not practical on Eagle Island, giving the restrictions of living on a small island with limited parking and access.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] it is imperative that all the residents respect the limitations of living on a small island.

[REDACTED] worth destroying the small island character [REDACTED]

I appreciate the enormous amount of work that has gone into developing a community plan and extend my thanks for giving me the opportunity to express my views.

Sincerely yours,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: OCP Review project
Subject: Eagle Island
Date: March-11-18 12:07:08 PM

Section 2.1.11 - Support the small island character of Eagle Island by prohibiting attached or detached secondary suites (i.e. basement suites or coach houses).

[REDACTED] I support Section 2.1.11 because there is already insufficient parking for cars for residents, and also insufficient capacity for additional barges unless dock space is expanded.

Very best,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: OCP Review project
Subject: OCP West Vancouver
Date: March-11-18 5:10:05 PM

Dear Council:

Where in the plan is boat launching ability in either Ambleside or Dundarave? If you launch at Horseshoe Bay, it is a very long run in small boats to get to the Capilano fishing grounds. Please bring back our boat launch. For a community that values its waterfront, it is not accessible for recreation by small boat launches by residents or others on the North Shore. As the population ages, fishing is an attractive hobby.

The provision of skating rink/swimming pool should be accelerated in the Western part of the municipality.

Finally, as a resident [REDACTED] I am supportive of your proposed bylaw although it is normative in its language. Small island character is in the eye of the beholder. Under present building bylaws "Monster Houses" could be built on many properties on Eagle Island with increased residential density. I leave it to our capable staff to balance the constraints on parking and dock space in their planning decisions.

To protect all waterfront areas and allow for first responders to attend in a timely fashion, could council please consider a fire boat or boat that is acceptable to the Fire Chief in order to access all marine areas in a timely fashion. Given global warming and the increased risks of interface fires, taking more than an hour to attend to a fire call on Eagle Island is a recipe for future disaster. [REDACTED] it is reasonable for West Vancouver residents to expect the same delivery times for services in all areas — the entirety of West Vancouver is full of physical challenges. As has been pointed out in the OCP this is the charm of West Vancouver, and to be preserved.

[REDACTED]

"Section 2.1.11 - Support the small island character of Eagle Island by prohibiting attached or detached secondary suites (i.e. basement suites or coach houses)."

From: [REDACTED]
To: OCP Review project
Subject: Draft Official Community Plan Feedback
Date: March-11-18 6:58:34 PM

To: District Of West Vancouver Planning Department

I am writing in support of Item 2.1.11 on page 16 of the 2018 OCP Draft, namely:-

'Support the small island character of Eagle Island by prohibiting attached or detached secondary suites (i.e. basement suites or coach houses).'

After 2.5 years of uncommon distress and anxiety, fighting to preserve the unique small island character in perpetuity, it would seem to the vast majority of Eagle Island residents that we have finally been heard by Council and Staff. (as reflected in the Draft - see above). I am grateful and wish to thank Staff for the extensive work they have put in to this Draft.

I hope that Item 2.1.11 is adopted in full in the Final OCP approved by Council.

Thank you

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
West Vancouver, [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [OCP Review project](#)
Subject: About OCP
Date: March-11-18 10:57:12 PM

Hi there:

All in all, it is not to want W. Vancouver to become a concrete jungle like Downtown!

Thanks

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: OCP Review project
Subject: West Vancouver Community Plan
Date: March-12-18 3:42:26 PM

Dear Sir/Madame

Through a neighbor I have just become aware of West Vancouver's plan to allow the subdivision of existing single family lots in order to build more smaller homes and coach houses .

That plan has never been put to the citizens of West Vancouver for their approval and as one of those citizens I want you to know that I am totally opposed to it. West Vancouver is one of the most livable communities in British Columbia because past development has allowed for larger single family lots and considerable green space around developments . This , over the years has attracted people who love nature and the space to wander outdoors in neighborhoods with lots of green space and walkable streets .

I totally oppose any plan to change this historic character of West Vancouver and am sure if you called for a referendum the majority of citizens in West Vancouver would agree with me .

[REDACTED]
West Vancouver

From: [REDACTED]
To: [OCP Review project](#)
Cc: [Michael Smith](#); [Mary-Ann Booth](#); [Craig Cameron](#); [Christine Cassidy](#); [Nora Gambioli](#); [Peter Lambur](#); [Bill Soprovich](#)
Subject: Draft Official Community Plan
Date: March-12-18 4:45:53 PM

Dear Sirs/Madams,

We have recently become aware of the proposed OCP which would allow subdivision and densification in West Vancouver. While this may be a developer's dream, it would completely change the character of West Vancouver, known for its low density, beautiful gardens, extensive green space and quiet, quaint neighbourhoods. As this would fundamentally change the municipality we cannot believe this isn't being put to a referendum.

As we still have until March 16th to have our say, we would like to communicate that we **oppose** "regenerating" the neighbourhoods of West Vancouver that are currently comprised of **detached single family dwellings** to allow for **more dwellings or increased density** or other "regeneration" to add housing units or reduce the green space we now enjoy.

Our opposition includes the addition of the following to the OCP:

2.1.1: "Amend neighbourhood subdivision standards to enable the development of smaller houses on smaller lots in existing detached residential areas." **We strongly disagree with this proposal.**

2.1.1 Update zoning provisions to increase the supply of coach houses ("detached secondary suites") in existing detached residential areas

2.1.3 Expand opportunities for duplex housing

2.1.7 Consider proposals within neighbourhoods for site-specific zoning changes

2.1.9 Protect buildings, structures and landscapes on the District's Heritage Registrar by:

- allowing the conversion of **single family homes into multifamily use**
- allowing infill options on the same lot
- encouraging protection through bonus density

2.1.13 Create capacity for 200 – 300 new housing units in Horseshoe Bay

- *This kind of density is inappropriate for this location. Horseshoe Bay is not an urban area like Ambleside and Taylor Way where people can very easily get around and commute downtown by foot, bike, bus, taxi. Although people in Horseshoe Bay walk around when they are at home in the neighbourhood, they need to have cars to get to work, groceries, etc. Most people in this area have two cars despite the car-sharing companies in the area as it is a reality of life out here. This increase in density would likely add 400 – 600 new cars in Horseshoe Bay on top of the multi-family developments now under construction. That amount of traffic increase is not realistic for the limited access / egress. And allowing for the development of housing that doesn't accommodate realistic parking requirements is a poor*

solution.

The planning department's website states: "West Vancouver is a community with a high quality of life, unmatched natural setting and valued community amenities. Our processes ensure that any change respects and enhances what is primarily a residential community and adheres to relevant legislation."

Doubling (or more) the number of detached dwellings would change the whole neighbourhood. There would be far less green space which provides so much of that "high quality of life" and "unmatched natural setting" referenced on the planning department's website. And being able to take a pleasant stroll to the "valued community amenities" which we now enjoy will no longer be the same when we have double the people, double the cars so double the noise and traffic. With the young families and older people no longer out for walks on the roads you lose the "meeting on the streets" which creates the wonderful character of the neighbourhood that exists today.

Please do not proceed with with the increased density provisions of the OCP without a proper referendum.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

West Vancouver

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: OCP Review project
Subject: Comments Re:Draft OCP
Date: March-12-18 5:58:41 PM

From [REDACTED] WV

Have examined a few main pages of Draft related to expected growth - graph - expect growth to be additional 20,000 over 20 yrs. - recent 50yrs growth has been holding circa 40,000.

[REDACTED] era migration to West Vancouver from either Vancouver City or "Away" (other places)

My comment:

With housing (all kinds) priced as it has since circa 2011 and apparently now 'steady' - how can people afford to buy or Sell

possible suggestions:

Homes >5000 sq.ft - renovated and divided into duplex/triplex units - multigenerational - multifamily (related or unrelated)

This happened in Vancouver Old Shaughnessy during WWII

Home on large lot - subdivide if existing house will allow [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

BPP developing land above ULHwy (Cypress Bowl Road) expensive - even small lots will be highpriced

Affordability ?? At what price ?? Where did our population /generation go wrong in building "beyond-human" scale/sized homes.

We must force ourselves to return to human-scale sized house.- ><3000 or less sq. ft

My own house [REDACTED] was considered large [REDACTED] when [REDACTED] I built it. Our family was [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: OCP Review project
Subject: Feedback
Date: March-12-18 8:06:11 PM

I have reviewed the OCP, and find that it is definitely aimed at creating an excellent community now and for the future. I especially endorse recommendation 2.1.11 regarding Eagle Island, which will do much to sustain the unique community within a unique environment that it is.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

Stina Hanson MUP, MFA
Planning Analyst | District of West Vancouver
t: 604-921-3459 | westvancouver.ca

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: March-12-18 11:25 PM
To: Stina Hanson <shanson@westvancouver.ca>
Subject:

Dear Stiana;

It is very nice to talk with you at library today.

I think our District are working very hard for the best interest of its future. We do need SIGNIFICANT CHANGE of neighbourhood to have more people live in Ambleside.

It is a such great plan to rezoning Ambleside to more duplex, triplex, and townhouse.

I totally support our city planning draft. We can even make 11th street wider as main traffic road and start between 12TH Street to 23th street to rezoning.

It will benefit all residents who live in West Vancouver.

I heard some concern about traffic. Well, public transportation will be our very first choice. Also, everywhere have traffic problem and we are not too bad.

Unlike Vancouver point grey, we have better place but less people live in Ambleside.

We have to change it.

Again, thank you for your time and have a good rest.

Warm Regards

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [OCP Review project](#)
Subject: OCP comment
Date: March-13-18 8:42:27 AM

Re Ambleside Local Area Boundary

It appears again as if the OCP is trying to push this boundary north from Fulton to Inglewood Avenue. The issue I have, as a resident [REDACTED] is related to density factors as you move up the hill. In Ambleside today there are towers of 8 to 10 stories in the region but all are below Fulton. I have not seen within the OCP specific language that outlines at what level up the hillside such structures will be allowed. I would be specifically against any high rises above the the current top level which effectively one could argue as being defined by either Esquimalt or Fulton Avenues.

I realize the need for higher density though the expectation that this could result in more affordable housing is, from both an economic and historic perspective, a pipe dream. The idea of smaller lots, coach Houses and duplex units seems a logical progression for our community within what you have defined as the Ambleside Area Boundary. I am, however, not in agreement with unit counts larger than this in part due to the inability of our community to handle the traffic flow this would entail. No to triplexes, no to multi family (more than two units per lot) structures and definitely no to any form of a high rise above Fulton in my opinion.

Finally, as to traffic flow, within West Vancouver we continue to do an adequate job of managing local flow. That said the bigger issue of course is flow within the GVRD which, along with weather, is the top topic of discussion at any social gathering. This is not an issue our council can control but we are now at a stage, I am sure you know, where on a weekday after 3 pm it can be an enormous challenge to get out of West Van to either Downtown or to the Ironworkers Bridge. Wish you all the best in gaining broad agreement on how to fix this issue.

Final comment on the redevelopment of the Ambleside waterfront including John Lawson Park and the area between that park and Ambleside Park. Fully support what has been done to date. One strong suggestion would be to consider constructing a permanent performance shell along that corridor. This could be designed for musical, theatrical, movie and display purposes that would be available year round and would further support and encourage local development of our arts culture.

Regards

[REDACTED]

Though not

Sent from my iPad

From: [REDACTED]
To: OCP Review project
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Draft _ OFFICIAL COMMUNITY PLAN REVIEW
Date: March-13-18 7:09:07 PM

Dear Sir/Madam,

The proposed OCP does not go nearly far enough in catching up with other Municipalities ie Vancouver and City and District of North Vancouver. West Vancouver has lagged behind over many years with the lack of zoning for new condo's and townhouses etc.. There is a great deal of catching up to do to meet the needs of the West Vancouver residents. The residents require affordable options other than existing condo's,40 to 60 years old. Bold action is required to satisfy the majority, ranging from younger to older residents. Enough has been done to determine the need. Due to the limited supply and excessive demand condo prices have soared to beyond their true value and affordability.

Bold action by the Planing Department and Council could include an interim step such as:-

Permitting an increase in the size of existing and new legal suites in areas in close proximity to the bus routes. Together with expansion of the definition for permitted users of the suites . The number of legal registered residents in the suite could be limited. A creative method can be established to enforce this such as the City holding a substantial deposit paid in by the owner of the suite to be automatically forfeited in the case of a breach of the conditions set out in the bylaws. Realistic simple methods of enforcement can be established.

One benefit can be for single persons or older couples to be able to downsize within their community and rather than stay on in a much larger home with high maintenance costs etc. For example old friends could adopt this option and be more comfortable and self reliant with the knowledge of having assistance close by if needed. It could also feel to them more like a community rather than living alone in isolation. Similarly young people could benefit from such an arrangement.

Such a bold move could immediately relieve the pressure from a lack of rental options. Areas easily accessible to public transport should be considered as suitable for this change in use. There will obviously only be a limited number of owners that this would elect to create such suites however it can make for an excellent option for some of those in need. West Vancouver can by doing so, can create a progressive approach to rezoning and be an example to other Municipalities

Such a move would assist to revitalize areas and increase consumers for the retail sector making it more vibrant and also supplying accommodation for younger people wishing to work and reside in West Vancouver.

I hope that my comments will be seriously considered. I shall be glad to expand on my thoughts and [REDACTED]

Yours truly,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: David Hawkins; OCP Review project
Subject: West Vancouver Draft OCP & Eagle Island Input
Date: March-14-18 12:02:49 PM

[REDACTED] I support Section 2.1.11. I support this policy particularly because of the Eagle Island parking and water access challenges/limitations.

[REDACTED]

Although Eagle Island is "NOT A STRATA" [REDACTED] it does have shared facilities being the dock and parking, the latter being regulated by the District by way of one designated parking spot per legal lot with a sticker issued to be placed on a resident's car. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] for a secondary suite for an immediate family member, especially since immediate family could conceivably be living in the principle dwelling under the current by-laws.

[REDACTED] I would be prepared to accept a slight variation on the wording that I would suggest read as follows:

Section 2.1.11 - Support the small island character of Eagle Island by prohibiting attached or detached secondary suites (i.e. basement suites or coach houses), save for attached or detached secondary suites used exclusively by family members or personal care givers (e.g. nannies or senior care for Island residents) and further provided that there be a restriction of one barge and two non-motorized dinghies (10 ft or under) per legal lot permitted to use the DWV mainland and island docks and further provided that Development Permit Area Designation Guideline BF-B 3.1(III)(f) parking requirement for a detached secondary suite be satisfied by the grant to the owner of the lot applying for a detached secondary suite of a permanent easement on mainland private property within 0.5km of Eagle Island rather than on site parking.

Respecting the foregoing compromise wording, I believe keeping secondary suites "in the family" may be a reasonable compromise since it would be possible for a family to share a common barge or dinghy whereas unrelated third parties would be unwilling or less inclined to share the one barge water access arrangement the Island has historically accepted as an unwritten rule due to capacity and based upon the concept of fairness. The increased burden on parking for such a family/care-giver secondary suite rule is more difficult to address. Development Permit Area Designation Guideline BF-B 3.1(III)(f) requires on site parking for coach houses. I think that should still apply and anyone wanting to build a coach house must get a permanent easement from some private property owner on the mainland. Providing


public lands to satisfy the detached secondary suite parking requirement is a mis-use of public property for the sole benefit of one resident. Presumably an attached secondary suite would be smaller and occupied by only one or possibly two people whereas a detached secondary suite could have an entire family. So an attached secondary suite would have a lesser impact on the limited parking.

And completely aside from the OCP, I think there should now be a By-Law passed providing a restriction of one barge and two dinghies (dinghies 10 ft or under) per Eagle Island legal lot permitted to use both the DWV mainland and island docks. This is a historically accepted unwritten rule accepted by the Islanders but needs to be enshrined. It could be undesignated spots as is currently the case but each barge on either the mainland dock or Island dock would have to display a sticker issued at the same time as the stickers are issued for Eagle Island cars.

Section 2.1.7 - Suggest you add a new item to the list:

- require parking be provided on site or on other private property within reasonable proximity to the site by way of permanent easement/restrictive covenant tied to the site, subject to possible reduction of parking requirements in areas where there is comprehensive (i.e. day/night + hubs - like Park Royal), regular and reliable public transportation.

So, in summary, I support the proposed Section 2.1.11 and would only be prepared to accept secondary suites subject to the strict provisos stated above that are designed to address infrastructure constraints and community concerns.



From: [REDACTED]
To: QCP Review project
Subject: In opposition to detached or secondary suites on Eagle Island
Date: March-14-18 2:27:34 AM

To Whom It May Concern in the District of West Vancouver,

I am writing in regards to the official community plan, specifically in opposition to the construction of detached or secondary suites on Eagle Island.

[REDACTED]

Allowing the addition of secondary suites or coach houses would damage the feelings of security and peace in this close knit community. Having a revolving door of potential renters on the island who have no connection to its residents would have a negative impact on the community.

There is also the question of barges and parking spots. The island parking as well as the docks are small and correspond to the current number of homes on the island. It is already a strain for islanders possessing two vehicles. By trying to cram in secondary suites or coach houses which would potentially house new residents this would put even more of a strain on the already limited space for barges and cars.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter,

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: QCP Review project
Subject: Draft OCP comments
Date: March-16-18 7:49:40 AM

Corporation of the District of West Vancouver
Planning Department

Dear Sirs/Mesdames:

I am writing to you as a West Vancouver commercial and residential land owner, [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] I have read your entire Draft OCP, which sadly, I would speculate, would put me in the minority of West Vancouver residents.

Firstly, I would like to compliment the author(s) of the plan for what for me was an insightful, and very well written draft plan. I have no doubt that the District has a first rate planning staff in place that have a clear grasp of the issues confronting it. The challenge for the Planning Department, I think, will be for West Vancouver residents and District Council to have the courage and foresight to allow you to adopt the necessary changes to the OCP to address West Vancouver's very real, and long unaddressed issues. Good luck.

I was struck, though not surprised, at the shockingly low number of residents involved in the OCP review process. Page ten of the Draft mentions "...there have been approximately 3,000 instances of engagement...". In my opinion, this participation by a really small percentage of our population leaves us vulnerable to direction by special interest groups, and their myopic objectives. I think it is incumbent on Council to pay attention to constituents, naturally, but also to listen to the Planning staff, who have the experience, education, and long term vision to guide the District when it comes to desirable outcomes for the whole of the population in the long term.

Before I comment on the Draft OCP, I would like to relate to you my perspective in the roles mentioned above in the context of the Draft OCP proposals.

From my perspective, West Vancouver is wildly imbalanced in terms of the age of its population, the variety and cost of housing available and the commercial shopping and dining experiences available, and it has been so for decades because of lack of political will for change. I feel that the root cause of all of these problems is an insufficient supply of housing options. It's a supply side issue, plain and simple, that has cascading consequences for the other four key areas your Draft OCP hopes to address.

As the owner of [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Ambleside [REDACTED] I observe a community

without a sufficient surrounding population base to produce economic demand for a varied and vibrant local business district. Further compounding this problem, in Ambleside, we have a population base of predominantly seniors, that typically don't spend in the way a younger cohort might and who typically don't come out of their homes later in the evening- hardly very vibrant or fertile ground for merchants. I am desperately struggling to attract employees that will permit my businesses to survive- and my experience is not unique. The reason for this, is that employees for many businesses cannot afford to live in West Vancouver. The commercial areas languish, with many vacancies. This is not surprising. Businesses locate where there is commercial demand and fertile conditions in which to operate. Attempts to promote business through the recently formed ABDIA, while well intentioned, are like attempting to push string. The real problem is the lack of housing supply in various forms which will produce the necessary conditions for business success.

As [REDACTED] resident, in West Vancouver, I observe a community with tremendous natural resources and recreational opportunity, but a community of predominantly elderly people, with elderly viewpoints and elderly habits, which doesn't make it particularly attractive to prospective younger residents or the ones already here. The imbalance in the population and the lack of choice in terms of local merchants and restaurants makes it a less interesting place to live.

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] Kitsilano Point, just across the bay from Ambleside, but on a different planet in terms of the living experience offered. There is an energy and real difference in activity and people's attitudes and friendliness that I think comes from the younger average age. There is way more housing density (including three story homes with small side yards and small lots and a lot of towers too). This provides a population base that, supports the plethora of entertainment, shopping and dining options. It's what Newport Beach, CA is like. It's what Ambleside, Dundrave and Horeshoe bay should be like. It makes West Vancouver look positively boring in comparison. [REDACTED]

There are my observations. What do I think is the solution? Substantially increase housing supply on or near established transportation nodes. Increased supply of rental housing will offer those that can't afford it, whether it be younger people, seniors, or employees of businesses and the District an opportunity to live here. Increased density of all ownership forms will result in more people living in the community, creating economic demand for goods and services and less commercial vacancy with a greater variety of services. A healthy business district makes a neighborhood attractive to potential residents, and a more desirable place for those already here. It also means that people don't have to travel by car to get the things they regularly need.

My comments on the Draft OCP:

You have identified the issues confronting the District well

The amount of population growth in West Vancouver contemplated under the RGS seem insufficient to address the concerns expressed above. It's not near enough change, but is in the right direction.

2.1

I like the idea of permitting more housing flexibility through duplex housing in existing neighborhoods. You should blanket zone the areas to pave the way.

I like the idea of allowing coach houses and basement suites. In the past, one has had to choose between one or the other

I like the idea of three stories in established residential areas. It works brilliantly in Kits Point. I am concerned that this limit not be applied to Local Area Plans like Ambleside and Dundrave and Horeshoe Bay, where I think higher limits would be appropriate.

2.1.13: I don't think the Draft OCP contemplates anywhere near a sufficient number of new units to achieve what is necessary in the LAP areas described. I regard the success achieved in Lower Lonsdale in terms of housing supply and neighborhood vibrancy and would ask you to compare the proposals in the Draft OCP against the number of housing units created in Lower Lonsdale. I don't think you are creating near enough

2.1.14: This appears concerning as it appears to call into question the existing 1.75 FAR density up to four stories that is permitted at present. 1.75 FAR is not enough to induce real change in housing form in the towncenter areas, nor address the concerns identified in the Draft OCP with demographics and housing supply. We need far greater density in those areas and we should not be afraid of some well designed point towers. There are already towers in Ambleside. What's wrong with more of them? It's the only way you are going to get a critical mass of population there.

2.1.17: I like the idea of density bonuses for rental housing. Land used for condominium apartments, is worth nearly twice what land used for rental (at the same density). If you don't provide a density bonus of nearly double that of condo site, you won't get rental projects.

2.1.19: Requiring a range of unit sizes and increasing the minimum provision of accessible and adaptive units interferes with a developer's natural response to commercial demand in the marketplace and may compromise projects or increase consumer costs. How about providing incentives for the same?

I do like the idea of prohibiting rental restrictions and age restrictions.

2.1.20 I like the idea of using municipal land for rental specific projects. Just don't have the District try to build it itself.

2.1.22 and 2.1.23: Please remember that "requiring leading energy efficiency standards" may unreasonably increase project costs. This may result in a project not proceeding, or the costs being passed to consumers, which makes the housing more expensive. Developers have a natural incentive to respond to consumer demand on this topic.

As a general comment, I have observed that the District will sometimes provide increased FAR, but at the same time charge the developer for this. Please remember that increasing the costs of providing more density tends to limit the amount of density produced or increase the end cost to consumers buying or using that density.

I am not in favour of DCCs and revenue from upzoning going into a municipal housing fund. I think the District would be better served in providing incentives through zoning to produce the type of housing desired instead of trying to produce it by itself through land acquisition and development.

Thank you for reading my comments. Good luck with the process.

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

West Vancouver, BC

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: March-14-18 1:28 PM
To: David Hawkins <dhawkins@westvancouver.ca>
Cc: Stina Hanson <shanson@westvancouver.ca>
Subject: Comment on Official Community Plan - Eagle Island - Detached/Attached Secodnary Suites

Hi David,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

The "small island character" of Eagle Island can still be maintained with the inclusion of detached or attached secondary suites. The prohibition of these secondary housing forms do not address aging in place, affordability, avail housing options for various family arrangements, or many other positive aspects of the proposed OCP. The unfortunate interim neighbour squabbling should not adversely affect an OCP that looks out for the community at large and guides decisions that will affect future generations.

I hope this prohibition on secondary suites can be revisited before becoming set in stone within the OCP. Maybe options such as an "Eagle Island Infill Housing Guideline" could at least open the door to secondary suites (detached or attached) being built.

The only real factor affecting infill housing on Eagle Island might be the dock space (yet this could easily be overcome with a "one house one barge" policy). All other issues such as views, siting, size, design, overlook, landscaping etc. could be addressed within the guidelines. The issues of parking are immaterial (given that most houses there already have multiple vehicles) and the "water pressure issue" raised can be addressed with pressure valves.

All said and done, I don't think overarching (and important) aspects of the OCP should be omitted for Eagle Island. Secondary Suites (detached or attached) should be allowed on Eagle Island.

Thanks for your time. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

West Vancouver, [REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]

To: dhawkins@westvancouver.ca

[REDACTED]

Sent: Sunday, March 11, 2018 12:00:30 PM
Subject: Comment on Official Community Plan

Dear Neighbours

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] recognize that this is about the value of your opinion on whether secondary suites, attached or detached, should

be allowed on Eagle Island.

Exercise your right to comment on the draft Official Community Plan. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Your opinion matters. Every opinion counts.

The process for establishing the new OCP is now in the final stages. It has been a comprehensive, expensive and time consuming exercise. It will be relied upon by Council to establish the path forward for the entire community, including Eagle Island, for many years to come.

The way to participate in that process and make your views known is by accessing the OCP website through the link copied below. The part that concerns Eagle Island is at Section 2.1.11 which states:

Section 2.1.11 - Support the small island character of Eagle Island by prohibiting attached or detached secondary suites (i.e. basement suites or coach houses).

It only takes a minute to make your views known and you are not limited to one response per household. You can respond from anywhere at anytime of the day.

The District has requested comments prior to [March 16](#).

Here is the link.

<https://westvancouver.ca/home-building-property/major-projects/official-community-plan-review>

Kind regards

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [OCP Review project](#)
Cc: [David Hawkins](#)
Subject: More Coach Houses Please - for Seniors and Families
Date: March-14-18 1:37:21 PM

2018 OCP Review

My [REDACTED] family ([REDACTED] [REDACTED]) would love to move to West Vancouver and assist my parents "Age in Place" and build a coach house. [REDACTED]

More coach houses in West Vancouver would achieve many of the goals for the municipality such as offering more affordable housing options and for seniors to stay in the community. Coach houses are also an excellent way to increase density while retaining the original home and the character of the neighbourhood. Currently, the zoning regulations regarding Coach Houses are a barrier to getting more coach houses built in West Vancouver. The Draft OCP suggestions for Coach Houses don't address the issue for allowable Gross Floor area or the Floor space ratio. This is something needed for homes in the Ambleside and Dundarave area specifically where the lots are smaller than the minimum lot size noted in the current Residential Zone bylaw.

I would like to suggest three options to increase Coach houses in West Vancouver to provide affordable housing for families, seniors and retaining neighbourhood character.

1. **Exclude coach houses from floor space ratio calculations.** This policy approach has been a success for the City of Vancouver to build more affordable housing options and create "gentle density".
2. or **increase the Floor Space Ratio in residential zones** (Vancouver is 0.6, CNV is maximum 0.5, DNV 0.45...)
3. or **offer a bonus square footage for coach house** (for example DNV,CNV,...)

References and examples from local municipalities for these suggestions are found here:

Vancouver Zoning bylaw 11.24.11

4.7.3 The following shall be excluded in the computation of floor space ratio:

(h) the floor area of a laneway house;

District of North Vancouver RS Zoning

Floor Space Ratio a) for lots < or = to 464m² (5000ft²) 0.45

b) for lots > 464m² (5000ft²) 0.35 + 32.5m² (350 sq.ft.)

City of North Vancouver zoning

509 SIZE, SHAPE AND SITING OF BUILDINGS FOR ONE-UNIT RESIDENTIAL USE AND ACCESSORY COACH HOUSE USE

(2) Gross Floor Area (One-Unit and Two-Unit Residential) [Bylaw 8464, May 30, 2016]

(a) combined and in total, shall not exceed the lesser of:

(i) 0.5 times the Lot Area; or

(ii) 0.3 times the Lot Area plus 92.9 square metres (1,000 square feet);

The City of North Vancouver is currently reviewing the Zoning Bylaw to increase coach houses on smaller lots and **allowing 0.5 FAR on all lots with the addition of a Coach House**

Please include the above noted suggestions in the final OCP revision as an approach to increasing Coach Houses in West Vancouver and allowing seniors to age in place while creating affordable options for families.



From: [REDACTED]
To: OCP Review project
Cc: Michael Smith; Mary Ann Booth; Craig Cameron; Christine Cassidy; Nora Gambioli; Peter Lambur; Bill Soorovich
Subject: Opposition to Draft OCP Regeneration of existing neighbourhoods and Transportation
Date: March-15-18 1:37:22 PM

Dear Sir/Madam

[REDACTED] residents [REDACTED] in West Vancouver, and have lived in the District for [REDACTED]

Please consider this my [REDACTED] strong opposition to the Draft OCP as presented.

Section 2.4, in its entirety, is woefully inadequate to address the transportation requirements of the District. Should the District follow through on plans for increased density this inadequacy will only be exacerbated. We only need to look to North Vancouver to see how substantial increases in density have resulted in a traffic and transportation disaster.

The encouragement of "walking and biking" will do nothing to address what is completely absent from the Draft OCP; commuting. The word "Commuting", or any of its derivatives, appear exactly ZERO times throughout the plan. To not even consider the impact of the plan on people who may actually work, or work outside of West Vancouver, is a gross oversight.

This plan proposes 200-300 new housing units in Horseshoe Bay alone, allowing infill homes, expanded duplex housing, smaller homes on smaller lots and coach houses. Beyond these measures hurting the beauty and desirability of the area (sections 2.1.1 - 2.1.13) the arithmetic of plan simply makes no sense.

In the population projections, the plan indicates a growth of more than 13,000 residents. Without explanation, the plan increases the number of people employed in the District from ~19,000 (excluding Squamish Nations) to ~29,000 even though the report acknowledges that there is a DECLINE in the number of jobs within the district.


In addition to not providing any support for the increase in the number of jobs in the District, the OCP also fails to provide an explanation as to why the ratio of employment to residents should be increasing from 41% to 48%.

The simple reality is that the District of West Vancouver is a commuter city for the City of Vancouver and surrounding communities. Increasing the population density by at least 30% (as is documented in the OCP) will increase traffic congestion by at least that amount, and absolutely even more when you include increased traffic from ferry traffic, and communities along the Sea to Sky highway.

With only two bridges, and two East/West arteries, there is no way the District of West Vancouver can handle a substantial increase in population density.

My family opposes this OCP, and will be sure to reflect that in our discourse and all upcoming elections.

[REDACTED]
Resident, West Vancouver BC



From: [REDACTED]
To: OCP Review project
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: [REDACTED]
Date: March-16-18 11:29:18 AM

Dear Sir / Madam,

There is a Restrictive Covenant on title [REDACTED] which protects [REDACTED] [REDACTED] from densification which we would like to see recognized by the municipality when more detailed neighbourhood level subdivision and densification standards are being implemented.

We are also requesting the following addition to the OCP:

Respecting character and protecting heritage

2.1.12 Support the "cottage country" character of Gleneagles by:

- recognizing neighbourhood guidelines that limit subdivision and the number of allowable dwellings per lot

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: OCP Review project
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: DRAFT OCP INPUT
Date: March-16-18 1:54:50 PM

Dear Planner,

My wife and I have reviewed the draft OCP and are in agreement with higher density [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Kind regards

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] West Vancouver.

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: OCP Review project
Subject: draft ocp comment and questions
Date: March-16-18 5:35:41 PM

Hi there, I have a few comments and questions:

I note the Upper Lands Study recommends the following:

3.1.1.3 West Vancouver seek municipal ownership of vacant private lands that are surrounded by municipal lands above 1200 feet, [REDACTED] with a priority placed on lands with intact forests.

The draft OCP has the following language:

2.7.8 Seek to acquire vacant private lands above 1200 feet, with priority for lands with high environmental value (e.g. intact forests) or high recreational potential.

Comment: The above policy is too vague. It needs a more specific strategy and timeline.
General comment: 1200 foot elevation is not a good public policy boundary, it should be informed by ecological value, topography, etc.

Questions:

1. What kind of strategy are you proposing to acquire those properties above 1200 feet?
 2. Will you be offering development rights to owners of [REDACTED] below the 1200 foot mark similar to what is being proposed elsewhere?
 3. Will there be fairness when transferring development rights for small lot owners, vs big lot owners for upper lands properties?
 4. Will the lands acquired be dedicated as public park?
 5. What is the timeline for acquisition?
- [REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: OCP Review project
Subject: Re: Community Plan
Date: March-17-18 12:24:16 PM

The following comments are offered (sorry one day late)

Parking: You can plan & make changes to Ambleside all you want, But it will Not result in a more vibrant area without parking. Find a site to have a Free Multi-level parking garage so people will frequent this area & support merchants. This is exactly what has been done in many European places, with great success.

Be very mindful of replacing present buildings what our mayor describes as a disgrace....these places are the bread & butter to locals with affordable services, like a fish shop, tailors, unique grocers, bakeries, etc. If you take the buildings down they will leave because they cannot afford the rents in new buildings & those that stay will have to increase their prices substantially. Instead meet with the owners...offer incentives to dick up the buildings (paint & flowers do wonders)...work on a seaside theme for the bldgs...After all we are Ambleside By The Sea. Make these old buildings shine with a nautical theme. Offer monetary incentives to the owners to do this.

Park System...Maintain what we have first before forging ahead with new trails, etc. Fix those Big Pot Holes that can damage cars...Put in Toilets..Empty the garbage before it overflows...fill the dog bag containers(often empty for 2 to 3 days at a time). In other words, don't bite off more than we can chew, charging forward with new initiatives before we can properly maintain what we already have.

Transportation: Cycling...carefully monitor usage before created more...if not utilized enough to justify the cost, don't just forge ahead with them. Our topography & elderly citizen base does not justify this.

Buses...Need greater coverage...where I live there is no bus so I am paying taxes & getting no service. I would love to be able to take the bus.

Spirit Trail...monitor closely the funds spent in future. Seaview walk has had too much unnecessary grooming done to it, to the detriment of the walk..ie: cutting down of some trees & many shrubs so you now look at Marine Drive instead of greenery, Blackberry bushes whacked to the ground (that locals have picked for years). One wonders is they are milking it (the golden goose that never stops giving).

Housing: Consider seniors one level patio homes in clusters.

The biggest deterrent is COST...would you trade your house & nice yard for a one or two bedroom apt. because that is all you would get from the money from your house...then be saddled with monthly strata fees & special assessments?

From: [REDACTED]
To: [OCP Review project](#)
Cc: [Michael Smith](#); [Mary-Ann Booth](#); [Craig Cameron](#); [Christine Cassidy](#); [Nora Gambioli](#); [Peter Lambur](#); [Bill Soprovich](#)
Subject: Opposition to Draft OCP Regeneration of existing neighbourhoods and Transportation
Date: March-17-18 2:23:06 PM

Hello - [REDACTED] and we echo [REDACTED] comments below and agree wholeheartedly. This has been a big topic of conversation with the families at [REDACTED] and people are consistently strongly opposed. We hope you will take this feedback seriously and make changes to the plan.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

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

From: [REDACTED]
Date: Thu, Mar 15, 2018 at 1:37 PM
Subject: Opposition to Draft OCP Regeneration of existing neighbourhoods and Transportation
To: <ocp@westvancouver.ca>
CC: <msmith@westvancouver.ca>, <mbooth@westvancouver.ca>, <ccameron@westvancouver.ca>, <ccassidy@westvancouver.ca>, <ngambioli@westvancouver.ca>, <plambur@westvancouver.ca>, <bsoprovich@westvancouver.ca>

Dear Sir/Madam

My family are [REDACTED] in West Vancouver, and have lived in the District for [REDACTED]

Please consider this my family's strong opposition to the Draft OCP as presented.

Section 2.4, in its entirety, is woefully inadequate to address the transportation requirements of the District. Should the District follow through on plans for increased density this inadequacy will only be exacerbated. We only need to look to North Vancouver to see how substantial increases in density have resulted in a traffic and transportation disaster.

The encouragement of "walking and biking" will do nothing to address what is completely absent from the Draft OCP; commuting. The word "Commuting", or any of its derivatives, appear exactly ZERO times throughout the plan. To not even consider the impact of the plan

on people who may actually work, or work outside of West Vancouver, is a gross oversight.

This plan proposes 200-300 new housing units in Horseshoe Bay alone, allowing infill homes, expanded duplex housing, smaller homes on smaller lots and coach houses. Beyond these measures hurting the beauty and desirability of the area (sections 2.1.1 - 2.1.13) the arithmetic of plan simply makes no sense.

In the population projections, the plan indicates a growth of more than 13,000 residents. Without explanation, the plan increases the number of people employed in the District from ~19,000 (excluding Squamish Nations) to ~29,000 even though the report acknowledges that there is a DECLINE in the number of jobs within the district.

In addition to not providing any support for the increase in the number of jobs in the District, the OCP also fails to provide an explanation as to why the ratio of employment to residents should be increasing from 41% to 48%.

The simple reality is that the District of West Vancouver is a commuter city for the City of Vancouver and surrounding communities. Increasing the population density by at least 30% (as is documented in the OCP) will increase traffic congestion by at least that amount, and absolutely even more when you include increased traffic from ferry traffic, and communities along the Sea to Sky highway.

With only two bridges, and two East/West arteries, there is no way the District of West Vancouver can handle a substantial increase in population density.

My family opposes this OCP, and will be sure to reflect that in our discourse and all upcoming elections.

██████████

Resident, West Vancouver BC

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [OCP Review project](#)
Subject: Green cycle lanes and make them separate.
Date: March-18-18 2:47:14 PM

Hi,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] I'm happy to see that the OCP indicates that more dedicated bike lanes will be built.

In my opinion, the existing cycle lanes through Ambleside are better, but still not good enough. Because the Spirit Trail through Ambleside is mostly mixed-use for walkers and cyclists there is a conflict. Many of the walkers have dogs and do not have their dogs on lease - so the dogs run free. This is dangerous for cyclists, as the dog can run at you or run at a squirrel at any time, and cause a serious accident. I would like to propose that cycle trails are painted green the whole way through West Van. This will make it safer for everyone. If walkers are crossing a cycle lane, they will be more aware and will look both ways to make sure it's safe.

I think the OCP should recognize three distinct user transportation user groups - walkers, cyclists and drivers. Each has different needs and should not be mixed with any other group. There are people walking all the time in the areas that are designated for cycling only - my sense is that if the lanes were painted green and the single was improved, this would be prevented.

Thank you.

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: OCP Review project
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Addition re Old-growth
Date: March-20-18 12:03:02 PM

[REDACTED]

I am interested in your considering adding the words " old-growth " to section 2.7.4 of Parks and Trails (2.7), or other sections you may consider. The reasoning for this request follows:-

There is increasing general interest in old-growth forest stands and individual trees on the Coast of B.C. and especially in the District of West Vancouver. There are forest stands of old-growth in such areas as Lighthouse Park, Cypress Falls Park, other parks, and individual old-growth trees along many of West Vancouver creeks. There are also many old-growth trees throughout West Vancouver which must be recognized as such. It is important that there be reference to OLD-GROWTH in the OCP so that the residents and visitors are aware of old-growth features and the integral part they play in the structure of our natural environment.

On [REDACTED] we suggest the following words be included in Section 2.7.4 of the OCP:-

(e.g. rock outcrops ,forests including old-growth, viewpoints and shoreline and water features), or

(e.g.. rock outcrops, forests, old-growth trees, viewpoints and shoreline and water features.)

I look forward to hearing from you,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: March-21-18 8:59 AM
To: David Hawkins <dhawkins@westvancouver.ca>
Cc: Stina Hanson <shanson@westvancouver.ca>
Subject: Comment regarding the new Official Community Plan - Support

Hi David,

As a resident of West Vancouver [REDACTED]
to "chime in" on the new OCP:

1. Support for infill housing options (e.g. duplex, triplex and townhouses) is absolutely necessary (mainly to provide "more affordable" housing options for new residents, workers, young family members of existing residents and downsizers).
2. Infill options should be clustered around existing nodes (Ambleside, Dunderave and Horseshoe Bay).
3. I whole heartedly support reduction in single family housing size/bulk.
4. Apartment development should be fully supported within Dunderave and Ambleside (view corridor studies much like Vancouver could be in order).
5. I like the idea of creating local area plans.
6. The idea of "local worker retention housing" could be explored (whereby single family homes and duplexes could be allowed multiple small/micro suites which are occupied by the local labour force or workers not wanting to commute every day). {enforced through housing agreements}.

As a general note:

1. In listening to some residents fear of over densification, I feel the density targets are not excessive in any which way and could/should be slightly higher (yet maybe leave well enough alone).
2. It seems that language around increased density around Dunderave is missing; the outlying area between the rec centre and Dunderave village core would be prime corridor to allow more intensive infill housing.
3. The language around protection of the environment is good and supports protection of the environment.
4. I really don't support development of the upper lands or Cypress Village for that matter (mainly b/c its is basically the opposite of TOD), yet there is history there (which I can appreciate) and the idea of road connections above Caulfield towards Cypress village is welcome. (yet please ensure mtn. bike trails are not destroyed).

Basically, the status quo (erosion of affordability, empty homes, and monster homes) is not working. West Van is a wonderful place yet needs to evolve to become better

(and not stagnant). The new OCP is definitely a step in the right direction.

Thanks for your time,

West Vancouver

Stina Hanson

Subject: [REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: March-23-18 10:47 AM

To: West Vancouver Communications <communications@westvancouver.ca>; Michael Smith <msmith@westvancouver.ca>; [REDACTED]

Subject: Vancouver Study Group recommendations

Hello,

Thank you for your email and invitation.

The [REDACTED] suggested a number of OCP recommendations. We noticed that none of these recommendations are expressed in your draft document [REDACTED]


Our comments are the following:

- 1) your draft OCP lacks aesthetics and imagination.
- 2) Even if you took out two of every five words in your document ... *it would still have too many words.*

The long term plan of West Van appears to be to continue to sell land and 'blight-up' the North Shore mountains. Our recommendations regarding the [REDACTED] was to provide an alternative view.

Some [REDACTED] ago we participated in a number of *North Shore Economic Development* efforts that made the North Shore a High tech Venue and has help to generate over \$ 25 Billion of economic activity for the region [REDACTED] Here is the report that was the blue-print ...

[High Technology on the North Shore: The North and West Vancouver Economic Development Commission \(1989 \): Part 1 : Patrick Bruskiwich : Free Download & Streaming : Internet Archive](#)



High Technology on the North Shore: The North and West Vancouver Economi...

Archived copy of a report completed in 1989 outlining a High Technology Survey and Strategy for North and West V.

[High Technology on the North Shore: The North and West Vancouver Economic Development Commission \(1989\) : Part 2 : Patrick Bruskiwich : Free Download & Streaming : Internet Archive](#)



High Technology on the North Shore: The North and West Vancouver Economi...

FBA

In making the [redacted] to West Vancouver it is clear no one was listening ...

P

From: [REDACTED]
To: [OCP Review project](#)
Cc: [Michael Smith](#); [Mary-Ann Booth](#); [Craig Cameron](#); [Christine Cassidy](#); [Nora Gambioli](#); [Bill Soprovich](#); [Peter Lambur](#)
Subject: OCP
Date: March 23-18 12:45:53 PM

We as [REDACTED] residents of West Vancouver object to 2.1.13 to create capacity for 200-300 new housing units in Horseshoe Bay.

[REDACTED] drove from their home near UBC to catch an early ferry from Horseshoe Bay to Nanaimo to attend a wedding. They planned to park and walk on the ferry. There was no parking available even so early in the day so they hurriedly took their car to ferry lineup and were told they would never make the wedding and not knowing what more they could do, drove home exasperated. How can you consider densifying when there is inadequate parking facilities at present. More density would only exacerbate the problem. In this eco-climate these people wasted their time and money polluting with a car in vain.

Parking in Ambleside is becoming more difficult and the density along Marine at 13 is increasing. I can't imagine where the elder residents of West Vancouver will park if trying to go to the 2 new restaurants going in to the Grovenor development.

Densification is already a problem, often times waiting 45 minutes just to get on to North side of Lions Gate bridge. Increasing the proposed development of 4 high rises in that high traffic area makes one wonder who makes these decisions - is it a robot or a human. I suspect developers money has something to do with the decisions.

If there was ever a forest fire on the North Shore mountains - think of how the thousands of residents would find an escape route.

Increased tree cutting along Marine Drive [REDACTED] clearing, after tearing down houses, is slowly eliminating the eagles habitat.

The proposed changes I think are eroding the very reasons we chose West Vancouver and I am sure voters, many not alerted to the changes, would vote against many of the OCP proposals. Maybe a referendum is in order.



>>> -----Original Message-----

>>> From: [REDACTED]

>>> Sent: March-23-18 2:30 PM

>>> To: Nora Gambioli <ngambioli@westvancouver.ca>

>>> Subject: Re Official Community Plan Draft

>>>

>>>

>>>> Thank you to you and your colleagues on Council and the staff in the Municipality for making the effort to update our Official Community Plan.

>>>>

>>>> For your information [REDACTED] long time residents of West Vancouver moving [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] In the last five years [REDACTED] there was a huge amount of construction with lots being stripped bare of forest and trees and huge very large and expensive homes replacing the more modest and more affordable homes. Many of these new homes remained unoccupied. Due to challenges with construction next door we decided to move from our long time family home to our current address.

>>>>

>>>> I attended recently an [REDACTED] meeting where I expected to hear a presentation from either a senior member of our Planning Department or from our Mayor or a Councillor engaged in the drafting of the plan. I appreciate the Mayor and most of Council attending the meeting but was disappointed there was no presentation of the plan or any member of our Planning department available to answer residents' questions although I understood invited.

>>>>

>>>> So having had the opportunity to read the plan but having no opportunity to ask questions of our Planning department or our Mayor and Councillors below are my comments and questions.

>>>>

>>>> Firstly I am concerned with the short time the draft plan has been published and the short submission date for comments - March 16 now amended to March 29. Many residents have no idea what this plan might mean for them. I think that there needs to be at least three months of review and many community meetings before plan goes to council for approval.

>>>>

>>>> I think the focus group meetings that were held this summer tended to drive people to certain conclusions and has given the Planning department some unfortunate feeling that in fact we all want more development (related construction) and density - fewer single family homes and a lot more townhomes and apartments.

>>>>

>>>> While I think that we do have citizens nearing retirement who want these types of properties I believe that there are plenty of apartments available - the gap perhaps is larger three bedroom plus apartments and low rise townhomes or coach houses (duplex, triplex developments). The idea of strong demand from younger citizens is I think misguided as it seems unfortunately that such apartments, townhouses or coach houses would remain unaffordable to most of them. I know that most of friends' children do not live in West or North Vancouver as it is just too expensive for them.

>>>>

>>>> Most people I talk with are concerned about traffic gridlock on the North Shore and if there are to be increases in density want to understand how it impacts there neighbourhood and traffic.

>>>>

>>>> The other issue they are concerned about is neighbourhood character and how this has been eroded over many years with very little concrete action to try to resolve.

>>>>

>>>> Affordability is also a concern but I fear there are no easy solutions to this one- recent steps taken by BC NDP may help a little here but not enough to make West Vancouver affordable any time in the near future , if ever. (recent developments Grosvenor, Cressey, Horseshoe Bay and planned development on Marine Drive bear this out-

increased density is not creating affordable homes).

>>>>

>>>> The 53 page draft plan contains a huge amount of motherhood and apple pie but very little that deals with traffic issues and very little explaining why the need for increased density and the impact on traffic and neighbourhoods of such increases. The plan also has very little to say on preserving neighbourhood character.

>>>>

>>>> Some more specific thoughts and questions where it would have been really useful for some member of Council or Planning department at the [REDACTED] meeting to answer. So I am hoping by writing that I will get answers.

>>>>

>>>> Pages 3-6 try to explain the increased population forecast which I believe is the driver in the draft OCP for the need for increased density. Given that our population has been flat to declining I am not sure why we are now forecasting the population of West Vancouver to start rising again? I almost feel the draft OCP needed to justify increasing density and population growth is what was required. This seems to be a critical assumption and think needs to be well thought through as much of the rest of the plan depends on this assumption. We need to understand the demographics of the forecast population growth surely to determine the type of housing they may need or want or could afford.

>>>>

>>>> Page 7 & 8 deal with Housing affordability and diversity- Firstly nowhere in this draft OCP do we define what our definition of affordability is - affordable to B.C. citizens at large, those who already own homes and are downsizing, younger people in B.C. ? With very high land prices more diversity of housing will not necessarily make our housing affordable except to foreign investors or a wealthy minority of the BC population. We have built Grosvenor one 7 floor and to be built one 6 floor building and have under construction Cressy a 20 story . We also have the Horseshoe Bay development and also under plan The Residences on Marine -from \$1.9 million to \$2.75 million. None of these would be affordable at all to the vast majority of B.C.residents and likely only affordable to those with inheritances, downsizing from an existing home or foreign investors. So increased density will not provide affordable housing only housing that is marginally more affordable than a single family home.

>>>>

>>>> Employees of businesses here will still have to commute to West Vancouver as even the higher density smaller homes will remain unaffordable to most if not all- so what we need is to make it easier for those employees to travel to the North Shore by transit and road!!! This begs discussion re adding lanes to our bridges or a third crossing.

>>>>

>>>> Page 10 where we are in the process- as stated above I think the first three phases and the discussions led by planning surprisingly led participants to the solution that planning was directing residents to- I am not convinced that in many instances this is really what residents of West Vancouver are looking for.

>>>>

>>>> Page 15- 2.1.1 - I think the concept here is valid but wording a little unclear- my read is that draft OCP is saying throughout most of West Vancouver larger lots will be able to be subdivided and also coach houses built - what is not clear are actual minimum lot sizes (assume 33 foot) or minimum lot size where coach House could be built. Are we also saying that basement suites would be allowed anywhere as well?

>>>>

>>>> Page 15 & 16 2.1.4 to 2.1.7 This seems to be what is defined as the Marine Drive Transit Corridor which you are defining essentially going along Marine Drive from Park Royal all the way to Horseshoe Bay- all along this corridor Triplexes, Duplexes and townhouses should be permitted - these would be up to three stories - I am sure many residents of single family homes along this corridor would have concerns re the developments and impacts on views , traffic etc. Not sure I have understood this properly though?

>>>>

>>>> 2.1.7 seems to essentially permit Council to spot zone certain sites- I realize that Council wants flexibility but I think that spot zoning re Grosvenor (with a very split Council) did not set a good precedent to grant Council this flexibility- (was pushed through with the vast majority of residents opposed.) Not surprisingly this has created a low level of trust among residents. It would therefore be better if Council had a 75% or better still 100% majority to approve such cases should they arise.

>>>>

>>>> 2.1.8 - this really is the only small section (two small paragraphs) that talks about respecting neighbourhood character. For most residents I think this is a major priority and therefore ideas to protect neighbourhood character should be spelled out in more detail and given more prominence in the draft OCP. This has been a major concern for most residents for many years and very little action has been taken by our Mayor or Council. In the meantime we

continue to see many monstrosities built that have a very negative effect on existing long time residents' quality of life.

>>>>

>>>> 2.1.13 - Ambleside Town Centre - the plan proposes 1,000 -1,200 new units or about a 25% increase!!!

Seems quite high. I note that 2.1.14 looks at confirming area of Ambleside Town Centre which seems a larger area than would be currently zoned for townhomes and apartments etc? The second point states "Determine densities, heights, building forms that respond to neighborhood context and character"- what does this really mean? I residents want to know where high rises can be built and townhomes, duplexes etc and how that may impact them. They would also like to know the maximum number of stories for such dwelling types. Not clear to me here? The same questions re types of buildings allowed and number of stories apply to other areas such as Horseshoe Bay and Cypress.

>>>>

>>>> Next paragraph states "Prioritizing mixed-use and apartment forms in core areas and ground oriented multi family forms (eg townhouses ,duplexes) to transition to adjacent single-family neighbourhoods" Again using the Ambleside Town centre Map I think residents want to understand where Apartments can be built and to what height , where townhomes can be built and to what height and where duplexes etc can be built- this is not clear to me from reading the plan.

>>>>

>>>> Section 2.1.16 re Advancing housing affordability, accessibility and sustainability- all sounds good in principal but who is going to pay for subsidies and how do you determine who is worthy and who is not? Affordable to whom? It is interesting that we had some lower rental housing and Council approved demolition and building of Cressey Apartment tower with units selling well over \$3 million each?

>>>>

>>>> 2.1.20 re Use of District Owned Lands to create affordable housing There is a clear cost to taxpayers and how do we decide who is to benefit therefrom? Again affordable to whom?

>>>>

>>>> Planning of the new Cypress West Neighborhoods-starting at 2.2.7 -all sounds good but should we not determine what we will do with additional traffic- are there plans to add another link to the Highway? If not we are creating a traffic problem at the Cypress Bowl junction? We are of course in any event adding to the Upper Levels Highway Gridlock. I think this development should be deferred till we have solutions completed that relieve the gridlock that we have currently.

>>>>

>>>> 2.3 Local Economy and Employment- All sounds good but very general statements that need an action plan and specifics to determine what , if anything, the Municipality can actually do. The focus on more retail and restaurants sounds wonderful but think of Amazon- Retail stores are struggling unless they can create a real experience that makes people want to visit. We also have many restaurants that struggle already- will adding more really help? With no growth in population in West Vancouver customer growth will have to come from attracting visitors from elsewhere in Lower Mainland- this will add to traffic gridlock and discourage further those who may consider coming.

>>>>

>>>> Our businesses and employers on the North Shore struggle today to get those willing to commute to North Shore to work. We are unlikely to be able to make it affordable for employees to live here so we need as a priority to make it easier for those employees by transit and road to get here!

>>>>

>>>> 2.3.10 Supporting tourism and visitors- Again sounds good but how do you execute - also need to improve transit and road access to North Shore if you want to attract tourists and visitors. The Evening Entertainment sounds again wonderful but who are the customer base? We have an ageing population so not sure who we are catering to? Have we good feedback from our residents that they want this? Cypress Park is great but again it is attracting huge volumes of traffic and therefore this brings us back to the inadequacy of our road systems and transit.

>>>>

>>>> 2.4 Transportation and Infrastructure - Surprising to me that we start off with walking and cycling? We are an ageing population living on the side of a mountain- is this really our top priority and that of our residents? I hope we are not following Vancouver by adding endless bike lanes and creating further traffic gridlock.

>>>>

>>>> Yes it would be good to have improved transit to connect communities and to other parts of Lower Mainland and not just downtown- not really sure of need for transit along Marine drive within West Vancouver nor who would use it- the demand I think is to make it easier to get to other Municipalities in lower Mainland (on and off

North Shore)

>>>>

>>>> Expansion of the Ferry Terminal should be resisted without the Province investing in improved transit and road access (third crossing or additional lanes on our bridges)- The Ferry traffic is already a major contributor to the Gridlock on the Upper Levels and our bridges.

>>>>

>>>> 2.4.12 Enhancing road network and sustainability I support but there is no real mention of what ought to be the very top of the list- A third crossing or additional lanes to our bridges- we need to get the Provincial and Federal Government to realise that the most significant volume of traffic to and from the North Shore is through traffic to Ferries, Squamish and Whistler and visitors to Grouse Mountain and Cypress Park- It is highly unlikely that those through travellers would use transit. It is also highly unlikely that Construction workers would use transit either.

>>>>

>>>> 2.4.21- Prioritize sustainable transportation options and seek to reduce auto dependency in private and public development projects- a great goal but how do you actually get construction workers out of their cars? We need some concrete ideas here such as ensuring on all major developments that developer stores tools on site and provides compulsory ride sharing from say Burnaby and other locations.

>>>>

>>>> Bike sharing , car and ride sharing ? Have you actually asked residents if they would use that? I cannot see the demand for that now or in the medium future.

>>>>

>>>> Provide infrastructure for electric vehicles- do we really want to subsidize Tesla owners?

>>>>

>>>> Again our clear priority needs to be firstly improved road systems including more lanes of traffic to get on and off the North Shore and across the North Shore. Improved Transit to other Municipalities would be next.

>>>>

>>>> 2.6 Parks and Environment- I think fair to say one of the joys of living here in West Vancouver is our Parks and access to the waterfront- lets keep that but also when we want to expand areas of plantings in our Parks be conscious of maintenance- I think often we cannot maintain adequately existing planted areas. We do need also improved Parking at Lighthouse Park.

>>>>

>>>> 2.8 Social Well being- Section seems to be largely all Motherhood and Apple Pie- yes all worthy but how do you action and what are costs versus benefits.

>>>>

>>>> In general as taxpayers we have seen significant increases in our taxes and added billings for utilities- It is incumbent on our Municipal Government to manage costs and staffing demands very carefully to ensure the services are really meeting community wants and needs and to assist making living in our community more affordable. I am not convinced that enough attention paid to managing costs.

>>>>

>>>> In summary on speaking to many of my friends and acquaintances I think Residents priorities are:

>>>>

>>>> 1) Traffic challenges and gridlock - we need a solution for residents, employees of our businesses and those passing through our community

>>>>

>>>> 2) Neighborhood character and concrete actions to address which is long overdue.

>>>>

>>>> 3) Provision of more housing options that fit nicely and architecturally into neighbourhoods- but definitely not large and very expensive high rise development

>>>>

>>>> 4) More affordable housing but I think recognised that there is no easy solution that is not very costly.

>>>>


>>>> I realize the above is quite a lot to read through but so were the 53 pages of the draft OCP!! If you got to the end thank you for reading and I hope that some of my comments will be taken into consideration before any final OCP is brought to Council for approval.

>>>>

>>>> I look forward to hearing directly from you or receiving a reply from the Planning Department.

>>>>

>>>> Respectfully submitted,



From: [REDACTED]
To: OCP Review project
Subject: comments on OCP
Date: March-24-18 10:38:19 AM

To the Staff, Mayor and Councillors:

I would like to provide some feedback on the proposed Official Community Plan.

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] I do NOT want Ambleside turned into a "Town Centre"! I do not want increased density. In particular, I do not want buildings, particularly commercial structures on Marine Drive to be any higher than the existing height.

I see that the OCP seems to limit heights to "three stories", but my experience [REDACTED] [REDACTED] has suggested to me that the definition of a "storey" can be modified to suit the needs of developers or landlords. I also do not quite see how the new OCP clarifies the issue of "special sites" which I understand have negotiable height restrictions.

Next, I do not want to see vastly increased traffic in Ambleside from the addition of "boutique" hotels, B&B's and chain restaurants. Ambleside needs to remain a quiet, village by the sea. I would like to point out that Deep Cove made attempts to "welcome" visitors and now it is unliveable by those who actually reside there due to traffic and congestion. I would also note that, unless West Vancouver builds more FREE parking (highly unlikely), all those visitors to "Ambleside Town Centre" will park north of Marine Drive on the residential streets. I see that the West End of Vancouver now charges in the vicinity of \$500/year for residential parking permits. Are residential parking permits also in the planning stages for West Vancouver? I also would like to see chain stores and big box restaurants like "Earl's, which will be moving into the Grosvenor development, stopped. However, if this "revitalization" goes forward, only big box stores and chains will be able to afford the rent.

I do not agree that "revitalizing" West Vancouver by making Ambleside the target of development will make it any more desirable or affordable. Perhaps it is time to say: Sorry, there is no more room in West Vancouver, go somewhere else. Or council could actually try to control the astronomical housing costs by controlling non-resident ownership and also empty houses.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: OCP Review project
Subject: [REDACTED] - input to OCP draft review
Date: March-25-18 6:21:14 PM
Attachments: [REDACTED] letter re OCP March 2018.pdf

Hello,

A few comments to OCP attached.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

March 25, 2018

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

Re: comments to the OCP draft dated February 13, 2018

Dear West Vancouver Mayor and Council,

Following encouragements to review OCP draft I would like to share the following:

2.1.22 – add bullet points

- provide financial incentives for energy retrofits for existing residential and multi-residential buildings
- consider tax based financial disincentive(s) for buildings with high GHG emissions

2.4.10 – add

- extend usage of existing rail infrastructure (CN) for local transportation within West Vancouver, also including further connections with other municipalities (like Squamish)

Note: aside from issues with CN we have now, infrastructure is already in place and it is clearly underutilized. Small size rail vehicles with low noise level are very popular in Europe and similar model could be used here

After reviewing OCP Scope and Legislative Context I feel that Plan should include for policies related to social well-being, especially in relation to strategic decisions for substantial urbanistic and architectural projects (like Grosvenor and similar). Since these large projects located in critical places of Municipality have life expectancy of 100+ years (and will influence life of a few generations), I feel that direct involvement of the community in the form of referendum shall be included in the OCP.

Sincerely,



From: [REDACTED]
To: OCP Review project
Subject: Draft Official Community Plan : Part One dated February 13, 2018
Date: March-26-18 10:51:26 AM

[REDACTED]
West Vancouver, B.C.
[REDACTED]

2018 March 26

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

RE: Draft: Official Community Plan : Part One dated February 13, 2018

Dear Mayor and Council,

This letter is to support the above noted OCP Review. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] seniors looking to downsize with limited options to stay in the community".

I urge Council to approve the OCP.

Yours truly,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: OCP Review project
Subject: Further comments on draft OCP - Old Growth Trees and Forest
Date: March-26-18 1:05:32 PM

I am very concerned about the complete lack of reference to protection of old growth in the OCP. This community is blessed with trees over 250 years old and in some cases over 1000 years old. We are holding these rare assets not just for our residents but for the world and future generations. Old growth trees are that important and need to be recognized as such. There should be a policy statement at the highest levels to protect these unique heritage assets by providing for it in the OCP. The presumption should be that old growth trees (over 250 years old) should not be cut unless exceptional circumstances justify it as determined by Council after public input. Adding the section described below will hopefully achieve that result.

Protecting Old Growth Trees and Forest

2.7.18 Protect remaining old growth trees and forest under municipal control by:

- Identifying the location of all remaining old growth stands including remnants within younger stands;
- Prohibiting the cutting of or damage to old growth trees under municipal control, except in exceptional situations, and only after a public consultation process with specific approval by Council;
- Preventing any development or activity that may damage the ecological integrity of any remaining old growth stands, except as may be approved by Council after a full and fair public consultation process;

[REDACTED]

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: March-26-18 4:28 PM
To: David Hawkins <dhawkins@westvancouver.ca>
Subject: Thanks and follow up comments

Hi David,

Thanks so much for taking the time to meet with me, as a community member, last week to discuss West Vancouver's OCP draft. Further to our conversation, I am forwarding along my comments for your consideration below.

First and foremost, I think that all instances of the word "affordable" in relation to housing are misleading.

Traffic and transportation need to be dealt with in a meaningful way prior to the densification of Taylor Way and Ambleside.

Locating appropriate and adequate "park and ride" options need to be explored now -- as residents are already being ticketed for parking outside of the 80 spots on the top of Park Royal north -- prior to further densification.

Parking both for construction vehicles and for duplex/triplex/fourplex development needs addressing. Many of the streets in Ambleside are rife with trade vehicles, cement trucks, delivery vehicles etc. every weekday, leaving virtually no parking for residents and guests. With the additional removal of much of the parking for municipal employees, parking around city hall is difficult to find. The creation of a fourplex on a single family lot will likely mean four (three extra) cars for that lot. Will we soon be looking at permit only parking in Ambleside?

While the plan offers a diversity of homes, it states that some will be rental. As neither staff nor council can assure that any of it will be market rental, but could all be sold, it's unclear to me how this can be guaranteed. If developers are seeking bonus density for rental housing but do not receive said bonus density, they will either choose to sell units or not develop.

Nowhere in the plan is it discussed that there will be budgeting for emergency services for additional population being planned.

This plan leaves open to Ambleside, Taylor Way and Horseshoe Bay spot zoning. If this is a high-level document, it should not include anything "area-specific" or "site-specific".

The challenges we need to overcome in Community Wide directions are not exclusive to West Vancouver, but rather range throughout the GVRD.

It's beyond me how increasing the population will lead to more employment opportunities.

While there are more points to be made, I think that this is long enough for the time being! I hope I've not lost your interest with the length. I appreciate your time and interest, and look forward to following along with the process as a citizen of this outstanding community.

All the best,

[REDACTED]

wv



From: [REDACTED]
To: [OCP Review project; David Hawkins](#)
Subject: West Vancouver Draft OCP review
Date: March-26-18 5:12:17 PM

To whom it may concern,

We are a North Shore family and are in West Vancouver regularly to visit and help care for my [REDACTED] parents.

As West Vancouver residents for [REDACTED] my parents would love to stay but are finding their current home to be more of a burden to maintain and live in over the past few years. There are limited options for families to age in place or have multiple generations living together in West Vancouver. We would like to see more housing options for families to age in place, or down size to a townhouse or coach house.

The current draft OCP requires stronger language to allow for more coach houses on smaller lots to retain the existing home. I suggest a floor area exemption for coach houses on all residential lots so that the property owner can age in place or house family.

Please consider my revision/recommendation for the draft OCP. Please contact me if you have any questions.

Thanks,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [OCP Review project](#)
Subject: Comments moving forward!
Date: March-26-18 9:48:59 PM

To Council and volunteers/ professional input,

I have to say I am blown away with the detail and scope of ideas! Thank you to all concerned with this proposed action plan.

I truly hope this entire package moves forward. I am born and raised in West Van and hope to stay here in a smaller condo when my age and physical needs start to slow me down. Convenience for activities of daily living and transit /recreation at reasonable cost will become paramount within this 10 years.

Good luck and let us get on with it!

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]
Sent from my iPad

From: [REDACTED]
To: OCP Review project
Subject: OCP Thoughts for your consideration
Date: March-27-18 10:50:28 AM

To whom it may concern.

I largely agree with the ambitions of the OCP and offer a few points to consider in your final recommendations.

With an aligned aim of having a thriving community long term, where there are options for both my kids to live in the area we love, as well as provide opportunities for new residents and people who work within West Vancouver, please consider the following:

- You already recognize that West Vancouver offers very unique living experiences – from the connection to the downtown core, shopping, restaurants, and abundant transit of Ambleside, to the quiet, no street light, no amenity secludedness of Eagle Island - therefore one solution will not fit all areas. Keeping West Vancouver something for everyone deserves the extra effort to understand the unique attributes of each neighborhood. For example, I moved to Gleneagles to not be in the energy or convenience of Ambleside, enjoying the fact that I live without streetlights, and am surrounded by trees. Convenience was not my primary motivator, nor is it the motivation of my neighborhood – therefore I perceive elements of the plan, if applied carte blanche to all neighborhoods, would dramatically change what people in my neighborhood already knowingly selected as our ideal environment.
- Density (smaller more affordable options) relies on infrastructure. The smaller and more affordable units generally mean that these residents may or may not have a car, and will benefit from robust Transit and surrounding amenities within walking distance. So being mindful of how to create these opportunities, while not causing West Vancouver to undertake massive infrastructure projects versus leveraging off of existing infrastructure should be considered. For example Horseshoe Bay with its transit hub and supporting retail is already in place at one end, and Ambleside, the most metropolitan of all our communities is at the other end. These are logical areas to continue densification, with the emphasis on rejuvenation and development heights in Ambleside. Transit and amenities are in place, it is already the town center, and the merchants and restaurants would thrive, helping to make it a place that will shed its “dead by 10 pm” reputation and attract younger people who would otherwise be in Kitsilano, Yaletown, or even more recently Lower Lonsdale.
- [REDACTED] to live in Point Grey before moving here [REDACTED] [REDACTED] there, [REDACTED] an argument for splitting lots to increase opportunities for families. Some argued then, that it would put an end to monster houses and create affordable options. Practically speaking it did the following, and that is why we left:
 - Inflation: 1+1 does not equal 2 – the portions of a subdivided lot would sell at a premium per square foot per over larger lots as it was more accessible to more people.
 - Speculators: Every small lot was maxed out in its buildable square footage, as this was a “small lot” that was more affordable to more people. The speculators gutted the character of neighborhoods East of Blanca developing smaller homes. West of

Blanca, the City recognized the unique character of a neighborhood called "Little Australia" and maintained that area in its true character – a great live example of why it is important to protect some areas, because once they are gone, they cannot be gotten back.

- Deforestation: With people speculating on their lots, there is no room for trees given both the building envelope required to max the development, and they interfered with having sun in all areas of the yard, as the sunny lot sells for more than a shady lot
- Congestion: More cars to park and no "onsite" parking rules led to streets too congested by parking for kids to play safely on, and cars unable to pass each other.
- Sense of Community : was diminished by people looking to stay to themselves as they could be far more anonymous in a more crowded environment.

I guess the big point I am hoping to make is that while evolution and progress are inevitable, it does not need to fit every street or area the same. There is low hanging fruit in existing areas with infrastructure, where the existing mindset of the people that chose to move there is to embrace increased convenience, and other areas of West Vancouver, where the mindset of the people that moved there was to have a different pace and setting. Please reconsider the nature of each unique neighborhood when deciding if lot subdivision is true to the experience that the existing residents sought out.

I welcome the opportunity to discuss further if you wish.



From: [REDACTED]
Sent: March-27-18 10:58 AM
To: David Hawkins <dhawkins@westvancouver.ca>
Subject: OCP comments

Hi David, here are my comments on the draft OCP. Look forward to the next phases.

Regards, [REDACTED]

Comments on Feb 13, 2018 DWV OCP Draft

1. Development and Density

I am strongly in favour of increased density in the Ambleside Town Centre and the Taylor Way corridor. However many residents of WV are generally opposed to new development. This attitude has had an influence of municipal decision-making, and has negatively affected the cost, timeliness and predictability of the development approval process. As a result, the pace of development has been significantly lower than other municipalities and DWV has a generally negative reputation amongst developers. There are easier places to do business.

The draft plan is missing an explanation why this situation will somehow change, such that the "projections" set out in the plan (see comments below) might be achieved notwithstanding local opposition. If history is any guide, there is reason to believe that they will not come close to being achieved.

The challenges facing new additions to the housing stock must also be considered in light of redevelopment activity, which will result in yet more expensive housing without any net increase in units. Non-housing development and redevelopment must also be considered. The combination of replacement and net new housing and non-housing building contemplated by the draft plan implies a scale and pace of activity that is unprecedented and unlikely to meet with spontaneous broad community support.

The explanations provided in the draft plan of why the community needs increased development and density therefore need to be more forceful. The introduction to the draft needs a stronger "call" that also acknowledges and speaks to the elephant in the room - prevailing anti-development, "NIMBY" sentiments - and it must explain the pros and cons of new development and increased density. It may be helpful in this regard to set out two visions, or two scenarios, one which is based on the status quo and established trends, and the other which describes a realistic alternative based on increased density and forms the basis for the OCP.

2. Population and Housing Projections

There should be a more transparent explanation of the basis for and meaning of the projections and

estimates for future population and housing growth. The 5,000 new housing units is described on p. 4 as being “accordingly” derived from the RGS and/or the Urban Futures analysis (which actually projects more like 3,600 units); it is also described as a number that “could be accommodated” under the draft plan, as an “estimate”, and as a “guide” to plan for housing needs, and it is tied to the “projected” population growth. These all mean different things - I don’t know if I should consider it a forecast, a target, or a scenario. The rationale for this foundational element of the OCP is insufficiently explained.

The “Past and Projected Population” chart on p.5 chart is also not credible, if a “projection” is to be taken as a forecast or a most probable estimate. Over the past 40+ years, the population growth rate has been relatively stagnant and recently has turned negative. There is no reason to believe this has changed and that we are now on a very different growth trajectory. The ‘hockey stick’ curve should be described as a target, or as being conditional on the plan being adopted and implemented.

3. Housing Diversity and Affordability

The discussion on p. 6-7 about housing diversity and affordability suggests that the OCP could bring about changes that would lead to more young adults, families and employees living here.

As long as housing prices remain around current levels, these kinds of changes may occur on the margins, but not on any meaningful scale and in any case will be more than offset by out-migration of this demographic. Our housing prices are disconnected from incomes, and are driven by instead by wealth. I don’t think the draft plan makes any mention of this basic driver.

The draft plan does appropriately address the issue of housing diversity (although I have no idea what “30% more diverse housing” means). The problem is that smaller, newer units will still be very expensive and unaffordable based on incomes.

4. Realistic Expectations

The draft plan focusses on goals and narratives about complete communities, with a diversity of housing and demographics, access to local jobs that allow people to live in affordable housing and work here in a vibrant economy, cycle and take transit, etc.

These goals are laudable but are they realistic on a meaningful scale in WV? By emphasizing them, the plan may be focussing too much on what may hopefully occur on the margins (positive though they may be), while downplaying established realities that will dictate a different future for the majority of residents. These realities involve the influence of increasing wealth, continued dominance of single family homes, low levels of reliance on transit, and lack of local jobs filled by local residents, and new development that is still unaffordable based on incomes. A more probable future for most of WV is one that will look similar to the status quo, with a continuation of established conditions and trends. The plan does not adequately acknowledge and work with these underlying realities.

5. Housing and Neighbourhoods

I strongly endorse the proposals for accommodating increased density and would be happy to see it go further. The growth targets are nevertheless ambitious, and therefore need to be better explained and defended as mentioned above.

6. Local Economy

The case for a stronger commercial sector and employment growth seems to cater more to business owners than residents. The community has excellent private and public services notwithstanding the challenges in hiring and retaining low-wage staff, which are not unique to DWV. It is also a very wealthy community and it doesn't have an unemployment problem.

At the same time, WV has very few competitive advantages for any businesses that serve a non-local clientele and are not related to recreation and tourism.

To the extent that new employment could be brought to WV, it will place additional pressures on parking and congestion in Ambleside, which is not well located for effective use of transit as it is at the end of a relatively small finger in the transit network. WV is well located for commuting to jobs in the downtown area, but for people coming here to work, continued reliance on travelling by car is likely, with attendant pressures on limited infrastructure.

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: March-28-18 4:53 AM
To: OCP Review project <ocp@westvancouver.ca>
Subject: Opinions on OCP

March 27, 2018

To whom it may concern,,

We, as residents of [REDACTED] in West Vancouver for [REDACTED] disagree with [REDACTED] proposal to ban building coach houses on Eagle Island. Specifically, we object to Section 2.1.11 of OCP for the following reasons:

Section 2.1.11 states that due to the so called "small island character", the right of Eagle Island residents to build attached or detached secondary suites will be specifically banned until 2041. If this proposal is passed, it will become a right deprivation clause. We believe that the municipality should consider and solve certain problems regarding this right deprivation clause.

1. There should be justified, reasonable and clearly stated reasons when residents' certain rights are deprived

In Section 2.1.11, the reason for the deprivation of rights is so called "small island character". But what is a small island character? If we chat about such a thing, this is fine. However, if the OCP uses "small island character" as a reason for right deprivation, there should be a clear definition of the legal meaning unless the legal connotation of the concept is common sense. For example, "the single-family residential character" in Vancouver's zone by-law is an example of a clear concept of legal meaning.

"Small island" itself cannot constitute a reasonable reason for deprivation of the rights of building a detached coach house. Since Eagle Island is an island with Full city service and just a few dozens of meters away from the mainland, it is not different, in terms of water, electricity, sewage, communication devices, etc., from other areas or some other regions in West Vancouver. Its garbage management is the same as that in strata property communities in other regions.

Because cars cannot drive onto the island, there is a special need for municipal services such as (1) Docks and trestles, as well as (2) parking spaces for land vehicles. This is the real character of Eagle Island. However, this has nothing to do with the "small island", because in a big island or mainland areas, if these two municipal service resources are limited, it may also cause restrictions on the rights of secondary suites or detached coach houses. Therefore, the real legitimate reason for the deprivation of the right of building secondary suites and the detached coach houses in Eagle Island can only be that the aforementioned two municipal service resources are limited, and it has nothing to do with so called "small island".

Another possible explanation for the "small island character" is a certain life style, some kind of environmental atmosphere or some kind of value. However, if the municipality uses these reasons to constitute justified reasons for deprivation of the rights for secondary suites or detached coach houses, these reasons must have a legal status that must be uniquely protected on Eagle Island, for example, Natural or historical heritage, Sensitive environmental

protection zone, etc. Does Eagle Island have this legal status?

Certainly not. If not, why and how can the "small island character" in this sense be the reason for depriving islanders of their rights to build a coach house? For example, if some people claim that "maintaining a better environment and keeping the island away from getting crowded" is "small island character", then the same claim can be made by all communities of West Vancouver residents. Why not prohibit secondary suites and detached coach houses in all residential communities? This is unfair to Eagle Island property owners.

The unclear or undefined "small island character" concept can easily provide umbrellas for some seemingly reasonable but essentially unreasonable claims, creating an injustice to the deprived people. Therefore, we think it is extremely inappropriate to use it as a reason for deprivation of rights in a right deprivation clause.

2. Municipal service resources can fully support Eagle Island's need for detached secondary suites or detached coach houses

Since the real reason for the deprivation of rights in section 2.1.11 is that the aforementioned two municipal service resources (docks and parking) are limited, we must look to see if the Eagle Island property owners' demand for the secondary suites or detached coach houses exceeds what is provided by these resources and if there must be such a ban in Eagle Island. According to the survey, only 1 per cent property owners in West Vancouver currently have the intention to apply for a detached coach house. As for the Eagle Island community, ever since 2014 when the city bylaw provided for site specific rezoning to allow for coach houses on Eagle Island (RS6 zone), only one application has been filed in the past four years. According to the EIRA, 23 owners (72% of the island property owners) support a ban on all secondary suites for the next 20 years and the other owners (26%) have not shown any intention to build one. Therefore, the demand is very small, limited to one. In terms of municipal resources for Docks and trestles, the city government established a new Dock and trestles system in 2015, adding six or more new barge spaces, which could have been set aside to meet the demand of 3 or more new detached secondary suites. If other design options are adopted, more mooring space may be provided.

As for the land parking, practically speaking, there is no space within 100 meters from the dock, but the well known frequently vacant public parking lots 200 meters away are underutilized and many islanders and their visitors park there. It is entirely feasible for the municipal government to change the use of several parking spaces there to meet the the need of detached coach houses. Even if there are problems with other kinds of city services, it is not unique to Eagle Island. There are also other areas in West Vancouver, which face the same problems as the Eagle Island does, such as low water pressure, which is not the problem brought about by building a coach house. In some high areas and at certain times in North Shore, low water pressure problem does exist. Does that mean that coach houses cannot be allowed in those areas? Therefore, low water pressure cannot be used specifically as a reason to oppose building a coach house on Eagle Island. Instead, the city should deal with water pressure problem now if such a problem exists not only in Eagle Island but also in some other high areas. Therefore, such problems as mooring, parking and low water pressure do not constitute special restrictions on Eagle Island's detached coach houses. That's why the city planning department [REDACTED] gave the green light to the Eagle Island application for [REDACTED] a coach house and stated in Council Reports that an additional 1-3 coach houses could be accommodated. This shows that the municipal service, city service resources and engineering capabilities and means to meet the demand can fully support Eagle Island's detached suites. There is absolutely no need to limit such demand through deprivation of rights.

3. Revocating section 2.1.11 is conducive to the implementation of a core goal of the long-term community plan in West Vancouver, namely, the establishment of a more liveable community

A liveable community needs to achieve many of the values we pursue, such as the comfort of personal and family life. However, as a city's long-term community plan, it should put some social value in the preferred position, for example, to achieve social equity.

West Vancouver is a world-class residential area with high quality. With the rise of real estate prices in recent years, the cost of living in West Vancouver has continued to increase.

This requires a number of social adjustment policies so that more people can start housing and live in West Vancouver so that they can live closer to the value of social equality. The secondary suites policy has lowered the threshold for living in West Vancouver, both for home buyers and renters, and is one of the manifestations of this effort.

Another important value of the liveable community goal is sustainability. The progress of any liveable community requires a material basis -- reasonable tax increases to support the continuous improvement of public services. Without a reasonable tax source development, there is no talk of sustainability. The Secondary suites and coach house policy has opened up a reasonable source of taxation so that the liveable community can actually continue to operate.

In 2014, West Vancouver made adjustments to the original regulations and encouraged residents to build coach houses by giving the owners more rights. In the case of Eagle Island, the owners can have the right to establish a detached coach house through rezoning. This shows that on the issue of liveable communities, social values have been more recognized, and private interests and social values have been balanced at a higher level, which is a manifestation of social progress. Of course, we firmly support this correct direction of change. We believe that in Eagle Island, with the methods and capabilities of municipal services constantly improving to solve problems, as long as the municipal service resources can be provided, the municipal government should insist on encouraging and supporting the correct direction of the existing policies, instead of going backward. We hope that this social value's progress on the issue of the liveable community can lift the very barrier of putting private interest value above social values at Eagle Island. In the progressive trend, Eagle Island should not be a lone falterer.

4. Oppose the use of unfair means to create grounds for depriving owners of their rights to own coach houses in Eagle Island

Since 2014, when the city government allowed detached secondary suites through rezoning in Eagle Island, only one case has been filed but rejected by the city council. One of the key objections was based on the argument that there is no vacant dock parking space. Actually, this was what some opponents intended to create.

[REDACTED] In 2014, according to the new regulations of by-law, the residents on the island can apply for rezoning to establish detached secondary suites. In preparation for rezoning, [REDACTED] dismantled an [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] The reasons for opposition concentrated on insufficient resources of municipal services. The most important one was that the dock had no spare space. However, in mid-2015, the city government updated the Eagle Island Docks and trestles system and at the same time built a new system on the north side of the original system, adding at list 6 new barge spaces, which could easily solve the need for secondary suites. This was actually a solution to the dock space shortage, so the opposition side had no means to oppose it. Nobody raised any objections until the new system was built. However, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] loud cry against the new service dock and forcibly forced the city government to completely remove the completed project, to make the shortage of barge space become a ground for opposition again. All this shows that, for some in the opposing party, the barge space can never be sufficient. If it is sufficient, it must be removed and made inadequate at all costs.

The establishment and dismantling of this service dock caused several hundred thousand dollars of West Vancouver taxpayers' money to be thrown into water. This incident made us feel very shocked and it is also one of the most ugly community political incidents that we have witnessed. We wondered and got confused about this for a long time.

[REDACTED] This is unfair

In particular, some opponents at that time now proposed the section

2.1.11 in an attempt to make the result of their no-conscience behavior in the past in domination for a long time. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] In the name of several hundred thousand dollars of tax-payer's money that was wasted that year, we asked municipal decision makers to judge if the proposed 2.1.11 section is a justified one.

In short, based on the above reasons, [REDACTED] the existing by-law of the island regarding the Eagle Island is entirely applicable to its status quo, not only showing a difference from the land areas but also echoing the consistency with the progress of the entire municipal policy. As for the legal actions of the islanders according to the current by-law, because what they desire to do does not really exceed the limits that the municipal service resources can provide, their applications should be encouraged and supported. There is no reason to deprive and restrict their rights. Different opinions on this issue should not be eliminated in a way that deprives one party of its rights for a long period of time. Depriving people of their rights is a means for them to shut up, which is not allowed by democratic values. Instead, residents' different opinions should be fully expressed in future respective applications in Eagle Island's specific site rezoning cases during which all the parties concerned can fully understand the facts and correctly determine what is right and wrong. This will bring positive results not only to the residents of Eagle Island but also the long-term development pursued by the municipal government. Therefore, section 2.1.11 of OCP should be deleted.

Sincerely yours,

[REDACTED]

PS: The proposal in 2.1.11 of OCP does not represent the opinion of all the island residents. [REDACTED] Members, and the Association does NOT speak on behalf of the entire island and this Association certainly does NOT [REDACTED] Less than three years ago, when they asked us to sign a letter against rezoning application, we did not know much about the whole thing, [REDACTED] Now after [REDACTED] seen and heard, we have found the whole situation is much much more complicated than we originally thought.

From: [David Hawkins](#)
To: [Shina Hanson](#); [Maeve Bermingham](#); [Winnie Yin](#)
Subject: FW: Commentary on draft OCP
Date: March-28-18 7:34:01 AM
Attachments: [March 26 2018 OCP comments.docx](#)

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: March-27-18 8:26 PM
To: MayorandCouncil <MayorandCouncil@westvancouver.ca>
Cc: Michael Smith <msmith@westvancouver.ca>; Mary-Ann Booth <mbooth@westvancouver.ca>; Craig Cameron <ccameron@westvancouver.ca>; Christine Cassidy <ccassidy@westvancouver.ca>; Nora Gambioli <ngambioli@westvancouver.ca>; Peter Lambur <plambur@westvancouver.ca>; Bill Soprovich <bsoprovich@westvancouver.ca>; David Hawkins <dhawkins@westvancouver.ca>
Subject: Commentary on draft OCP

Dear Mayor and counsellors,

As you may know I care greatly about my community and have spent time reviewing and researching possible solutions to the housing crisis in our community.

I would very much appreciate your thought and comments on the attached document.

Attached please find my comments on the OCP draft, section A, Housing.

Please contact me if you have any questions.

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

March 2018

COMMENTS ON THE WEST VANCOUVER DRAFT OCP SECTION A HOUSING

BACKGROUND:

West Vancouver is drafting the current OCP at the peak of the housing price and affordability crisis in Toronto and Greater Vancouver with West Vancouver experiencing the worst crisis of any district or city.

The price of a typical detached single-family house has increased by 100% over the last nine years and is now about \$2,500,000 with the average land price of approximately \$2,300,000 while the recognized affordable housing price is \$400,000.

This large difference between the affordable price and the very high land price have resulted in the following problems in the community, all of which have to be addressed and resolved in the Draft OCP.

There is a lack of affordable small houses, partly because purchases of existing small houses have been torn down and replaced with maximum allowable floor area houses to justify the high land prices.

Three quarters of the people that work in West Van, and a quarter of school children, commute daily from other communities due to the fact that the average family cannot afford to live in West Van.

This daily commuting and the increasing traffic from Squamish, Whistler, Pemberton etc. results in added congestion of roads, highways and bridges.

COMMENTS ON DRAFT OCP

The Draft OCP includes a list of options for smaller less expensive housing, but does not address whether these options are “affordable”. It also does not include information on the criteria for affordability of purchased or rental housing.

This information is essential to assess whether each option is “affordable” by the recognized criteria and also affordable for seniors, young families, and people who work in West Van.

As an example, consider the options for sub dividing properties and building multi-family housing on the divided strata owned land (townhouses, row housing, duplexes and triplexes, strata titled carriages, and lane cottages etc.).

From the information provided in the Draft OCP, one would assume that these options are affordable. Yet, the recently sales listing of the garden cottages on the “Vinson Property” indicates that they would be grossly unaffordable.

These garden cottages are part of a development where the heritage house has been jacked up and three housing units added to the property, increasing the housing density by a factor of four.

The two garden cottages have recently been placed on the sales market for 2.6 million and 2.8 million (approximately 1080 sq. ft. based on the sales listing floor area, and approximately 1700 per sq. ft. based on the floor area in the District of West Van document which presumably was the areas used in the FAR calculations of .59).

These prices are disturbing as the development is larger but similar in concept and densification to the multi-family housing options in the Draft OCP document. It confirms our own calculations that most of the purchase options for multi-family housing will not be affordable for people who work in West Van, the typical young family which are the group that West Van needs the most.

It confirms that it is essential for the Draft OCP to include information on the recognized affordable purchase price based on the average household income, and the forecast price of the different options, so that the options can be evaluated and prioritized.

The Draft OCP contains little information on the most important, cost effective, and desirable option. Namely, the building, and rental of apartment buildings on West Van District land, which should be leased at a nominal rate to the project.

These small apartments would be rented to seniors, people who work in West Van, young families, and to individuals with special needs. The Draft OCP should include complete information on this option.

Rental of apartments in mid-rise and high-rise buildings are much more affordable than single family housing because they have one third to one fifth the floor area, and that the high cost of land is shared by many units.

The OCP should include details of existing rental for small apartments for seniors and larger ones for families to verify whether they meet the affordability requirements.

The OCP draft should include information on what action is planned for the billion of dollars that the federal government has assigned to CHMC for the provision of affordable housing for the Toronto and Vancouver areas. (See Appendix)

SUMMARY

1. The Draft OCP should include a “comprehensive long term plan”, with goals, objectives, and an action plan to achieve them. It should also address the present housing crisis and possible solutions.
2. The Draft OCP should include:
 - The recognized and accepted house price to household income ratio.
 - The average household income for West Van.
 - The resulting affordable house price.
 - The forecast housing price for the different options.
 - The resulting affordability of the options.
 - The recognized and acceptable rental affordability as a ratio of household income.

None of the above is included in the Draft OCP. Without this information, it is impossible to assess the affordability and viability of the many options. Many of the options listed in the Draft OCP do not meet the affordability criteria by a large margin, and therefore their viability is questionable.

3. The many housing options shown in the Draft OCP for multi-family housing on subdivided or full lots, do not meet the affordable criteria

by a large margin. This is confirmed by the recent sales listing price for the two cottages on the Vinson property of 2.6 and 2.8 million. These cottages are larger but close in concept, and site housing densification as some of the options. Their prices are six to seven times the recognized affordable price.

Our own calculations show that the house prices on many of the options listed would be over twice the recognized affordable price for housing. This would make them unaffordable for seniors, young families, and many of the people who work in West Van who are presently commuting daily.

The viability and use of these options should be reviewed. (For instance, they could be subsidized by the Federal Government's CHMC Program, and be rented by applicable families.)

4. The Draft OCP should advise what action has been taken, or, will be taken of the Federal Government's allocation of money to CHMC for the provision of affordable housing for the Toronto and Vancouver areas.
5. The option of rental housing on West Vancouver owned land, for seniors, young families, people who are working in West Van but presently commuting daily, and individuals with special needs, should be highlighted in the Draft OCP as it is far the best option for affordable housing.

West Vancouver,

INFORMATION APPENDIX

AFFORDABLE HOUSING

PURCHASE BY BUYER

It is generally accepted that an affordable housing price should be approximately three to five times the household yearly income. The West Vancouver area average household income is \$80,000. This results in an affordable purchase price of \$400,000. This compares with an average purchase price in West Vancouver of detached single-family dwellings of over \$2,500,000. The average house price to yearly income/ratio throughout Canada is 5.4 Many of the smaller cities average ratio is between 3 and 4.

RENTAL AFFORDABILITY

It is recognized that housing rental and associated costs should be approximately 30% of household income. Assuming household income of \$80,000 for young families, this would result in affordable rentals and associated costs of \$24,000 per year, and correspondingly less for seniors.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND CHMC AFFORDABLE HOUSING:

A Globe & Mail article dated March 14, 2018 stated that two weeks ago, the Federal Government allocated \$1.35 billion of new money to CMHC for building rental housing for young Canadian families. The first allocation of money is \$447 million for the 2018-2019 fiscal year. The primary focus is Vancouver and Toronto because the housing has become extremely expensive for the average person. The 'Creative Housing Program' is to build 50,000 units (mostly rental) designed for median households earning slightly less than \$80,000 per year. The article also stated that that CMHC would play a key roll. Its rental construction financing initiative was launched a year ago. The article stated as well that the Government boosted CMHC's lending capacity for rental construction by 50% to \$3.75 billion (error ?) over the next three years.

From: [REDACTED]
To: QCP Review protect
Subject: OCP thoughts for your consideration
Date: March-27-18 10:50:33 AM

To whom it may concern,

I agree with your effort to enable younger generations to afford to buy or rent in West Vancouver. [REDACTED] children within the community of Gleneagles, [REDACTED] shared how much they love where they live. It has been a safe community, with so much to offer in ways of activities outside, enjoying nature, and growing up amongst other young families.

It is exciting to see the plans for Cypress Village, and it's goal to offer more affordable housing with nature at your door. This will give young families the ability to raise their children here, young adults affordability to live here, and seniors the ability to downsize while remaining within the community they know and love.

Cottage homes on larger lots makes sense for families who want to have their family stay in the community they know, while also having their extended family close by for support.

I can also understand the benefits of being able to subdivide lots. It would seem that there are areas that naturally densify because people choose them for convenience of stores, restaurants, transit, etc. There are also areas that seem to naturally remain less dense due to the inconvenience of them. My only concern with developers having the ability to subdivide any lot, even lots in areas that are presently protected from being subdivided, is that communities with large lots will become over packed with homes developed, and sit empty due to the inconvenience of location for many people. This then could change the character of these communities, the reasons people choose to live in these more remote areas would be gone.

Change is natural and necessary. I support your efforts in trying to maintain the character of all areas of West Vancouver and protecting the nature we live within. Nature at our door is the reason we choose to live in West Vancouver, it needs protection from overdevelopment.

This then leads me to the topic of the Interim Tree Bylaw. We have beautiful views in West Vancouver, trees are part of that beautiful view.

I understand why some trees need to be cut down for various reasons. There absolutely needs to be a very clear bylaw against any property owner, or developer, clear cutting for the purpose of easier building. The health of trees should be a factor considered before any tree is cut down for the purpose of building. There are many examples of homes built amongst the healthy trees on a lot vs clear cutting then just replanting after. West Vancouver absolutely needs to protect it's nature, not just on public but on private land as well.

Gone are the days of neighbors being able to trust other neighbors, newcomers and developers to do the right thing when it comes to trees.

I strongly support a much more strict bylaw that prevents developers from cutting down trees for the sole purpose of making construction easier. Nature is a big part of West Vancouver's character, it needs to be protected.

Sincerely,
[REDACTED]

From: [Maeve Bermingham](#)
To: [Maeve Bermingham](#)
Subject: FW: Comments on District of West Vancouver Draft OCP
Date: April-30-18 8:02:47 PM
Attachments: 2018_Draft_OCP_28March.docx

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: March-28-18 1:06 PM
To: Stina Hanson <shanson@westvancouver.ca>
Subject: Comments on District of West Vancouver Draft OCP

To: West Vancouver Staff Rep.

Please find attached my comments on DWV's Draft OCP.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]
West Vancouver
[REDACTED]

March 28, 2018

To: shanson@WestVancouver.ca

From: [REDACTED]

Re: Draft OCP - District of West Vancouver

Comments on Section B: Local Economy (Supporting tourism and visitors) and Section A: Housing and Neighbourhoods (Future Neighbourhoods).

My focus is on Cypress Provincial Park: See key OCP items from Section B below.

- Page 32, #2.3.14: "Support the Province's operation of Cypress Provincial Park as a major regional recreational and natural resource."
- Page 32, 2.3.15: Work with key partners, such as local and regional business and tourism associations, and Provincial and Federal tourism agencies to market West Vancouver as a recreational and cultural destination in Metro Vancouver and Sea-to-Sky regions."

Questions:

- 1) What does "Support the Province's operation of Cypress Provincial Park as a major regional recreational and nature resource" mean?
- 2) Does DWV see the park as a tourist attraction like the Capilano Suspension Bridge and therefore an important economic benefit to West Vancouver?
- 3) Is DWV interested in helping to ensure that the park's natural environment is adequately protected while supporting appropriate public recreational opportunities?
- 4) Given the current recreational pressure on the park as described below, might DWV consider "supporting the Province's operation of Cypress Provincial Park" by contributing funds for hiring a trail crew for trail upgrades?

Comments:

- 1) Cypress Provincial Park is already the busiest park in BC Parks' South Coast Region. Its recreational carrying capacity is seriously stretched.
- 2) Most of the park's hiking trails need upgrading.
- 3) BCP's operating budget (at somewhat above \$31M) is half or less what it should be to provide acceptable management for the province's 1032 protected areas, including 643 provincial parks.
- 4) The two Vancouver Area Senior Park Rangers and two Auxiliary Rangers (this summer) are responsible not just for Cypress, but for nine other Vancouver Area parks as well.
- 5) Both Sections A and B of the draft OCP mention encouraging recreational use of the mountainside above Cypress Village. See:

- Section A: Housing and Neighborhoods - Page 28: # 2.2.13: "Establish Cypress Village as a unique gateway to mountain recreation . . ." and 2.2.16: "Incorporate recreational and visitor considerations into the design and planning of Cypress Village, including trail connectivity to the wider mountainside and the potential development of complementary non-residential uses above 1200 feet (e.g., visitor accommodation, natural wellness, outdoor education.)"
- Section B: Local Economy - Page 31: #2.3.5: "Plan for a range of commercial uses in the new Cypress Village to create a successful mountain 'gateway' village and to support local residents."

I hope that DWV staff and Council Members will consider my questions and comments seriously and will perhaps provide a response.

Sincerely,

[Redacted]
[Redacted]
West Vancouver, [Redacted]
[Redacted]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [OCP Review project](#)
Subject: Future plans for West Vancouver community
Date: March-28-18 1:36:34 PM

I moved to West Van for the peace and quiet. Traffic congestion is already here and to add more high rises and coach houses will make it more of a disaster. Ocean views are important to most residents and to allow high rises to block many views from those who already live here is simply wrong. Trees are important and yet it was ok for the city to allow a row of them [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] to be destroyed. If you allow this then you might consider a by law on private property to have homeowners keep their hedges and trees trimmed so their neighbour still has the ocean view there once was before the hedges and trees grew so high that the view is now blocked. Coach houses are an eyesore to neighbours and will take away backyard green space. Please reconsider the future plans for beautiful West Vancouver.

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

From: [REDACTED]
To: OCP Review project
Subject: comments on draft WV OCP
Date: March-29-18 10:58:16 AM

Dear OCP planners,

I am writing in support of the Draft OCP dated February 13, 2018. The inclusion of climate change issues as a Key Trend and its insertion under each section is extremely important – Council approved the Community Energy Emissions Plan in 2016 and its strong presence in the WV OCP is critical to the full implementation of recommendations. Some adjustments have been recommended by the former Working Group as outlined in our letter dated March 23, 2018, which I support.

The next most important issue is to keep this Draft OCP moving along. West Vancouver has been without a current OCP since 2004 – the time is now to get an OCP in place, not a year or two from now. WV is slowly dying and we are in critical need of some reenergization and rejuvenation. Let's all continue to work together to make West Vancouver a wonderful place to live for all.

And, finally, let's look at how this Draft OCP has been created - over the past two years staff have lead and responded to extensive and unprecedented resident input. Opportunities to participate have been open and welcome. No one can claim that they have not had enough time to participate. It is clear from input at each stage that this Draft OCP represents the majority of WV residents who have participated in this process.

I urge this current Council and staff to have the courage to move this OCP ahead now – when a new Council is in place in the Fall of 2018, they will be able to move ahead quickly and confidently with changes that West Vancouver residents want – a Plan that provides a future for West Vancouver with a vision, housing for all, improved mobility, and lower energy emissions.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] WV

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: March-29-18 11:19 AM
To: Stina Hanson <shanson@westvancouver.ca>
Cc: David Hawkins <dhawkins@westvancouver.ca>; Jim Bailey <jbailey@westvancouver.ca>
Subject: OCP Feedback

Congratulations on the good work done on the OCP Update. West Vancouver needs to move forward with this to start addressing the current and foreseeable demographic challenges.

I'm sure there will be criticism both for it advocating too much growth and for it not encouraging enough. Count me in the latter. To me, a bolder vision is needed for more and denser housing to support economic vitality. I would have preferred more than the estimated 1,000 new units in the Ambleside Town Centre.

I am disappointed that Section 2.2.16 does not encompass ULWG recommendation 3.2.2.3 that recreational uses above 1200' be included in the planning of Cypress Village. Section 2.2.16 specifies consideration of recreational use, which is much weaker. The planning area for Cypress Village should be expanded to include recreational areas above 1200', otherwise the vast recreational potential could remain in limbo.

On the nitpicking front:

- On page 1 of 53 old growth should be hyphenated as old-growth.
- 2.6.14 is weak in that it only targets conserving lands supporting biodiversity, which is a poor measure of ecological value. For example, cutting a road through an intact forest increases biodiversity by encouraging plants that need more light or thrive in disturbed soils. More diverse, yes. Better, no. Section 2.6.13 uses the more appropriate description of "ecologically important assets".
- Some old-growthers would like to see old-growth specifically named. Others are satisfied that old-growth is included in 2.6.13's ecologically important assets.

Thanks again for what you've achieved with a tight timeline. You can count on my support to move forward on this with the current Council.

[REDACTED]

From: ■
To: OCP Review project
Subject: OCP Draft review
Date: March-29-18 1:23:09 PM

COMMENTS ON OCP DRAFT

- Up to 1200 new units in Ambleside is excessive; will turn Ambleside into a ghetto
- Infrastructure e.g. water, sewer and traffic and parking issues need addressing first
- Object to bonus density; allows for increased profitability at expense of current residents; we will end up with endless variance applications for spot zoning
- If you build green, you should pay for the added expense up front and recoup the savings over time; it is not for current citizens to pay for this in their loss of livability, views and property values.
- Views and view corridors are important. Marketing and prices emphasize views. Loss of view is loss of property value, period.
- Height maximums need to be clearly defined
- Neighbourhood character is not adequately addressed – monster homes, height restrictions, sunlight, views etc.
- Same with quality of life; we do not need Yaletown here.
- Most jobs in West Vancouver are portable and most are low paying. Plans to provide affordable housing are a politically correct pipe dream. Cost of land is reflected in housing costs. As long as West Vancouver land is expensive, so will be housing. It has been ever thus.
- Commuters in and out of West Vancouver commute to all areas of the Lower Mainland. Transit improvements along Marine Drive and to Downtown will not significantly reduce traffic. It is not economically viable to have good transit across the region.
- Our population is aging. Expecting that more and more people will walk and cycle on our hilly topography is wishful thinking.
- No more Grosvenor monstrosities; was a bad deal for the city and out of character for the neighbourhood
- Retail is affected by on-line shopping e.g. Amazon. Expecting that 14000 new residents will save our local retail community is a fallacy.
- **No hotels.** This is not Whistler. We are a residential community, not party central. This will negatively affect neighbourhood character and livability.
- Quality of life is important. Cramming all development into Ambleside will ruin the character of the neighbourhood. IS Ambleside the collateral damage in our agreement to with Metro to increase development??
- NO commercial enterprises e.g. bistros on waterfront. This should be public land for public enjoyment.
- Increased population is increased costs for services – hospital, community centre, library, police, fire etc. The windfall we get in reduced taxes from development fees will not go on forever and be eaten up by such costs
- Has the impact of the Squamish Nation plans been considered? Might not be our issue, but it will affect our livability e.g. traffic, parking, community service costs
- Concerned that older, rental buildings are considered obsolete and should be razed for new builds, which appear to be luxury high-rises out of the price range of those residents. Most older rentals and condos in West Van. appear to be well maintained and well looked after.
- Issue of empty houses and apartment need addressing. Would probably meet our agreement to accept increased population without a single development.
- Too many urban myths about what people want and why they are selling. NO data. People are downsizing to improve their income/lifestyle and help their children. They often can't do that without leaving the community for cheaper accommodation. So, they say there is nothing to their liking in West Van. Well, there are a lot of new builds, and large suites with even larger price tags. Somehow, new and large is still not meeting their needs for diverse housing. Better evidence is needed before we justify the OCP.
- Current new-builds have reduced affordability, not improved it; this is not a practical or viable solution
- Yes, I live in Ambleside and work in W.V.

Sent from Mail for Windows 10



From: [REDACTED]
To: OCP Review project
Subject: West Vancouver's OCP
Date: March-29-18 1:47:38 PM

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

... which is all of us who live here, live near here, visit here, and pass through here!

I moved to West Van [REDACTED] after [REDACTED] renting in North Van, [REDACTED] recuperating at [REDACTED] – long-time residents of West Van – [REDACTED] living 'back to the land' in the Comox Valley, commercial fishing on the coast, and [REDACTED] growing up (ongoing process) on Vancouver's west side, including travels to Europe, SE Asia, and Australia.

There is nowhere like West Van! It is unique in its neighbourhood feeling, quiet and gentle way of life for families, multi-cultures, young and old, natural beauty, diversity of shops along with excellent mall services and options, 360-degree views even at street level, walks, beaches, bike paths, sports and arts facilities, outstanding library and rec centre, seniors' centre, and enlivening events for all ages in every season. **There is nowhere like West Van!!**

So how can it be protected from inevitable change while also be current with changes around us, openly engaging in improvements available to us? Mindful, thoughtful care to preserve, protect and enhance what is working is essential to a future that provides inclusively for healthy evolution of community and home. Dialogue with people who live here and invest in life here. Research. Due diligence. And ongoing celebration and gratitude for the opportunity to call West Van home!

What do I hope for West Van? Continued enjoyment of all I've expressed in paragraph two. [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Our representative leaders have an opportunity and challenge to fulfil. No small task! Because **there is nowhere like West Van!**

Respectfully,
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: OCP Review project
Subject: OCP Survey and Discussion
Date: March-29-18 2:45:51 PM

Thank you for the opportunity to again present my opinions of the draft proposal for the new OCP for the District. I have attended many of the public sessions and contributed through surveys and workbooks, etc.

I reviewed the draft proposal and here are my comments-

Housing affordability is at the forefront of discussion these days, but my experience leads me to believe that in a free, capitalist society, controlling this is a difficult task. I understand that most of the revenue the district relies on comes from property taxes. Consequently there is a decreased incentive to build affordable. And, the provincial government relies on the real estate market; especially the PTT brought in by the Social Credit party [REDACTED] and which has become a cash cow for all governments since then. So far, all recent developments in West Vancouver cannot be considered affordable but these developments have received the green light by the district and are under construction. As far as I can determine, these developments do not have a social housing component. I attended a recent council meeting at which there was a discussion of the detached homes [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
So, good luck. At this point in West Vancouver sales of detached homes are down considerably. Maybe this will result in a drop in value but if that drop results in affordability - doubtful. Many pundits suggest low supply is the problem. However with the proposed plans being considered for various sites - I think that 2 towers have been approved for Park Royal, which I oppose, [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] I refer to the Taylor Way Local Planning Area – Map 7. Will these units be affordable? What will the community benefit be? Will the developer receive increased density? And, the forever question about traffic, all this coming along with the Lions Gate Town Centre, etc in North Vancouver. You know that your aging population (referred to many times) will not all be able to travel by bike on this topography. In conclusion, I understand why this area is considered optimum for increased density and development., near all amenities, the bridge, but is there some assurance that these buyers will be taking public transit? FYI, recent new developments in Vancouver have seen condos priced at \$4000 a s.f. and a parking stall at \$95,000 [REDACTED] Prices at One Burrard have increased by 38% in a couple of years from their presale prices and this development won't be ready for occupancy for another couple of years. How can local developers compete with these prices and make condos affordable? Cypress Village will have only multifamily developments I have been informed, no detached homes, which is in keeping with the district's vision moving forward. Affordable?

[REDACTED] I do try to take public transit as often as we can, certainly to sporting events in Vancouver, and to business meetings that are near transit routes. At the March 12th meeting of

council, I understood that Translink was proposing better service for the North Shore, albeit not anytime soon. Eventually that might ease some traffic headaches.

I understand that the [REDACTED] is in discussion with the district about an exchange of land with BP which contains a stand of old growth trees they would like preserved. If this is a one time undertaking, I would certainly approve. And I applaud the district for giving value to older, mature trees, which was not a consideration I saw in the [REDACTED] recommendations unfortunately. I do not generally support transferring development rights from one area for another when it concerns development above the 1200 ft line. Pardon the pun, but this would be a slippery slope if developers ever used this as a precedent to build up the mountain. This area should be used for recreation, hiking etc. as the draft proposal suggests. I have experienced serious drainage problems and know that development in the BP properties has resulted in issues for storm water management in areas below. So I welcome discussion around this issue. And, since we are discussing drainage issues, I and others have been on the receiving end of serious debris and waterflow issues due to the cutting of mature trees which we know have large root systems, maintaining water and soil. The B.C. Building Code, known outside the province as the Utopian bldg. code, Section 9.36 is all about building energy efficiency, which has been estimated to add a minimum of 20% more in construction costs for a homeowner through the addition of energy rated double and triple glazed windows, insulation increases in walls, energy efficiency in lighting to name a few. What is anticipated going forward in the next building code is net 0 energy consumption where a house must produce as much energy as it consumes on an annual basis increasing building costs even more. However, there are current studies that have found that green infrastructure – the use of mature shade trees – can achieve similar energy efficiency investments as comparable to the energy efficiencies no required in the current building code using current comparable evaluation methods. This means that energy efficiencies for new buildings and also retrofits can be achieved with investments in the much more cost effective use of green infrastructure which is the use of mature shade trees to save on electricity costs. Beyond all of these benefits, mature trees are a contribution to the collective good and they should be preserved. And, that would obviously be trees on boulevards, parks and residential properties. It only seems natural that in our environment, our mature trees should be considered in these calculations And, as mentioned in this draft proposal, to reduce the GHGs which are among the highest GHGs in the region. Trees need protection on other areas not just on those properties noted in the District Heritage Register.

I don't think that anyone in the community would argue that existing views should be preserved. They have been bought and paid for. However, views are expensive, many thousands of dollars worth, and if a property is purchased without a view, then that Buyer has no right to make a view which was not paid for and did not exist to the detriment of the surrounding neighbourhood. Most neighbours want natural character and landscapes. Most want development plans that support ecosystems for wildlife and birds. It is not up to the District to determine and increase property values.

I support the objective of water restrictions. I am reminded of [REDACTED] South Africa who has decided not to return home for holidays due to the issue with water; [REDACTED] tells me that it was known 20 or 30 years ago of the impending drought but nothing was done to avert this. Climatologists are pointing out that in our situation, we are receiving more rain in the winter than in the past and that

the summers are drier due to climate change. Education would seem as the draft proposal suggests to be helpful – pointing out that short showers, not baths for instance, rain barrels, watering lawns maybe only one a week- I am sure there are other ideas.

Because I live in an area where in the last 12 years there has been constant demolition of homes and new construction, I have been witness to demolition and construction waste. The plan to look into reducing this waste is very much supported. The timing seems right [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Pressure must be applied to retailers in supermarkets and restaurants in the district to reduce their packaging and use more environmentally friendly products. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Where will this concrete go what landfill, when the house comes down? I think that the production of concrete is expensive and requires a lot of water for production.

[REDACTED] I would not support spot-rezoning. I read that re-zoning of future land use change would require a process of bylaw amendment which would further require council approval and a public hearing. How would that conflict with the district plans to increase density and promote smaller single family housing, or duplex and townhouses in areas zoned for single residential houses?

To end on a positive note, I applaud the proposal to support the development of integrated food systems – urban agriculture (chickens) community gardens, because not all communities have space, farmers' markets and the like. Unfortunately, Richmond cannot come to any decision about the size of homes on agricultural land, and or the placement (home plate) of such a house, maybe up to 11,000 s.f. which restricts the area that can produce food. I am grateful for the ALR and hope that somehow the substitution of productive farm land for unproductive land in the northern part of the province will be discontinued.

Thank you for your efforts and all of ours, the community.

Regards,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
West Vancouver

From: [REDACTED]
To: OCP Review project
Subject: STOP CHANGE
Date: March-29-18 3:09:49 PM

[REDACTED] I have lived in West Vancouver for more [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] I request the government not to change the status quo!

If the government agrees to increase the volume ratio of the buildings and increase the population, the quality of our life will be seriously reduced. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
I once again asked the members of West Vancouver not to change the status quo. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: OCP Review project
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: OFFICIAL COMMUNITY PLAN INPUT
Date: March-29-18 4:02:16 PM

Good afternoon.

Six of our strata property owners reviewed the plan and we would like to provide the following feedback.

While the plan is focusing on a vision down the road, there are some actions that council and the business merchants can implement immediately without too much effort that would improve the "visual" appearance of the Ambleside area.

COUNCIL

=====

1/ Enforce existing Bylaws (Bylaw#4499, 2007 part 20) the [REDACTED] block are littered with sandwich board signs on municipal property that are there 24/7 whether the business is open or not. They create a hazard/nuisance/danger and obstruction to pedestrian traffic, who have to squeeze around these and the numerous cardboard boxes with rotting fruit on the boulevard in the middle of the [REDACTED] block.

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

2/ A hand delivered envelope and pictures to the Mayor & Council November 2017 (we received acknowledgement of same & it was recorded in council's Minutes Meeting in Nov) regarding a [REDACTED] which is an eyesore contravenes many Bylaws and again we have never heard from anyone since – review your own Meeting Minutes which will give you all the information – it was referred to the Director of Planning and Development Services.

3/ Again the Bylaws are very specific where street parking is concerned but on an ongoing basis our Ambleside Streets are littered with oversized commercial vehicles (clear signage on them) for days/nites/weekends & each time they are reported to the Bylaw Department a different explanation is given as to "why they can't enforce". An [REDACTED] parked on [REDACTED] for 3 months – with many complaints from residence – still there.

4/ Have Mayor & Council should be involved in ensuring that [REDACTED] Blocks are swept regularly.

5/ A recent decision by Mayor/Council not to intervene in the 2.00 AM closing of Earl's

Restaurant was never presented to the residence – whom would be greatly affected – luckily all our opposition emails to the [REDACTED] have negated Earls proposal. This type of action by council does not foster trust from residence.

It is very discouraging that concerns/issues from Tax Payers regarding our community do not even warrant a response!

On a closing note, while this is NOT specifically referred to in the OCP Plan it would go a long way to improving the community ASAP without much effort on the Mayor's or Councils part.

Perhaps the 2 written concerns are on their way to the 14 taxpayers who took the trouble to contact the District.

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: OCP Review project
Subject: Comments on the Draft OCP
Date: March-29-18 4:55:15 PM

To whom it may concern,

I was very impressed with draft OCP and the rigorous process that led to its preparation. I feel that the transportation and mobility section could benefit from a couple of visionary ideas, so have included a new rapid transit crossing of Burrard Inlet and a two-way cycleway connecting the Spirit Trail in Ambleside to the north end of the Lions Gate Bridge which has been proposed by North Shore HUB (see attached drawing). They are included in the following suggested improvements to the draft:

1.1 Community Context - page 1

- Add **Caulfeild Village** to the 4th paragraph.

West Vancouver milestones – page 2

- Add **Centennial Seawalk and Spirit Trail**.

1.3 Key Trends - page 5

- A section on Transportation challenges is missing, as a key trend even though there has been a significant increase in traffic congestion in recent years and it is mentioned on Page 13 in the following sentence: *"What challenges do we need to overcome? We need to respond to unaffordable and limited housing options, an aging and declining population, lack of employment opportunities, transportation challenges, and climate change impacts."*

Climate change - page 8

- Replace the 2nd sentence of the 1st paragraph with the following which is based on wording taken from the IPCC website: *"While the scientific understanding continues to evolve, there is broad agreement that human influence on the climate system is clear and growing. Furthermore, continued emissions of greenhouse gases will cause further warming and long-lasting changes in all components of the climate system. This will increase the likelihood of widespread and profound impacts affecting all levels of society and the natural world."*

Planning the new Cypress Village and Cypress West Neighbourhoods – page 28

- Modify 2.2.13 as follows: *"Establish Cypress Village as a unique gateway to mountain recreation, with strong transit and active transportation connections to the rest of the community."*

- Include the remainder of the sentence in 2.2.13 to a new subsection as follows: *"Incorporate distinctive uses and features (such as unique retail, a civic plaza, community and recreational facilities, and other public amenities) in addition to commercial and institutional uses that serve the local community."*
- Modify 2.2.14 as follows: *"Include a range of higher density housing types, tenures and unit sizes (including rental, non-market, family, and seniors housing) within the Cypress Village and Cypress West neighbourhoods to meet the needs of residents of different ages and incomes, and establish maximum unit sizes for these housing types."*

Encouraging walking & cycling – page 35

- Modify 2.4.1 as follows: *"Address gaps and complete the pedestrian and cycling network with integration to transit, Town and Village Centres, community facilities, parks and trails system (see Map 11)."*
- Modify 2.4.2 as follows: *"Provide attractive alternatives to driving by enhancing the safety, accessibility and connectivity for pedestrians and cyclists through measure such as:

 - Key new connections such as a two-way cycleway connecting the Spirit Trail in Ambleside to the north end of the Lions Gate Bridge;
 - Wider and weather-protected sidewalks; and
 - Protected bike lanes and cycle highways."*
- Modify 2.4.6 as follows: *"Expand wayfinding features on the cycling and pedestrian networks, especially in and around centres and key neighbourhood hubs (e.g. schools, parks, churches and community facilities)."*
- Due to the lack of bike racks in the commercial districts, add the following subsection: **2.4.7 "Expand parking and related destination infrastructure for cyclists."**

Supporting transit mobility and regional connections – page 35

- add the following subsection:

"2.4.12 Work with the other North Shore municipalities and TransLink to plan for a new rapid transit crossing of Burrard Inlet."

Enhancing road network accessibility, safety and efficiency – page 36

- Modify 2.4.12 as follows: *"Maintain the road network for the safety and reliability of all road users, and seek to expand proposed road connections as opportunities arise (see Map 12), including:

 - Access roads with protected bike lanes to the proposed Cypress Village*

area;

- *The Low Level Road with protected bike lanes to bypass the Lions Gate Bridge; and*
- *A Clyde Avenue-Klahanie Park crossing with protected bike lanes over the Capilano River.”*

Managing our valuable parks system – page 43

- add the following new subsection:

“2.7.7 As much as possible, ensure that parks are accessible by transit along with safe connections to the pedestrian and cycling networks and that there are bike racks and garbage collection bins located at all parks.”


Enabling an active community – page 49

- add the following new subsection:

“2.9.6 Expand and maintain infrastructure, including wayfinding signage, to encourage and promote active modes of transportation.”

Sincerely, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] British Columbia,
[REDACTED]



Typical Lightweight
Bike Bridge Example



Typical Cycleway

Proposed Route of an Ambleside to Lions Gate Bridge Cycleway

- Legend:**
- · — Proposed Cycleway
 - Existing Spirit Trail
 - Existing Bike Network

From: [REDACTED]
To: [OCP Review project](#)
Subject: Comments on draft OCP
Date: March-29-18 7:30:56 PM
Attachments: [OCP 2018.pdf](#)

I am a resident of West Vancouver for [REDACTED] and would like to provide some feed back on the draft OCP. Please see the attached.

Regards
[REDACTED]

Comments on West Vancouver Draft OCP 2018

I would like to provide some feedback on the draft OCP that has been recently published.

West Vancouver is truly a unique part of Greater Vancouver. It provides some of the elements of living in a smaller community, access to outdoor activities, while at the same time it is close to a major urban center and all that it has to offer.

Density

West Vancouver is geographically constrained. This does put practical limits on how many people can live in the area without creating major congestion and livability issues. I am concerned about the proposed increase in density along the Marine Dr. and Taylor way corridors. These areas are already often congested with no easy solutions. The additional density will not improve the situation and the suggestion that people will walk or bike to ease this issue is unrealistic. The hills of West Vancouver limit the practicality of this option for most people. When considering additional density in these areas careful thought must be given to the impact this will have not only on these neighbourhoods but to the community that uses the corridors through the neighbourhoods. For example, the intersection of Marine Drive and Taylor Way is often very congested.

Neighbourhoods

Map 1 seems to indicate that all areas are to be considered for infill housing of various types regardless to the suitability or residential support. Residents of the current neighborhoods need to be active participants in the approval of changes that will affect where they live. Changes like those to allow for less on-site parking will inevitably cause more cars being parked on streets making them less pedestrian (very few streets have sidewalks) and biker friendly as well as taking away from the overall livability of the neighbourhood.

The new Cypress Village and Cypress West Neighbourhoods development do provide an opportunity for a denser housing development than has been traditionally available in West Vancouver. This could be a community of smaller homes that is keeping with some of the goals of the OCP by providing different housing options with a common neighborhood feel. Done well, this would be an attractive mountain community that has been well planned for this type of density. It would also not cause disruption to existing neighbourhoods that were planned for lower density.

Ageing Population

The older population is mentioned in the OCP. West Vancouver does have a number of options for people that want to move from their house to some other residence. Apartments and retirement residences are available. The big shortage in this community is long term care. The public facilities that are in the community are old and outdated. It is a shame that when people need the most support in the community, they have to endure what is provided here or leave to another region if that is even possible.

From: [REDACTED]
To: [David Hawkins; OCP Review project](#)
Subject: Eagle Island/Draft OCP
Date: March-29-18 8:19:08 PM

Dear Mr.Hawkins,

Why is a ban of secondary suites and coach houses on Eagle Island being included in the Draft OCP? (2.1.11)

Unlike the rest of West Vancouver, secondary suites are not a permitted use on Eagle Island and a Bylaw is already in place for site specific rezoning approval for coach house(s)

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Eagle Island should not be treated differently than any other West Vancouver community, nor should its' property owners be treated any differently than any other Law-abidin, West Vancouver tax-paying citizen.

For all the aforementioned reasons, Mayor and Council should absolutely REMOVE paragraph 2.1.11 in the OCP Draft and include Eagle Island in 2.1.1.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]

West Vancouver, BC

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [OCP Review project](#)
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Submission to Draft OCP 2018
Date: March-29-18 8:44:51 PM
Attachments: [REDACTED] [Comments re Draft OCP 2018.docx](#)

Please find enclosed our comments in relation to specific sections in the Draft OCP 2018.
Thank you

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Comments to Draft 2018 OCP re Section A (Housing and Neighbourhoods) Part 2
(Respecting Character and protecting Heritage)

General Comments re Respecting Character and Protecting Heritage

"Heritage", including built structure and landscape, has been of such importance to West Vancouver residents that it features in each OCP and Municipal election.

We appreciate that Council has been working with the Heritage tools it currently has to preserve the heritage resources that exist, but there are still only a small number of the buildings on the Heritage Register, and landscapes, that are legally protected; those that are protected may still be challenged (eg Binning House); and sadly, buildings that are on the Heritage Register continue to be demolished.

Until relatively recently, there seemed to be a widespread understanding amongst residents of the contribution of "heritage" to the attraction and livability of West Vancouver. Further, there was an acceptance both of modest scale of homes, and of renovation of existing structures (rather than replacement) as a way of adapting to changing needs. As a result, heritage resources survived passively.

With the more recent changes in both the demographic and business landscape, structures on the Register, and landscapes, increasingly have been viewed simply through the glasses of "assets" and "return on investment". If the "business case" for renovation and retention of such Heritage resources is measured against that for replacement (particularly when municipal processes and speed of development are factored in), it is not surprising that demolitions are accelerating.

Further, given the capital, time and effort required by a homeowner to achieve an equivalent "asset" via renovation and retention (particularly under an HRA) to that resulting from a property sale, it is little wonder that houses on the Register, most of which are in private hands, are, or will be, under threat, and those that have been retained under HRAs, have involved property developers.

Given that the vast majority of houses on the Register are lived in by their owners, the question becomes, "why are they selling and not redeveloping themselves", or more importantly, "how do we encourage Residents to do this" and facilitate them staying in, and caring for these houses? As redevelopment of a property is now for most residents a business decision, the answer, in our view, lies in making retention and renovation easier and more financially attractive than demolition and replacement.

Specific Comments

Para 2.1.8 Ensure that new single-family dwellings respect neighbourhood character
[REDACTED] agree with the tenets expressed in both of the bullets in the Draft
[REDACTED] modify the second bullet to read:

- Applying and updating built-form Guidelines, as relevant, in regards to neighbourhood context and character, streetscape and natural features, including giving protection to the "amenities of daily living";

Comment: Guidelines in use in large urban environments (such the Borough of Camden in London, England) speak to preserving the “amenities of daily living” (privacy, light, sun and sight lines) and ensure that development is done in such a way that the livability and enjoyment of existing houses/properties (many of which are older and of modest scale) are not materially impacted;

■ suggest adding a third bullet as follows:

- Development and/or modification of boulevards and laneways should be coherent within a neighbourhood, and with neighbourhood plans and/or planning processes where these exist;

Comment: the public spaces that are boulevards and laneways contribute significantly to neighbourhood character; while maintenance should remain the responsibility of residents whose properties they border, development or modification needs to be done in such a way that streetscapes are preserved or enhanced, logically in a coherent fashion that fits (or defines) the street and surrounding neighbourhood, rather than being done piecemeal;

Para 2.1.9 Protect buildings, structures and landscapes on the District’s Heritage Register

■ agree with the general tenor of the bullets in the draft
would modify the fifth bullet to read:

- Considering financial incentives (eg the reduction of development fees or charges, tax incentives, loans, direct grants);

Comment: as outlined in the General Comments, there is a need to find ways to make renovation and retention a more compelling business case for motivated residents of modest means than selling and redeveloping; owners of houses on the Heritage Register may struggle to pay the taxes and incremental maintenance costs associated with older houses, and may not easily afford the costs of renovation, let alone have the capital to build infill units negotiated as density bonus, and are unlikely to recover their costs until they sell; further, Residents throughout West Vancouver benefit from heritage conservation, whether built or landscape and thus need to have some “skin in the game”, for instance by absorbing the costs of tax incentives/holidays, or by contributing to a heritage fund (eg. using levies on new development) that supports direct grants, interest-free loans, a “TrueColours” program;

■ suggest adding an eighth bullet as follows:

- Streamline municipal processes to support renovation and retention of heritage resources (eg. moving development permits to the head of the queue; identifying a “Heritage Planner” to oversee such developments; develop a “Heritage” working party within the Planning Dept to develop expertise, coordinate efforts, troubleshoot);

Comment: a key component of renovation and retention being a more compelling business case than selling and redevelopment involves reducing the time and effort of permitting and inspection processes, including finding alternatives ways of meeting building code standards.



28 March, 2018



From: [REDACTED]
To: OCP Review project
Subject: My humble comment
Date: March-30-18 3:44:09 AM

Dear Friends

I read the Draft Official Community Plan. Thank you for the effort invested in its preparation. I have a few humble comments:

HOUSING AFFORDABILITY: West Vancouver should never aim to offer low or lower cost housing. The previous administrations have worked hard to create a precious brand that commands a high price, These high prices make the tax base greater and enable the City Administrators to build and maintain a first class city. A Rolls Royce must never aim to offer a low cost version of the car. Who are we fooling? New apartments and townhouses in West Vancouver will not be affordable: not now, not ever.

COMPOSITION OF DWELLING TYPES: We should maintain our high rate of single-family dwellings, and slowly replace those ugly apartments constructed in the 1960s and 1970s with mid-rise buildings. Yes I am proposing a contrarian plan: try to maintain our population static by making it less affordable to live here. We need not offer new housing options "for seniors to downsize, adult children to stay close to their families, or young families to move into West Vancouver".

Please compare the number of persons per dwelling for Greater Vancouver versus West Vancouver.

	2011	2021	2031	2041
Greater Vancouver Population	2,356,000	2788000	3152000	3443000
Greater Vancouver # of Dwellings	890000	1112000	1287000	1423000
Greater Vancouver # of Persons/Dwellings	2.6472	2.5072	2.4491	2.4195
West Vancouver Population	46300	51000	56000	60000
West Vancouver # of Dwellings	18400	20600	23100	24500
West Vancouver # of Persons/Dwellings	2.5163	2.4757	2.4242	2.4490

This OCP aims to make West Vancouver more congested than Greater Vancouver vt 2041. That's not right. I support efforts and legislation to make it easier to share single family homes by creating legal secondary suites.

POPULATION GROWTH: There is a glaring paradox in the OCP: it states on the one hand: "limited supply of affordable and diverse housing directly impacts our transportation, environment, economy and social well-being. Nearly three-quarters of our workforce and approximately one-quarter of our school students commute into West Vancouver every day. This contributes to traffic congestion, road maintenance costs, pedestrian safety concerns, and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions." The solution the OCP offers is to increase our population by keeping the residents that we have and bring in more workers to live here! That's not right either.

REDUCING CONGESTION: We need to reduce density, permanently ban the construction

of high rise buildings in West Vancouver and build a world class public transportation system here using electric smart minivans instead of big busses.

Thank you.

Best Regards

[Redacted signature]

From: [Stina Hanson](#)
To: [Maeve Bermingham](#)
Subject: FW: OCP Draft - Comments
Date: April-30-18 2:57:20 PM
Attachments: [OCP - Comments on Draft OCP, 2018.03.28.pdf](#)

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: April-03-18 2:36 AM
To: David Hawkins <dhawkins@westvancouver.ca>
Cc: MayorandCouncil <MayorandCouncil@westvancouver.ca>; DWV Senior Staff
[REDACTED]
Subject: OCP Draft - Comments

Hello, David:

Attached are my comments on the OCP Draft.

Keep up your good work.

All the best,

[REDACTED]

DATE: March 28th, 2018.
TO: David Hawkins – Manager, Community Planning & Sustainability
CC: Mayor & Council, Senior Staff, Engaged Citizens.
FROM: [REDACTED]

West Vancouver's Official Community Plan Draft OCP – Comments

Hello David:

A. PREAMBLE – Introductory Remarks

1. First of all

Heartiest congratulations to you and your OCP Team for your phenomenal work in obtaining impressive amounts of excellent Citizen input through opportunities provided by numerous Workshops, Surveys and Pop-ups. All of this was well organized and highly professional.

2. Incubation & Reflection

The challenge now is to compile the input material into a coherent whole. [REDACTED] said, "I don't start serious writing until I get the first proofs back from my printer." Thus, opportunity for reflection and comments (now & later, p. 53) in the OCP's final stages is essential and welcome.

3. Completion of the OCP must not be delayed by searching for elusive perfection – that would be the enemy of *good enough, done !!* As noted in the Draft (p. 52), "the OCP is a living document ... to be amended from time to time."

4. Context for the OCP and EDP

West Vancouver is a Paradise – all who live here drew a lucky number in the Lottery of Life. Yet at the same time West Vancouver, despite its good fortune to be well within "the top 1%" in wealth and talent, does not live up to its capabilities and Vision "*to inspire excellence and lead by example*".

The Draft OCP and the Economic Development Plan (EDP) both refer to the challenges facing the District – declining population & departing businesses while the surrounding region is growing; affordable housing; transportation constraints; climate & environment. Progress on meeting these challenges has been slow.

[REDACTED]
"we must act to re-invigorate the community, step-up our game, and stop the reports & consultants".

B. VISION – An Essential OCP Theme

The Draft OCP and the EDP are well done, containing a wealth of background information and suggestions. They are *necessary* for progress, but *not sufficient* (per the logic/math concept of "necessary & sufficient" for something to happen or be true) to drive community and economic development in future.

Both documents lack a clear, overarching vision for West Vancouver as a community – *a grand concept and focal point* – to provide a "*magnet*" for attracting interest and action regarding:

- The five OCP themes – Housing, Economy, Environment, Social Well-being, Transportation, and;
- The three EPD strategies – Visitors, Commercial Areas, Emerging Opportunities.

At the start of Section 2 (p. 14) it would be desirable to include a section on Vision, to "set the scene" and provide a context within which to view and consider the subsequent five OCP themes.

To boost its effectiveness, the OCP must proceed beyond wishful adjectives like "Vibrant, Resilient, Diverse, Engaged, Inclusive, etc." toward clarity and action, by suggesting specifics as to: "*What?*" and "*How?*"

1. Image

West Vancouver currently has no image, beyond being seen as an expensive residential backwater. In the past, creating an image via the motto/catchword "The Waterfront Community" was attempted, but not pursued. Nevertheless, a water-related image along the lines below would be logical.

2. The Oceanside Community – a "What"

Along the way we discussed the need for West Vancouver to adopt a **guiding image** or "**gestalt**" (an organized whole that is perceived and can function as more than the sum of its parts – two reasons:

- To provide a unifying theme for creating synergy among the many initiatives and activities undertaken by the District and active community groups, now operating largely in separate silos.
- To project an external image supporting development objectives, such as outlined in OCP and EDP.

The word "oceanside" projects a stronger, broader image than "seaside" (holidays, beaches, a huge new luxury cruise ship); while "waterfront" (industrial) is inappropriate since West-Van has none.

3. Ambleside, "West Vancouver's Downtown" – a "What"

While the EDP sees the need to "*Establish a clear vision and objectives for the Ambleside Town Centre,*" (p. 14) it offers only to "*Continue to consider needs and opportunities for the Ambleside Village Centre*" (p. 58). So, after decades of non-consequential studies, committees, working groups, two years of preparing EDP, plus a new Ambleside Planning Process, all we get is "more of the same" – one is reminded of the legendary Australian Oozlum bird, and its North American Wa-hoo sub-species.

- Let's have a design competition (with honoraria) to see possibilities for Ambleside revitalization. Currently it's largely whatever developers propose.
- A series of models (likely computer-generated images) would produce a great deal of public interest and go a long way to "*re-invigorate the community*".

4. Maritime Hub – a "What"

West Vancouver has considerable maritime assets – so, to "*build on strength*" is an obvious strategy. A "Maritime Hub" would provide a focal point (gestalt) and a physical entity supporting "Oceanside".

- Maritime assets include:
 - A "peoples' sailing club", currently in a non-optimal location with deteriorating facilities;
 - Opportunities for "boating, fishing", both launching and renting;
 - A magnificent Marine Park – beaches, amazing views, rich marine life, a small island, diving (glass sponges, Giant Pacific Octopus);
 - Fisheries and Oceans research facility, currently undergoing major changes; possible public participation in sustainability and educational activities;
 - Active community groups like the Shoreline Preservation Society, Stream-keepers Society and Hollyburn Sailing Club;
 - Sea Walk, Spirit Trail, views of the ocean and port activity;
 - Yacht clubs.
- Located "out of the way" at the east-end of Ambleside Park, incorporated as a non-profit society.
- Potential partners could include:
 - Park Royal, Squamish First Nation, Port of Vancouver, West-Van District, North-Van District, Commercial enterprises, Sponsors, Naming rights.

5. Leadership – a "How"

The District must undertake to exert strong, focused leadership – it has the resources, responsibility, and authority to enable and co-ordinate action.

- Community groups would, of course, be active and mutually supporting participants. They are:
- The Chamber of Commerce, West Vancouver Community Foundation, Ambleside Dundarave Business Improvement Association; plus active community groups and resident associations.
- To ensure that OCP/EDP objectives are accomplished, an action oriented "command-post" or a "war-room" would be desirable, with strong, task-focused leadership.

C. PLAN MANAGEMENT

Add to the OCP ideas along the following lines, which are not included in Section 3 of the Draft.

6. Community Engagement – a “How”

A long-standing source of pride and “leading by example” is West Vancouver’s goal and commitment to community participation in civic governance through Working Groups. More than 30 have been completed in the past dozen years, and most produced useful recommendations and analyses.

- A key policy in 2004 directed the District to “engage our citizens in civic decision-making and empower them to have influence in an effective and inclusive local government process.”
- In 2007, the Community Engagement Committee saw CE as “an integrated approach involving citizens, elected officials, and municipal staff in policy formulation and decision making,” and described it as “a three-legged stool”.
- In 2010, the Community Strategic Plan’s vision saw “Collaborative government and a spirit of personal civic commitment (shaping) our shared future ... the strength of this relationship (being) the measure of our success as a community.” The Community Engagement Committee and Working Groups formed effective 2007 were seen to be the means to this end.

7. Operating Principles – a “How”

The District’s operating principles are to:

- Remember West Vancouver’s vision to “inspire excellent and lead by example” in all activities.
- Exhibit strong leadership, undeterred by vocal minorities.
- Actively engage the community in policy formulation and civic decision making.
- Recognize its privileged position of being in the “top 1%” in terms of wealth and talent.
- Strive to be an innovative and pro-active leader in civic governance ... a “test bed” for new ideas.
- Actively manage District operations to be efficient and effective, using the four well established measures of KPIs: Output/activity; Efficiency/cost; Community impact; Customer service.
- Recognize that the key for an organization’s success is a positive culture – good modus operandi.

D. OTHER COMMENTS

- Measurable Targets (p. 14)
 - Show annual targets, in addition to the 2041 total.
 - Report annually on the steps taken, results achieved, and planned next steps.
- In the four Local Area Maps (p. 22-25) – Show existing and proposed land-use designations using colours – residential (detached, attached, apartment), commercial, industrial, institutional, parks.
- In the Housing section (2.1, 2.2)
 - Include guidelines for developers describing the types & designs of buildings West Vancouver wishes to see built ... beyond technical requirements.
 - Similarly, provide guidelines for the desirable attributes of residential properties ... beyond measures like square-foot-ratio, height, set-back.
 - Require that building outlines be shown (with “sticks”) prior to approval, a common practice in some jurisdictions, to avoid offensive designs like “huge hotels” among average residences and “hostile fortification walls”.

Comments are Encouraged & Appreciated

SECTION IV: OTHER CORRESPONDENCE

Council Correspondence

Some residents provided their feedback directly to Council via email, emails received by Mayor and Council between February 13 and April 3 and are presented on the next page:

From: [REDACTED] 5.22.11
Sent: February-26-18 1:21 PM
To: MayorandCouncil; editor@nsnews.com; sunletters@vancouver.sun.com;
provletters@theprovince.com
Cc: Michael Smith; Mary-Ann Booth; Craig Cameron; Christine Cassidy;
ngamboli@westvancouver.ca; Peter Lambur; Bill Soprovich; Jim Bailey; Nina Leemhuis
Subject: COMPLAINT...

February 26, 2018

To whom it may concern:

I am appalled by the OCP Draft process. I understand that mayor and council wishes to push Phase 3 through within a short timeframe which excludes a full democratic process.

COMPLAINT #1

The lack of effort by mayor and council city hall to make known to ALL of West Vancouver's residents the OCP. Indeed, just today, I met a woman who has lived here since 1965. I opened the OCP topic with her and she told me that she has never heard about it. She was aghast and furious!

It seems like wilful intent on the part of mayor and council and city hall - that both have been derelict of duty in not making aware to ALL residents of West Vancouver the fact that an OCP process has been occurring.

- 1) the only place information about public participation in the OCP was made public was in the North Shore News;
- 2) for those residents who do not read the North Shore News, there was no other way of knowing out about the OCP;
- 3) calculations provided by city hall in the OCP Draft Part 1 indicate that only 1-2% of ALL West Vancouver residents participated in the process, 1/3 of them school children who are easily influenced and don't pay property taxes.

Therefore, I put forth the complaint that due to only 1% of the population participating in it, the process is therefore unethical, undemocratic, and possibly illegal to proceed with it.

COMPLAINT #2

I understand that the Planning Staff are hosting a series of information booths as follows:

WV Library, Feb. 28, 1-4pm

WVCC, Mar. 6, 4-7pm

GECC Mar. 1, 9-12 noon

Municipal Hall:

Feb. 22, 1:30-4:30 pm

Mar. 5, 10am - 1pm

The only available timeframe for people who work 9:00-5:00pm (regular work days) and who require travel time each way of 1 hour is at WVCC on March 6, from 4:00 to 7:00 pm. Even then, they will have only 1 hour to participate.

I declare this undemocratic. Perhaps it is time for the BC Civil Liberties Association to step in to protect residents from mayor and council's methods.

This is one more indication that the OCP Draft Phase 3 process is designed so that the majority of West Vancouver residents will be unable to participate in it.

Yours truly,

s. 22(1)

West Vancouver, BC, s. 22(1)

s. 22(1)

(2)

2517-02

From: Laura Anderson [REDACTED]
Sent: March-05-18 2:18 PM
To: MayorandCouncil
Cc: Sheila Scholes
Subject: Letter for March 5, 2018 DWV Council meeting
Attachments: WV SAT ltr Mar5 DWV re OCP extension.doc

Good day,

This letter is directed to Mayor and Council, DWV, for the March 5, 2018 meeting.

It is a request to extend the community review period for the draft OCP

Apologies for the late entry.

Would there be time to include this letter in the information package for tonight's meeting?

If not, I'm sure it will be circulated to Mayor and Council.

I trust the address of our organization, Lionsview Seniors Planning Society, as noted on our letterhead meets the address criteria for submissions to DWV Mayor and Council.

thank you,

Laura Anderson
Coordinator, West Vancouver Seniors Action Table (SAT) and Co-Coordinator Lionsview Seniors Planning Society

[REDACTED] 5. 22(1)

[REDACTED] 5. 22(1)

WEST VANCOUVER, BC



A Strong Voice For Seniors on the North Shore

The Lionsview Seniors' Planning Society is funded in part by the City of North Vancouver, the Districts of North and West Vancouver, the United Way of the Lower Mainland and the Province of British Columbia.

March 5, 2018

Via e-mail to the District of West Vancouver

Dear Mayor & Council,

I am writing on behalf of the West Vancouver Seniors Action Table (SAT) with reference to the recently released Draft Official Community Plan (OCP). We request that DWV extend the time available for community review of the draft.

Background. As you know, the North Shore is Age Friendly. West Vancouver, North Vancouver and the City of North Vancouver adopted the principles of Age Friendly communities identified by the World Health Organization in 2012.

Seniors Action Tables (SATs) are neighbourhood groups formed and operated by seniors to advocate for positive change based on Age Friendly principles.

Age Friendly communities conform to principles identified by the World Health Organization in housing, outdoor spaces and buildings, social participation, respect and inclusion, civic participation and employment, communication and information, community and health support services. The four North Shore SATs have included transportation as an additional local issue with a significant impact on seniors.

Issues facing an Age Friendly Community. The Age Friendly priorities adopted by the District of West Vancouver are congruent with the Draft OCP. We are interested in providing comment on these principles in relation to the Draft OCP, specifically on those identified as particularly relevant to our community.

These are: communications and information; community and health support services; transportation and housing, noting the Draft OCP's stated objective of providing housing options for down-sizing seniors.

Conclusion. We appreciate the opportunity to contribute to the OCP. The window of opportunity, however, is too narrow for our group of volunteers to review the draft, and to convene and formulate a considered and comprehensive response to a plan that will inform the future direction of our community.

North Bldg. 600 W. Queens Road
Telephone: (604) 985-3852

North Vancouver, B.C., V7N 2L3
Fax: (604) 988-7105

Email: lionsview@telus.net
www.lionsviewseniorsplanning.com



A Strong Voice For Seniors on the Northside

The Lionsview Seniors' Planning Society is funded in part by the City of North Vancouver, the Districts of North and West Vancouver, the United Way of the Lower Mainland and the Province of British Columbia

March 5, 2018

via e-mail

Letter to Mayor & Council requesting an extension of the review period for DWV's draft OCP. page 2 / 2

We request that the District of West Vancouver extend the review period to provide sufficient time for the West Vancouver Seniors Action Table, as well as others in the community, and individuals, to prepare and provide a considered and comprehensive response to the Draft OCP, a plan intended to inform the future direction of our community.

We request also that the District include the West Vancouver Seniors Action Table as a stake-holder group for consultation purposes.

Thank you for your consideration.

Yours truly,

Laura Anderson

Coordinator, West Vancouver Seniors Action Table (WV SAT)
Co-Coordinator, Lionsview Seniors Planning Society

North Bldg. 600 W. Queens Road
Telephone: (604) 985-3852

North Vancouver, B.C., V7N 2L3
Fax: (604) 988-7105

Email: lions_view@telus.net
www.lionsviewseniorsplanning.com

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: March-08-18 6:35 PM
To: MayorandCouncil
Subject: Mayor and Council Re: Official Community Plan Draft

2517-02

Dear Mayor and Council:

I write concerning the Official Community Plan draft. My understanding is that this draft will be presented to you later this spring.

I live on Eagle Island [REDACTED] and ask that you keep the following section in the Official Community Plan (without exception):

"Section 2.1.11 - Support the small island character of Eagle Island by prohibiting attached or detached secondary suites (i.e. basement suites or coach houses".

With the inclusion of this section in the Official Plan, hopefully, we on Eagle Island can return to a sense of normalcy and neighbourliness.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]

West Vancouver, BC, [REDACTED]

2517-02

From: [Redacted]
Sent: March-08-18 11:45 PM
To: Mayor and Council
Subject: [Redacted] - Response to West Vancouver Community Plan Draft & Section 2.1.11 -
March 08, 2018

Dear Mayor and Council:

RE: Official Community Plan Draft & Specifically Section 2.1.11

Further to receiving and reviewing in detail a copy of the newly completed Official Community Draft Plan, firstly I wish to thank the City for the extensive amount of work and input completed. I have been advised the this draft will be presented to you later this spring.

As a West Vancouver owner residing on Eagle Island [Redacted] I wish to express my full support to keep in full as written as part of the Official Community Plan the Section 2.1.11 that states " Support the small island character of Eagle Island by prohibiting attached or detached secondary suites (i.e. basement suites or coach houses)".

As a resident of this unique part of the world, after over 2 years of ongoing strife and uncertainty on this specific issues high lighted above; with the above noted inclusion being approved, it will resolve and put behind all of the past unpleasantness on this matter, and hopefully return our community to a previous state of happiness.

I thank you for all your hard work, and look forward to approval of the Community Plan Draft.

Yours truly;

[Redacted Signature]

West Vancouver, BC, [Redacted]

[REDACTED]
West Vancouver, B.C.
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

March 12th, 2018

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

Mayor and Council,

Re: Draft Official Community Plan: Part One – E Social Well-Being

An important omission from the Draft OCP is that there is no mention in Part E of the important role that Lions Gate Hospital plays in the social well-being of West Vancouver residents.

The draft should be amended to acknowledge the role of Lions Gate Hospital in the West Vancouver community and municipal land use policy should allow for the implementation of a Lions Gate Hospital Development Cost Charge on new condominium and residential development in the community to help fund hospital services and meet changing community needs.

All residents of West Vancouver will make use of Lions Gate Hospital at some point in their lives. The estimated 5,000 new housing units by 2041 envisioned in the Official Community Plan will create a corresponding increase in the demand for hospital services. The costs of funding the hospital are only partially met by the Province and the hospital relies on the active support of the local community to make good the shortfall to fund equipment and facilities such as the newly opened HOpe Centre. However, at present less than 3% of North Shore residents make voluntary donations to the work of the hospital.

A Lions Gate Hospital Development Cost Charge on new developments within the community would recognize the importance of the hospital to the local community and help to allow the hospital to keep up with the increasing demands placed upon it by a rising and aging municipal population.

Yours truly,

[REDACTED]
cc. Director of Planning

From: [REDACTED]
 Sent: March-19-18 4:28 PM
 To: Michael Smith <msmith@westvancouver.ca>; Mary Ann Booth <mbooth@westvancouver.ca>; Christine Cassidy <ccassidy@westvancouver.ca>; Craig Cameron <ccameron@westvancouver.ca>; Nora Gambioli <ngambioli@westvancouver.ca>; Peter Lambur <plambur@westvancouver.ca>; Bill Soprovich <bsoprovich@westvancouver.ca>
 Cc: Sheila Scholes <sscholes@westvancouver.ca>; Nina Leemhuis <nleemhuis@westvancouver.ca>; David Hawkins <dhawkins@westvancouver.ca>; jbaily@westvancouver.ca
 Subject: Letter to Mayor & Council

[REDACTED]
 West Vancouver, B.C.

[REDACTED]
 2018 March 19

TO:
 Mayor and Council
 Municipality of West Vancouver
 750-17th Street
 West Vancouver BC, V7V 3T3

FROM: James C. Carruthers

RE: Draft: Official Community Plan : Part One dated February 13, 2018

Dear Mayor and Council,

This letter is to strongly support the above noted OCP Review. Except for a few detailed comments I have already made as part of the current public process, the plan is exactly what is needed for West Vancouver to thrive in the future. It is high time for an update to a plan that is already fourteen years old. As a retired professional planner I would like to congratulate your staff for a thorough public process which has incorporated the choices of the community.

I urge Council to approve the OCP, subject to minor amendments, before the fall election.

Yours truly,

[REDACTED]

West Vancouver, B.C. [REDACTED]
 CANADA

[REDACTED]

From: [Redacted]
Sent: March 19-18 4:03 PM
To: Mayor and Council
Cc: David Hawkins Jim Bailey; Nina Leemhuis
Subject: Draft OCP

March 18, 2018

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

CC: Nina Leemhuis

Jim Bailey

David Hawkins

I have read the Draft Official Community Plan with great interest and would like to acknowledge how well feedback from the public during the consultation process has been captured in this document. I was able to attend many of the events over the last few months and was pleasantly surprised by the appetite of the community for positive change to address the serious issues facing the community that are described so well in the Key Trends section of the Draft OCP.

I would like to thank your staff for the dedication, patience and extreme professionalism they have demonstrated throughout this process and I would like to congratulate them for so successfully addressing the Key Trends outlined in the Introduction to the Plan in the Community Wide Directions of the Draft Plan. It will be a positive guide for the future development of West Vancouver.

I urge Council to be bold and move forward with the process to ensure adoption of the Plan before the fall election. Waiting will only drag out the process and will most likely result in a much less progressive Plan.

Please demonstrate your commitment to excellence and show leadership by moving forward with the OCP with minor amendments based on the comments received during this latter phase of the lengthy process.

Yours truly

[Redacted Signature]

[Redacted Title]

[Redacted Address Line 1]

West Vancouver

[Redacted Address Line 2]

2517-02

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: March-22-18 11:53 AM
To: MayorandCouncil
Subject: Support for the OCP

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

I am writing this letter in support of the Draft Community Plan that was developed as a guide for the future development of West Vancouver.

As described in the Key Trends section of the Draft, our community is facing significant challenges for the future and I urge Council to move forward with the process to ensure adoption of the Plan before fall election. It may be more difficult to move ahead on a positive note if postponed.

Thank you and your staff for your hard work, patience and dedication.

Yours truly,

[REDACTED]
West Vancouver, BC
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
 Sent: March-22-18 11:41 AM
 To: Mayor and Council; OCP Review project; David Hawkins
 Subject: FW: OCP sec 2.1 Eagle Island
 Attachments: EIRA Member Map.pdf; EIRA Information Denial.pdf; 20150325_170201 (002).jpg; IMG_20160521_190540.jpg

From: [REDACTED]
 Sent: March-21-18 3:50 PM
 To: [REDACTED]
 Subject: RE: OCP sec 2.1 Eagle Island

Hello David,

I refer to the Feb 27, 2018 email you sent to Mary-Ann Booth which she forwarded to me. You note that the Draft Policy 2.1.11 responds to input, notably from The Eagle Island Residents Association specific to this topic.

1. As previously advised I am [REDACTED] and have requested copies of the submissions made by the EIRA to the District, but EIRA have denied me this info on the basis [REDACTED] (see attached). [REDACTED] I wanted to know what was being represented to the District in relation to Eagle Island. We have lived [REDACTED] for more than [REDACTED]. To be denied information that reduces the value and affects the use [REDACTED] is absolutely unacceptable. As the EIRA won't provide the information, it calls into question what they are hiding. I submit that the EIRA submissions were biased misrepresentations and should be treated as such and not considered. You indicated you would check if you could provide me with copies of these submissions but I have not heard back from you. I understood the OCP process was supposed to be open and transparent. As a property owner and citizen of West Vancouver I have to insist that the District provide us with the information.
2. What I did receive from the EIRA included a map with 23 members addresses highlighted. Are these the 23 of 32 owners you referred to as supporting 2.1.11. These addresses include [REDACTED] we are sure would not support the ban proposed as they wrote to mayor and council in support [REDACTED] coach house application.
3. Of the remaining 19 or 20 members, I believe 17 could not qualify for a coach house due to lot size, topography, not a permanent resident and/or existing building placement. One of these residents asked why [REDACTED] allowed to have a coach house when [REDACTED] could not accommodate one. Having to ask people who cannot have a coach house if it is ok if [REDACTED] is doomed from the outset. While District Planning fully supported our coach house [REDACTED] failed to get approval because of opposition from those who could not or did not want a coach house themselves. The zoning rules for coach houses on Eagle Island should be the same as the rest of West Vancouver, i.e. subject to Planning Dept approval.
4. The root of the whole issue is the widely varied lot sizes on Eagle Island (from 8223 sq. ft. to 40,741 sq. ft. [REDACTED] [REDACTED] That owners of smaller lots, or part time resident or those with steep rocky lots, or those who just are not interested in a coach house, are able to deny the property rights of the very few who can and do want a coach house is totally unfair. Why should a few Eagle Island residents with large lots be denied their rights to a coach house when the District as a whole is moving strongly in that direction. As detailed in the

Council Reports prepare by the Planning Dept on the subject [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Subdivision on Eagle Island was last allowed in the 1970's. While there are few very large lots, in fairness to owners, they should be considered for subdivision.

5. [REDACTED] right to age in place afforded to other West Vancouverites. This was a principal consideration in the coach house approval process. A [REDACTED] house would be perfect [REDACTED] at some future time.
6. The EIRA was formerly the Anti Coach House Coalition and I believe the name change was only to gain legitimacy. They remain totally anti coach house because they cannot have one, or are part time residents, or can't afford one. They have had a new 6+ barge District dock removed (photo of removed dock attached) and reduced mooring space for island barges by placing never used safety ladders in the middle of mooring spaces (photo of safety ladder placed in the centre of two mooring spots eliminating them both). All this to support their contention that there is no room for any more barges. This reduced the number of barge mooring spaces by 8 on the mainland side. It is unacceptable that this group has such control over District Engineering to the detriment of all Eagle Island residents and West Vancouver tax payers.
7. The current regulations that do not allow for in house secondary suites were in place [REDACTED] Eagle Island, but should be modified to allow for a single person suite for a nanny, health caretaker, elderly parent, etc. The current recently adopted coach house policy should be modified to allow coach houses approved by the Planning Department based on reasonable conditions, not on NIMBY motivation.
8. Eagle Island should be subject to draft proposal 2.1.1, and 2.1.2 subject to a one person in-house suite.
9. Draft Proposal 2.1.11 must be deleted as unfair and prejudicial against larger property owners on Eagle Island. This retrogressive clause has no place in the West Vancouver OCP.

Regards

[REDACTED]
West Vancouver BC, [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From [REDACTED]
Sent: March-07-18 2:54 PM
To: 'David Hawkins' <dhawkins@westvancouver.ca>
Subject: RE: OCP sec 2.1 Eagle Island

Hi David,

Further to our recent conversation you were going to check if the submissions of the EI Resident's Assoc. that support para 2.1.11 of the Draft OCP were available for review. I would very much like to see what was provided to you.

[REDACTED] I have requested copies of correspondence between the EIRA and the District but have received nothing in response. I also requested a membership list but have no reply.

The EIRA does not represent all Eagle Islanders and all EIRA members are not in favour of the long term ban of coach houses and secondary suites proposed in the Draft OCP. And what will happen to the illegal suites and coach houses currently on the island?

Under the current regulations secondary suites are not permitted and coach houses are subject to site specific rezoning. It gives those opposed to coach houses a chance to object, but allows for a change as views on this issue on Eagle Island catch up with those on the mainland. Is that not enough?

On Eagle Island [redacted] residents who are in their 60's, 70's and 80's. One of the 80 year olds [redacted] Others will likely sell or pass in the next 5 to 10 years. Some other residents are renting. Why should these people be in charge of denying younger people the opportunity to live on Eagle Island even after they are no longer residents.

[redacted] Eagle Island. [redacted] are part time residents and opposed [redacted] application. [redacted] the owner uses the cottage is a weekend and summer place, [redacted] the owners live in [redacted] and that will probably increase when the anticipated change from 6 to 8 months absence from Canada goes ahead. These people want no change even if that change would not affect them.

I am advised that District wide 72% of residents are strongly in favour of proposed plans to regenerate neighbourhoods with "sensitive infill units". What could be more sensitive [redacted] coach house [redacted] Another 20% District wide are not opposed to the infill plans for a total 92%. But on Eagle Island many are opposed because they are afraid of a proliferation of coach houses even though [redacted] has proposed one. Many lots on Eagle Island could not accommodate a coach house because of topography or placement of existing buildings and some residents are opposed because [redacted] they cannot. We are West Vancouverites first [redacted] We should not be subjected to the views of a few people who are totally out of step with the vast majority of West Vancouver.

We also note that Eagle Island is not included in the area where subdivision will be considered. [redacted] the size of the smallest lot [redacted] and could easily create a second lot much larger than the average in Ambleside or Dunderave. Subdivision on Eagle Island was last allowed in the 1970's. Times have changed. We strongly feel that fairness would dictate that the District not restrict subdivision or provide special rules for a group of NIMBYs.


It is totally inappropriate and unnecessary that Eagle Island be subject to different or new rules in the OCP.

Regards

[redacted]
West Vancouver BC, [redacted]
[redacted]

PRE-PLA
585

WATER ACCESS ONLY
PRIVATE FLOATS



EAGLE ISLAND

2018 EIRA
Member Households

[REDACTED]

From: Eagle Island Residents Association <eagleislandra@gmail.com>
Sent: March-09-18 4:45 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: EIRA Correspondence with District / Membership List

[REDACTED] You should have just received an e-mail from the EIRA gmail with the Membership List (presented as a map) and all correspondence from 2018 from the EIRA to the District (its just 3 items) as well as a Survey Form. The e-mail was sent to [REDACTED]

Myself and the other Directors do not believe that it is appropriate to provide you with copies of all the EIRA correspondence with the District from the time period [REDACTED]

The five volunteer Directors do our best to always confer and make decisions as group. Even [REDACTED] may be displeased. Having every single decision decided as a referendum [REDACTED] can be burdensome. You will see in the other e-mail that we have chosen a survey form to gather information regarding the dock emergency ladder, the garbage bin enclosure and some other things to make sure that everyone has a chance to voice their opinion.

If you have any other questions or comments then please let us know. If its about EIRA business then please use eagleislandra@gmail.com

All the best,

[REDACTED]


H [REDACTED]


Can you forward me copies of all correspondence sent to the district by the EIRA and a current membership list

Thanks

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
West Vancouver BC, [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]





From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
 Sent: March-23-18 2:43 PM
 To: Mayor and Council
 Subject: Re Official Community Plan Draft

2517-02

> Thank you to you and your colleagues on Council and the staff in the Municipality for making the effort to update our Official Community Plan.

>

> For your information my wife and I are long time residents of West Vancouver [REDACTED] s. 22(1) We lived on [REDACTED] s. 22(1) with great neighbours all around. In the last five years or [REDACTED] s. 22(1) there was a huge amount of construction with lots being stripped bare of forest and trees and huge very large and expensive homes replacing the more modest and more affordable homes. Many of these new homes remained unoccupied. Due to challenges with construction [REDACTED] s. 22(1) we decided to move from our long time family home to our current address.

>

> I attended recently an ADRA meeting where I expected to hear a presentation from either a senior member of our Planning Department or from our Mayor or a Councillor engaged in the drafting of the plan. I appreciate the Mayor and most of Council attending the meeting but was disappointed there was no presentation of the plan or any member of our Planning department available to answer residents' questions although I understood invited.

>

> So having had the opportunity to read the plan but having no opportunity to ask questions of our Planning department or our Mayor and Councillors below are my comments and questions.

>

> Firstly I am concerned with the short time the draft plan has been published and the short submission date for comments - March 16 now amended to March 29. Many residents have no idea what this plan might mean for them. I think that there needs to be at least three months of review and many community meetings before plan goes to council for approval.

>

> I think the focus group meetings that were held this summer tended to drive people to certain conclusions and has given the Planning department some unfortunate feeling that in fact we all want more development (related construction) and density - fewer single family homes and a lot more townhomes and apartments.

>

> While I think that we do have citizens nearing retirement who want these types of properties I believe that there are plenty of apartments available - the gap perhaps is larger three bedroom plus apartments and low rise townhomes or coach houses (duplex, triplex developments). The idea of strong demand from younger citizens is I think misguided as it seems unfortunately that such apartments, townhouses or coach houses would remain unaffordable to most of them. I know that most of friends' children do not live in West or North Vancouver as it is just too expensive for them.

>

> Most people I talk with are concerned about traffic gridlock on the North Shore and if there are to be increases in density want to understand how it impacts there neighbourhood and traffic.

>

> The other issue they are concerned about is neighbourhood character and how this has been eroded over many years with very little concrete action to try to resolve.

>

> Affordability is also a concern but I fear there are no easy solutions to this one- recent steps taken by BC NDP may help a little here but not enough to make West Vancouver affordable any time in the near future , if ever. (recent

developments Grosvenor, Cressey, Horseshoe Bay and planned development on Marine Drive bear this out- increased density is not creating affordable homes).

>

> The 53 page draft plan contains a huge amount of motherhood and apple pie but very little that deals with traffic issues and very little explaining why the need for increased density and the impact on traffic and neighbourhoods of such increases. The plan also has very little to say on preserving neighbourhood character.

>

> Some more specific thoughts and questions where it would have been really useful for some member of Council or Planning department at the ADRA meeting to answer. So I am hoping by writing that I will get answers.

>

> Pages 3-6 try to explain the increased population forecast which I believe is the driver in the draft OCP for the need for increased density. Given that our population has been flat to declining I am not sure why we are now forecasting the population of West Vancouver to start rising again? I almost feel the draft OCP needed to justify increasing density and population growth is what was required. This seems to be a critical assumption and think needs to be well thought through as much of the rest of the plan depends on this assumption. We need to understand the demographics of the forecast population growth surely to determine the type of housing they may need or want or could afford.

>

> Page 7 & 8 deal with Housing affordability and diversity- Firstly nowhere in this draft OCP do we define what our definition of affordability is - affordable to B.C. citizens at large, those who already own homes and are downsizing, younger people in B.C. ? With very high land prices more diversity of housing will not necessarily make our housing affordable except to foreign investors or a wealthy minority of the BC population. We have built Grosvenor one 7 floor and to be built one 6 floor building and have under construction Cressy a 20 story . We also have the Horseshoe Bay development and also under plan The Residences on Marine -from \$1.9 million to \$2.75 million. None of these would be affordable at all to the vast majority of B.C.residents and likely only affordable to those with inheritances, downsizing from an existing home or foreign investors. So increased density will not provide affordable housing only housing that is marginally more affordable than a single family home.

>

> Employees of businesses here will still have to commute to West Vancouver as even the higher density smaller homes will remain unaffordable to most if not all- so what we need is to make it easier for those employees to travel to the North Shore by transit and road!!! This begs discussion re adding lanes to our bridges or a third crossing.

>

> Page 10 where we are in the process- as stated above I think the first three phases and the discussions led by planning surprisingly led participants to the solution that planning was directing residents to- I am not convinced that in many instances this is really what residents of West Vancouver are looking for.

>

> Page 15- 2.1.1 - I think the concept here is valid but wording a little unclear- my read is that draft OCP is saying throughout most of West Vancouver larger lots will be able to be subdivided and also coach houses built - what is not clear are actual minimum lot sizes (assume 33 foot) or minimum lot size where coach House could be built. Are we also saying that basement suites would be allowed anywhere as well?

>

> Page 15 & 16 2.1.4 to 2.1.7 This seems to be what is defined as the Marine Drive Transit Corridor which you are defining essentially going along Marine Drive from Park Royal all the way to Horseshoe Bay- all along this corridor Triplexes, Duplexes and townhouses should be permitted - these would be up to three stories - I am sure many residents of single family homes along this corridor would have concerns re the developments and impacts on views , traffic etc. Not sure I have understood this properly though?

>

> 2.1.7 seems to essentially permit Council to spot zone certain sites- I realize that Council wants flexibility but I think that spot zoning re Grosvenor (with a very split Council) did not set a good precedent to grant Council this flexibility- (was pushed through with the vast majority of residents opposed.) Not surprisingly this has created a low level of trust among residents. It would therefore be better if Council had a 75% or better still 100% majority to approve such cases should they arise.

>

> 2.1.8 - this really is the only small section (two small paragraphs) that talks about respecting neighbourhood character. For most residents I think this is a major priority and therefore ideas to protect neighbourhood character should be spelled out in more detail and given more prominence in the draft OCP. This has been a major concern for most residents for many years and very little action has been taken by our Mayor or Council. In the meantime we continue to see many monstrosities built that have a very negative effect on existing long time residents' quality of life.

>

> 2.1.13 - Ambleside Town Centre - the plan proposes 1,000 -1,200 new units or about a 25% increase!!! Seems quite high. I note that 2.1.14 looks at confirming area of Ambleside Town Centre which seems a larger area than would be currently zoned for townhomes and apartments etc? The second point states "Determine densities, heights, building forms that respond to neighborhood context and character"- what does this really mean? I residents want to know where high rises can be built and townhomes, duplexes etc and how that may impact them. They would also like to know the maximum number of stories for such dwelling types. Not clear to me here? The same questions re types of buildings allowed and number of stories apply to other areas such as Horseshoe Bay and Cypress.

>

> Next paragraph states "Prioritizing mixed-use and apartment forms in core areas and ground oriented multi family forms (eg townhouses ,duplexes) to transition to adjacent single-family neighbourhoods" Again using the Ambleside Town centre Map I think residents want to understand where Apartments can be built and to what height , where townhomes can be built and to what height and where duplexes etc can be built- this is not clear to me from reading the plan.

>

> Section 2.1.16 re Advancing housing affordability, accessibility and sustainability- all sounds good in principal but who is going to pay for subsidies and how do you determine who is worthy and who is not? Affordable to whom? It is interesting that we had some lower rental housing and Council approved demolition and building of Cressey Apartment tower with units selling well over \$3 million each?

>

> 2.1.20 re Use of District Owned Lands to create affordable housing There is a clear cost to taxpayers and how do we decide who is to benefit therefrom? Again affordable to whom?

>

> Planning of the new Cypress West Neighborhoods-starting at 2.2.7 -all sounds good but should we not determine what we will do with additional traffic- are there plans to add another link to the Highway? If not we are creating a traffic problem at the Cypress Bowl junction? We are of course in any event adding to the Upper Levels Highway Gridlock. I think this development should be deferred till we have solutions completed that relieve the gridlock that we have currently.

>

> 2.3 Local Economy and Employment- All sounds good but very general statements that need an action plan and specifics to determine what , if anything, the Municipality can actually do. The focus on more retail and restaurants sounds wonderful but think of Amazon- Retail stores are struggling unless they can create a real experience that makes people want to visit. We also have many restaurants that struggle already- will adding more really help? With no growth in population in West Vancouver customer growth will have to come from attracting visitors from elsewhere in Lower Mainland- this will add to traffic gridlock and discourage further those who may consider coming.

>

> Our businesses and employers on the North Shore struggle today to get those willing to commute to North Shore to work. We are unlikely to be able to make it affordable for employees to live here so we need as a priority to make it easier for those employees by transit and road to get here!

>

> 2.3.10 Supporting tourism and visitors- Again sounds good but how do you execute - also need to improve transit and road access to North Shore if you want to attract tourists and visitors. The Evening Entertainment sounds again wonderful but who are the customer base? We have an ageing population so not sure who we are catering to? Have we good feedback from our residents that they want this? Cypress Park is great but again it is attracting huge volumes of traffic and therefore this brings us back to the inadequacy of our road systems and transit.

>

- > 2.4 Transportation and Infrastructure - Surprising to me that we start off with walking and cycling? We are an ageing population living on the side of a mountain- Is this really our top priority and that of our residents? I hope we are not following Vancouver by adding endless bike lanes and creating further traffic gridlock.
- >
- > Yes it would be good to have improved transit to connect communities and to other parts of Lower Mainland and not just downtown- not really sure of need for transit along Marine drive within West Vancouver nor who would use it- the demand I think is to make it easier to get to other Municipalities in lower Mainland (on and off North Shore)
- >
- > Expansion of the Ferry Terminal should be resisted without the Province investing in improved transit and road access (third crossing or additional lanes on our bridges)- The Ferry traffic is already a major contributor to the Gridlock on the Upper Levels and our bridges.
- >
- > 2.4.12 Enhancing road network and sustainability I support but there is no real mention of what ought to be the very top of the list- A third crossing or additional lanes to our bridges- we need to get the Provincial and Federal Government to realise that the most significant volume of traffic to and from the North Shore is through traffic to Ferries, Squamish and Whistler and visitors to Grouse Mountain and Cypress Park- It is highly unlikely that those through travellers would use transit. It is also highly unlikely that Construction workers would use transit either.
- >
- > 2.4.21- Prioritize sustainable transportation options and seek to reduce auto dependency in private and public development projects- a great goal but how do you actually get construction workers out of their cars? We need some concrete ideas here such as ensuring on all major developments that developer stores tools on site and provides compulsory ride sharing from say Burnaby and other locations.
- >
- > Bike sharing , car and ride sharing ? Have you actually asked residents if they would use that? I cannot see the demand for that now or in the medium future.
- >
- > Provide infrastructure for electric vehicles- do we really want to subsidize Tesla owners?
- >
- > Again our clear priority needs to be firstly improved road systems including more lanes of traffic to get on and off the North Shore and across the North Shore. Improved Transit to other Municipalities would be next.
- >
- > 2.6 Parks and Environment- I think fair to say one of the joys of living here in West Vancouver is our Parks and access to the waterfront- lets keep that but also when we want to expand areas of plantings in our Parks be conscious of maintenance- I think often we cannot maintain adequately existing planted areas. We do need also improved Parking at Lighthouse Park.
- >
- > 2.8 Social Well being- Section seems to be largely all Motherhood and Apple Pie- yes all worthy but how do you action and what are costs versus benefits.
- >
- > In general as taxpayers we have seen significant increases in our taxes and added billings for utilities- It is incumbent on our Municipal Government to manage costs and staffing demands very carefully to ensure the services are really meeting community wants and needs and to assist making living in our community more affordable. I am not convinced that enough attention paid to managing costs.
- >
- > In summary on speaking to many of my friends and acquaintances I think Residents priorities are:
- >
- > 1) Traffic challenges and gridlock - we need a solution for residents, employees of our businesses and those passing through our community
- >
- > 2) Neighborhood character and concrete actions to address which is long overdue.
- >

> 3) Provision of more housing options that fit nicely and architecturally into neighbourhoods- but definitely not large and very expensive high rise development

>

> 4) More affordable housing but I think recognised that there is no easy solution that is not very costly.

>

> I realize the above is quite a lot to read through but so were the 53 pages of the draft OCP!! If you got to the end thank you for reading and I hope that some of my comments will be taken into consideration before any final OCP is brought to Council for approval.

>

> I look forward to hearing directly from you or receiving a reply from the Planning Department.

>

> Respectfully submitted,

>

s. 22(1)

> West Vancouver

s. 22(1)

>

>

2517-02

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: March-25-18 9:59 PM
To: Mayor and Council
Subject: Response re Draft West Van OCP

Dear Mayor Smith and West Vancouver District Council Members,

As a native West Vancouverite and now retired [REDACTED] I was very interested to read the February draft of the District's new OCP.

I find the draft OCP to be quite appropriate to West Vancouver's unique conditions. Its major proposals are very reasonable and moderate, and unlikely to have serious negative impacts for any existing West Vancouver residents. My one disappointment is that the draft OCP does not target a bigger modal shift, from private cars to active transportation and public transit. But on the most important issues related to density, I strongly support the Plan's diverse strategies to accommodate West Van's mandated proportionate share of Metro Vancouver's anticipated overall population increase to 2040.

I encourage West Vancouver District Council to honour and capitalize on all the good work that has gone into the preparation of this document, and give formal approval to the new OCP as currently drafted.

[REDACTED]
North Vancouver, BC
[REDACTED]

(1)

2517-02

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: March-27-18 8:26 PM
To: MayorandCouncil
Cc: Michael Smith; Mary-Ann Booth; Craig Cameron; Christine Cassidy; Nora Gambioli; Peter Lambur; Bill Soprovich; David Hawkins
Subject: Commentary on draft OCP
Attachments: March 26 2018 OCP comments.docx

Dear Mayor and counsellors,

As you may know I care greatly about my community and have spent time reviewing and researching possible solutions to the housing crisis in our community.

I would very much appreciate your thought and comments on the attached document.

Attached please find my comments on the OCP draft, section A, Housing.

Please contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

March 2018

COMMENTS ON THE WEST VANCOUVER DRAFT OCP SECTION A HOUSING

BACKGROUND:

West Vancouver is drafting the current OCP at the peak of the housing price and affordability crisis in Toronto and Greater Vancouver with West Vancouver experiencing the worst crisis of any district or city.

The price of a typical detached single-family house has increased by 100% over the last nine years and is now about \$2,500,000 with the average land price of approximately \$2,300,000 while the recognized affordable housing price is \$400,000.

This large difference between the affordable price and the very high land price have resulted in the following problems in the community, all of which have to be addressed and resolved in the Draft OCP.

There is a lack of affordable small houses, partly because purchases of existing small houses have been torn down and replaced with maximum allowable floor area houses to justify the high land prices.

Three quarters of the people that work in West Van, and a quarter of school children, commute daily from other communities due to the fact that the average family cannot afford to live in West Van.

This daily commuting and the increasing traffic from Squamish, Whistler, Pemberton etc. results in added congestion of roads, highways and bridges.

COMMENTS ON DRAFT OCP

The Draft OCP includes a list of options for smaller less expensive housing, but does not address whether these options are "affordable". It also does not include information on the criteria for affordability of purchased or rental housing.

This information is essential to assess whether each option is “affordable” by the recognized criteria and also affordable for seniors, young families, and people who work in West Van.

As an example, consider the options for sub dividing properties and building multi-family housing on the divided strata owned land (townhouses, row housing, duplexes and triplexes, strata titled carriages, and lane cottages etc.).

From the information provided in the Draft OCP, one would assume that these options are affordable. Yet, the recently sales listing of the garden cottages on the “Vinson Property” indicates that they would be grossly unaffordable.

These garden cottages are part of a development where the heritage house has been jacked up and three housing units added to the property, increasing the housing density by a factor of four.

The two garden cottages have recently been placed on the sales market for 2.6 million and 2.8 million (approximately 1080 sq. ft. based on the sales listing floor area, and approximately 1700 per sq. ft. based on the floor area in the District of West Van document which presumably was the areas used in the FAR calculations of .59).

These prices are disturbing as the development is larger but similar in concept and densification to the multi-family housing options in the Draft OCP document. It confirms our own calculations that most of the purchase options for multi-family housing will not be affordable for people who work in West Van, the typical young family which are the group that West Van needs the most.

It confirms that it is essential for the Draft OCP to include information on the recognized affordable purchase price based on the average household income, and the forecast price of the different options, so that the options can be evaluated and prioritized.

The Draft OCP contains little information on the most important, cost effective, and desirable option. Namely, the building, and rental of apartment buildings on West Van District land, which should be leased at a nominal rate to the project.

These small apartments would be rented to seniors, people who work in West Van, young families, and to individuals with special needs. The Draft OCP should include complete information on this option.

Rental of apartments in mid-rise and high-rise buildings are much more affordable than single family housing because they have one third to one fifth the floor area, and that the high cost of land is shared by many units.

The OCP should include details of existing rental for small apartments for seniors and larger ones for families to verify whether they meet the affordability requirements.

The OCP draft should include information on what action is planned for the billion of dollars that the federal government has assigned to CHMC for the provision of affordable housing for the Toronto and Vancouver areas. (See Appendix)

SUMMARY

1. The Draft OCP should include a “comprehensive long term plan”, with goals, objectives, and an action plan to achieve them. It should also address the present housing crisis and possible solutions.
2. The Draft OCP should include:
 - The recognized and accepted house price to household income ratio.
 - The average household income for West Van.
 - The resulting affordable house price.
 - The forecast housing price for the different options.
 - The resulting affordability of the options.
 - The recognized and acceptable rental affordability as a ratio of household income.

None of the above is included in the Draft OCP. Without this information, it is impossible to assess the affordability and viability of the many options. Many of the options listed in the Draft OCP do not meet the affordability criteria by a large margin, and therefore their viability is questionable.

3. The many housing options shown in the Draft OCP for multi-family housing on subdivided or full lots, do not meet the affordable criteria

by a large margin. This is confirmed by the recent sales listing price for the two cottages on the Vinson property of 2.6 and 2.8 million. These cottages are larger but close in concept, and site housing densification as some of the options. Their prices are six to seven times the recognized affordable price.

Our own calculations show that the house prices on many of the options listed would be over twice the recognized affordable price for housing. This would make them unaffordable for seniors, young families, and many of the people who work in West Van who are presently commuting daily.

The viability and use of these options should be reviewed. (For instance, they could be subsidized by the Federal Government's CHMC Program, and be rented by applicable families.)

4. The Draft OCP should advise what action has been taken, or, will be taken of the Federal Government's allocation of money to CHMC for the provision of affordable housing for the Toronto and Vancouver areas.
5. The option of rental housing on West Vancouver owned land, for seniors, young families, people who are working in West Van but presently commuting daily, and individuals with special needs, should be highlighted in the Draft OCP as it is far the best option for affordable housing.

West Vancouver,

INFORMATION APPENDIX

AFFORDABLE HOUSING

PURCHASE BY BUYER

It is generally accepted that an affordable housing price should be approximately three to five times the household yearly income. The West Vancouver area average household income is \$80,000. This results in an affordable purchase price of \$400,000. This compares with an average purchase price in West Vancouver of detached single-family dwellings of over \$2,500,000. The average house price to yearly income/ratio throughout Canada is 5.4 Many of the smaller cities average ratio is between 3 and 4.

RENTAL AFFORDABILITY

It is recognized that housing rental and associated costs should be approximately 30% of household income. Assuming household income of \$80,000 for young families, this would result in affordable rentals and associated costs of \$24,000 per year, and correspondingly less for seniors.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND CHMC AFFORDABLE HOUSING:

A Globe & Mail article dated March 14, 2018 stated that two weeks ago, the Federal Government allocated \$1.35 billion of new money to CMHC for building rental housing for young Canadian families. The first allocation of money is \$447 million for the 2018-2019 fiscal year. The primary focus is Vancouver and Toronto because the housing has become extremely expensive for the average person. The 'Creative Housing Program' is to build 50,000 units (mostly rental) designed for median households earning slightly less than \$80,000 per year. The article also stated that that CMHC would play a key roll. Its rental construction financing initiative was launched a year ago. The article stated as well that the Government boosted CMHC's lending capacity for rental construction by 50% to \$3.75 billion (error ?) over the next three years.

2517-02

From: [Redacted]
Sent: March-28-18 4:51 AM
To: Mayor and Council
Subject: Opinions on OCP

March 27, 2018

Dear Mayor and Council,

We, as residents of [Redacted] in West Vancouver for [Redacted] disagree with some Eagle Island residents' proposal to ban building coach houses on Eagle Island. Specifically, we object to Section 2.1.11 of OCP for the following reasons:

Section 2.1.11 states that due to the so called "small island character", the right of Eagle Island residents to build attached or detached secondary suites will be specifically banned until 2041. If this proposal is passed, it will become a right deprivation clause. We believe that the municipality should consider and solve certain problems regarding this right deprivation clause.

1. There should be justified, reasonable and clearly stated reasons when residents' certain rights are deprived

In Section 2.1.11, the reason for the deprivation of rights is so called "small island character". But what is a small island character? If we chat about such a thing, this is fine. However, if the OCP uses "small island character" as a reason for right deprivation, there should be a clear definition of the legal meaning unless the legal connotation of the concept is common sense. For example, "the single-family residential character" in Vancouver's zone by-law is an example of a clear concept of legal meaning.

"Small island" itself cannot constitute a reasonable reason for deprivation of the rights of building a detached coach house. Since Eagle Island is an island with Full city service and just a few dozens of meters away from the mainland, it is not different, in terms of water, electricity, sewage, communication devices, etc., from other areas or some other regions in West Vancouver. Its garbage management is the same as that in strata property communities in other regions.

Because cars cannot drive onto the island, there is a special need for municipal services such as (1) Docks and trestles, as well as (2) parking spaces for land vehicles. This is the real character of Eagle Island. However, this has nothing to do with the "small island", because in a big island or mainland areas, if these two municipal service resources are limited, it may also cause restrictions on the rights of secondary suites or detached coach houses. Therefore, the real legitimate reason for the deprivation of the right of building secondary suites and the detached coach houses in Eagle Island can only be that the aforementioned two municipal service resources are limited, and it has nothing to do with so called "small island".

Another possible explanation for the "small island character" is a certain life style, some kind of environmental atmosphere or some kind of value. However, if the municipality uses these reasons to constitute justified reasons for deprivation of the rights for secondary suites or detached coach houses, these reasons must have a legal status that

must be uniquely protected on Eagle Island, for example, Natural or historical heritage, Sensitive environmental protection zone, etc. Does Eagle Island have this legal status?

Certainly not. If not, why and how can the "small island character" in this sense be the reason for depriving islanders of their rights to build a coach house? For example, if some people claim that "maintaining a better environment and keeping the island away from getting crowded" is "small island character", then the same claim can be made by all communities of West Vancouver residents. Why not prohibit secondary suites and detached coach houses in all residential communities? This is unfair to Eagle Island property owners.

The unclear or undefined "small island character" concept can easily provide umbrellas for some seemingly reasonable but essentially unreasonable claims, creating an injustice to the deprived people.

Therefore, we think it is extremely inappropriate to use it as a reason for deprivation of rights in a right deprivation clause.

2. Municipal service resources can fully support Eagle Island's need for detached secondary suites or detached coach houses

Since the real reason for the deprivation of rights in section 2.1.11 is that the aforementioned two municipal service resources (docks and parking) are limited, we must look to see if the Eagle Island property owners' demand for the secondary suites or detached coach houses exceeds what is provided by these resources and if there must be such a ban in Eagle Island. According to the survey, only 1 per cent property owners in West Vancouver currently have the intention to apply for a detached coach house. As for the Eagle Island community, ever since 2014 when the city bylaw provided for site specific rezoning to allow for coach houses on Eagle Island (RS6 zone), only one application has been filed in the past four years. According to the EIRA, 23 owners (72% of the island property owners) support a ban on all secondary suites for the next 20 years and the other owners (26%) have not shown any intention to build one. Therefore, the demand is very small, limited to one. In terms of municipal resources for Docks and trestles, the city government established a new Dock and trestles system in 2015, adding six or more new barge spaces, which could have been set aside to meet the demand of 3 or more new detached secondary suites. If other design options are adopted, more mooring space may be provided.

As for the land parking, practically speaking, there is no space within 100 meters from the dock, but the well known frequently vacant public parking lots 200 meters away are underutilized and many islanders and their visitors park there. It is entirely feasible for the municipal government to change the use of several parking spaces there to meet the the need of detached coach houses. Even if there are problems with other kinds of city services, it is not unique to Eagle Island. There are also other areas in West Vancouver, which face the same problems as the Eagle Island does, such as low water pressure, which is not the problem brought about by building a coach house. In some high areas and at certain times in North Shore, low water pressure problem does exist. Does that mean that coach houses cannot be allowed in those areas? Therefore, low water pressure cannot be used specifically as a reason to oppose building a coach house on Eagle Island. Instead, the city should deal with water pressure problem now if such a problem exists not only in Eagle Island but also in some other high areas. Therefore, such problems as mooring, parking and low water pressure do not constitute special restrictions on Eagle Island's detached coach houses. That's why the city planning department in both 2016 and 2017 gave the green light to the Eagle Island application for zone change at 5826 Eagle Island to establish a coach house and stated in Council Reports that an additional 1-3 coach houses could be accommodated. This shows that the municipal service , city service resources and engineering capabilities and means to meet the demand can fully support Eagle Island's detached suites. There is absolutely no need to limit such demand through deprivation of rights.

3. Revocating section 2.1.11 is conducive to the implementation of a core goal of the long-term community plan in West Vancouver, namely, the establishment of a more liveable community

A liveable community needs to achieve many of the values we pursue, such as the comfort of personal and family life. However, as a city's long-term community plan, it should put some social value in the preferred position, for example, to achieve social equity.

West Vancouver is a world-class residential area with high quality.

With the rise of real estate prices in recent years, the cost of living in West Vancouver has continued to increase. This requires a number of social adjustment policies so that more people can start housing and live in West Vancouver so that they can live closer to the value of social equality. The secondary suites policy has lowered the threshold for living in West Vancouver, both for home buyers and renters, and is one of the manifestations of this effort.

Another important value of the liveable community goal is sustainability. The progress of any liveable community requires a material basis -- reasonable tax increases to support the continuous improvement of public services. Without a reasonable tax source development, there is no talk of sustainability. The Secondary suites and coach house policy has opened up a reasonable source of taxation so that the liveable community can actually continue to operate.

In 2014, West Vancouver made adjustments to the original regulations and encouraged residents to build coach houses by giving the owners more rights. In the case of Eagle Island, the owners can have the right to establish a detached coach house through rezoning. This shows that on the issue of liveable communities, social values have been more recognized, and private interests and social values have been balanced at a higher level, which is a manifestation of social progress. Of course, we firmly support this correct direction of change. We believe that in Eagle Island, with the methods and capabilities of municipal services constantly improving to solve problems, as long as the municipal service resources can be provided, the municipal government should insist on encouraging and supporting the correct direction of the existing policies, instead of going backward. We hope that this social value's progress on the issue of the liveable community can lift the very barrier of putting private interest value above social values at Eagle Island. In the progressive trend, Eagle Island should not be a lone falterer.

4. Oppose the use of unfair means to create grounds for depriving owners of their rights to own coach houses in Eagle Island

Since 2014, when the city government allowed detached secondary suites through rezoning in Eagle Island, only one case has been filed but rejected by the city council. One of the key objections was based on the argument that there is no vacant dock parking space. Actually, this was what some opponents intended to create.

Property owners [redacted] of Eagle Island have a [redacted] acre property on the island. In 2014, according to the new regulations of by-law, the residents on the island can apply for rezoning to establish detached secondary suites. In preparation for rezoning, [redacted] dismantled an over [redacted] value overhead [redacted]. In January 2015, they announced to the entire island their intention to build a coach house and entered the rezoning process. At the same time, their neighbors began to solicit signatures against their application. The reasons for opposition concentrated on insufficient resources of municipal services. The most important one was that the dock had no spare space. However, in mid-2015, the city government updated the Eagle Island Docks and trestles system and at the same time built a new system on the north side of the original system, adding at list 6 new barge spaces, which could easily solve the need for secondary suites. This was actually a solution to the dock space shortage, so the opposition side had no means to oppose it. Nobody raised any objections until the new system was built. However, after the completion of the project, it is said that one resident on the land side did not like the new dock. Some islanders who opposed the rezoning immediately supported his stand. Together with some residents outside the island, they gave a loud cry against the new service dock and forcibly forced the city government to completely remove the completed project, to make the shortage of barge space become a ground for opposition again. All this shows that, for some in the opposing party, the barge space can never be sufficient. If it is sufficient, it must be removed and made inadequate at all costs.

The establishment and dismantling of this service dock caused several hundred thousand dollars of West Vancouver taxpayers' money to be thrown into water. This incident made us feel very shocked and it is also one of the most ugly community political incidents that we have witnessed. We wondered and got confused about this for a long time. Because some people involved in the operation had to make their private opinions reasonable in order to achieve private interests, they did not even care about wasting large amounts of taxpayers' money. Did they completely lose a kind of conscience known as public morality in this incident?

Up to now, those who contributed to this kind of result did not even get any condemnation. This is unfair to taxpayers in West Vancouver.

In particular, some opponents at that time now proposed the section

2.1.11 in an attempt to make the result of their no-conscience behavior in the past in domination for a long time. We believe that their behavior that year has made them lose credit in community issues. In the name of several hundred thousand dollars of tax-payer's money that was wasted that year, we asked municipal decision makers to judge if the proposed 2.1.11 section is a justified one.

In short, based on the above reasons, we believe that the existing by-law of the island regarding the Eagle Island is entirely applicable to its status quo, not only showing a difference from the land areas but also echoing the consistency with the progress of the entire municipal policy. As for the legal actions of the islanders according to the current by-law, because what they desire to do does not really exceed the limits that the municipal service resources can provide, their applications should be encouraged and supported. There is no reason to deprive and restrict their rights. Different opinions on this issue should not be eliminated in a way that deprives one party of its rights for a long period of time. Depriving people of their rights is a means for them to shut up, which is not allowed by democratic values. Instead, residents' different opinions should be fully expressed in future respective applications in Eagle Island's specific site rezoning cases during which all the parties concerned can fully understand the facts and correctly determine what is right and wrong. This will bring positive results not only to the residents of Eagle Island but also the long-term development pursued by the municipal government. Therefore, section 2.1.11 of OCP should be deleted.

Sincerely yours.



WEST VANCOUVER

PS: The proposal in 2.1.11 of OCP does not represent the opinion of all the island residents. [redacted] and the Association does NOT speak on behalf of the entire island and this Association certainly does NOT [redacted] Less than three years ago, when they asked us to sign a letter against rezoning application, we did not know much about [redacted] Now after [redacted] seen and heard, we have found the whole situation is much much more complicated than we originally thought.

2517-02

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: March-28-18 7:35 PM
To: MayorandCouncil
Subject: OCP CHANGES AND FUTURE DEV

HELLO, I was born and raised on NorthShore. I am for more development as many people do not know where to move to if they want to downsize. Definitely West Van is under developed and most downsizers end up moving outside of WVan.

I am for the new OCP and I think traffic will increase, but look at other cities? WVan marine drive between 13 to 18th Street some buildings not all buildings are falling apart, and look like they are neglected. Have the owners maintain buildings, and if they stay empty they should be taxed.

Also empty houses and condos should also be taxed, as its not wise to keep houses empty. I am for all the new rules and taxes.

Thank you for your time.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: March-28-18 11:52 AM
To: MayorandCouncil
Subject: RE: planning in West Vancouver

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: March 28, 2018 11:50 AM
To: 'MayorandCouncil@westvancouver.ca'
Subject: planning in West Vancouver

I have had a brief read on the new plans for West Vancouver and while some of it is quite logical other aspects don't reflect the issues faced even today. The development of Marine Drive needs to avoid the North Vancouver/ Kingsway development of uninspiring buildings crowding the street, with traffic lights that stall movement. A 3 story limit on structures tastefully done can work but continued exceptions like the recent structure beside the site of the old police station really detracts from the environment, and leaves suspect how it was ever allowed.

My other concern is the traffic situation especially near Park Royal where an overpass was replaced with a light and has created further delays in vehicle movement. It looks like you are proposing that it could be continued all the way to 23rd. Weekend traffic at Marine Drive and Taylor Way have become a joke. It's hard to believe the council is pushing for an extensive increase in density without consideration of the traffic or provide suitable alternatives.

I would like to see some reconsiderations of the plans, after all West Vancouver doesn't have an eroding tax base and some of these ideas, i.e. encouraging tourism simply aggravate the traffic and crowding at some of the local beaches and parks and destroys much of what makes West Vancouver unique.

[REDACTED]
West Vancouver, B.C.
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: March-29-18 8:15 PM
To: MayorandCouncil
Subject: Eagle Island/ Draft OCP

Dear Mayor and Council,

Why is a ban of secondary suites and coach houses on Eagle Island being included in the Draft OCP? (2.1.11)

Unlike the rest of West Vancouver, secondary suites are not a permitted use on Eagle Island and a Bylaw is already in place for site specific rezoning approval for coach house(s) Aside from 5826 Eagle Island, to date, there has been NO other application and NO interest from any Eagle Island homeowner to build a coach house. Indeed, many lots do not qualify for a coach house for reasons including topography, property size or Eagle Island not being the homeowners principal residence, so WHY is it necessary for West Vancouver council to go to lengths to include Eagle Island in the Draft OCP and how would this ban affect existing secondary suites and coach houses on Eagle Island?

In a recent e-mail to islanders and non-islanders, [REDACTED] states quite clearly that regardless of whether you live on or own property on Eagle Island, you should support the ban detailed in section 2.1.11 of the Draft OCP. A fawning response to that email suggests a good reason to back the ban is to show support to the author of the aforementioned email. How did it come to be that non-residents and non-homeowners have been given the power to decide the future of Eagle Island?

After being advised the ban was included as a result of submissions by Eagle Island Resident's Association [REDACTED] [REDACTED] requested copies of communications pertaining to the OCP between West Vancouver and the Association but in what appears to be a blatant intent to avoid transparency, all requests have been denied by the EIRA.

The Eagle Island Residents Association (EIRA), formerly the Anti-Coach House Coalition, does not speak for the entire island. Indeed, they do not even speak for their entire membershi, since 5 members supported the coach house application at 5826 Eagle.

The last time a subdivision was approved on the island was in the 1970's. The island does have a few properties approaching an acre, yet Eagle Island is not included in the area where subdivision(s) will be considered (Map 1) This makes absolutely no sense. Dispite misrepresentations from the EIRA to the contrary. the Planning Department determined there IS adequate parking and water access to support up to 4 additional residences (at the time referring to coach houses)

Banning secondary suites and coach house, as well as excluding subdivisions on Eagle Island will create an unjustified infringement on Eagle Island property owners. Moreover, the ban can only be seen as specifically targeting the homeowners of 5826 Eagle Island.

Eagle Island should not be treated differently than any other West Vancouver community, nor should its' property owners be treated any differently than any other Law-abidin, West Vancouver tax-paying citizen.

For all the aforementioned reasons, Mayor and Council should absolutely REMOVE paragraph 2.1.11 in the OCP Draft and include Eagle Island in 2.1.1.

Thank you,


West Vancouver, BC


2517-02

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: March-29-18 8:45 PM
To: MayorandCouncil
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Submission re Neighbourhood Character and Heritage in Draft OCP 2018
Attachments: [REDACTED] Comments re Draft OCP 2018.docx

Mr Mayor and Councillors,

Please find enclosed our comments in relation to specific sections in the Draft OCP 2018.
Thank you

[REDACTED]

Comments to Draft 2018 OCP re Section A (Housing and Neighbourhoods) Part 2
(Respecting Character and protecting Heritage)

General Comments re Respecting Character and Protecting Heritage

"Heritage", including built structure and landscape, has been of such importance to West Vancouver residents that it features in each OCP and Municipal election.

We appreciate that Council has been working with the Heritage tools it currently has to preserve the heritage resources that exist, but there are still only a small number of the buildings on the Heritage Register, and landscapes, that are legally protected; those that are protected may still be challenged (eg Binning House); and sadly, buildings that are on the Heritage Register continue to be demolished.

Until relatively recently, there seemed to be a widespread understanding amongst residents of the contribution of "heritage" to the attraction and livability of West Vancouver. Further, there was an acceptance both of modest scale of homes, and of renovation of existing structures (rather than replacement) as a way of adapting to changing needs. As a result, heritage resources survived passively.

With the more recent changes in both the demographic and business landscape, structures on the Register, and landscapes, increasingly have been viewed simply through the glasses of "assets" and "return on investment". If the "business case" for renovation and retention of such Heritage resources is measured against that for replacement (particularly when municipal processes and speed of development are factored in), it is not surprising that demolitions are accelerating.

Further, given the capital, time and effort required by a homeowner to achieve an equivalent "asset" via renovation and retention (particularly under an HRA) to that resulting from a property sale, it is little wonder that houses on the Register, most of which are in private hands, are, or will be, under threat, and those that have been retained under HRAs, have involved property developers.

Given that the vast majority of houses on the Register are lived in by their owners, the question becomes, "why are they selling and not redeveloping themselves", or more importantly, "how do we encourage Residents to do this" and facilitate them staying in, and caring for these houses? As redevelopment of a property is now for most residents a business decision, the answer, in our view, lies in making retention and renovation easier and more financially attractive than demolition and replacement.

Specific Comments

Para 2.1.8 Ensure that new single-family dwellings respect neighbourhood character

We agree with the tenets expressed in both of the bullets in the Draft

We would modify the second bullet to read:

- Applying and updating built-form Guidelines, as relevant, in regards to neighbourhood context and character, streetscape and natural features, including giving protection to the "amenities of daily living";

Comment: Guidelines in use in large urban environments (such the Borough of Camden in London, England) speak to preserving the "amenities of daily living" (privacy, light, sun and sight lines) and ensure that development is done in such a way that the livability and enjoyment of existing houses/properties (many of which are older and of modest scale) are not materially impacted;

We suggest adding a third bullet as follows:

- Development and/or modification of boulevards and laneways should be coherent within a neighbourhood, and with neighbourhood plans and/or planning processes where these exist;

Comment: the public spaces that are boulevards and laneways contribute significantly to neighbourhood character; while maintenance should remain the responsibility of residents whose properties they border, development or modification needs to be done in such a way that streetscapes are preserved or enhanced, logically in a coherent fashion that fits (or defines) the street and surrounding neighbourhood, rather than being done piecemeal;

Para 2.1.9 Protect buildings, structures and landscapes on the District's Heritage Register

We agree with the general tenor of the bullets in the draft

We would modify the fifth bullet to read:

- Considering financial incentives (eg the reduction of development fees or charges, tax incentives, loans, direct grants);

Comment: as outlined in the General Comments, there is a need to find ways to make renovation and retention a more compelling business case for motivated residents of modest means than selling and redeveloping; owners of houses on the Heritage Register may struggle to pay the taxes and incremental maintenance costs associated with older houses, and may not easily afford the costs of renovation, let alone have the capital to build infill units negotiated as density bonus, and are unlikely to recover their costs until they sell; further, Residents throughout West Vancouver benefit from heritage conservation, whether built or landscape and thus need to have some "skin in the game", for instance by absorbing the costs of tax incentives/holidays, or by contributing to a heritage fund (eg. using levies on new development) that supports direct grants, interest-free loans, a "TrueColours" program;

We suggest adding an eighth bullet as follows:

- Streamline municipal processes to support renovation and retention of heritage resources (eg. moving development permits to the head of the queue; identifying a "Heritage Planner" to oversee such developments; develop a "Heritage" working party within the Planning Dept to develop expertise, coordinate efforts, troubleshoot);

Comment: a key component of renovation and retention being a more compelling business case than selling and redevelopment involves reducing the time and effort of permitting and inspection processes, including finding alternatives ways of meeting building code standards.



28 March, 2018



2517-02

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: March-29-18 1:19 PM
To: MayorandCouncil
Cc: OCP Review project
Subject: ocp

Dear Mayor and Council members

I'm writing to ask that you provide a clear explanation of why you think it wise to so drastically alter the character of lower West Vancouver, particularly the Ambleside area.

We have lived here for over [REDACTED] primarily because we appreciated the quiet and relaxed village atmosphere,which is rapidly deteriorating.

Shouldn't your first commitment be to the present community members, not visitors or anticipated new money?

If you say you can no longer afford to support life here as we have been accustomed, please explain in detail .

We need to understand why you want to make these drastic changes.

And would you make these changes to the neighborhoods you live in?

thank you

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
WEST VANCOUVER, [REDACTED]

2517-02

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: March-31-18 5:43 PM
To: MayorandCouncil
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Fwd: Re new draft Official Community Plan for West Vancouver

I am a resident of West Vancouver. Like many retirees, I travel outside Canada for many months each year and I lead a busy life while I am here in West Vancouver. Consequently I have not been able to keep abreast of the District of West Vancouver's development plans (**Official Community Plan**).

I received the following email from [REDACTED] who has been more able than I keep watch on the District of West Vancouver's (so far draft) development plans.

I am writing to you to request very strongly that more time is required to present your plans to residents, and in forums that explain in plain language what you intend to do and, importantly, what the consequences to residents are.

I am particularly concerned that traffic congestion and transportation generally are not properly addressed in your development plans. I understand that transportation and traffic congestion are not within the sole domain of the District, however moving ahead with development without a meaningful and practical transportation plan and infrastructure is akin to putting the cart before the horse. Or perhaps more accurately, the District burying its head in the sand.

I hope that you give serious consideration to my request.

Thank you.

[REDACTED]
West Vancouver, BC
[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: [REDACTED]
Date: March 31, 2018 at 16:08:57 PDT
To: HOME [REDACTED]
Subject: Re new draft Official Community Plan for West Vancouver

If you agree with Scenery's letter below could you please write an email to Mayor and Council and also encourage your friends to write an email.

I have written already but they need support or the OCP draft likely to get pushed through with little further discussion. Easy just address mayorandcouncil@westvan.ca. If you do not agree please just ignore my email.

The draft OCP is easy to find on the West Vancouver Website and on request from you I can forward you a copy of my more detailed email to Council in the draft OCP.

The draft plan seems pro development and to support more density (more apartments and townhouses) throughout West Vancouver but particularly Ambleside and Dundarave as well all along the Marine Drive Corridor From Park Royal to Horseshoe Bay.

It also appears to seek to give Council full authority re future "spot" zoning as occurred with Grosvenor Building.

The idea seems to be we need density to support a larger population and more affordable housing (although one needs to understand that means \$1.9 million for 2 bedroom apartments on Marine Drive- already advertised for sale!!!) to create a vibrant community to support dying businesses and attract more tourists.

The transportation section largely deals with need for more bicycle lanes and walking trails and some improvement to transit- it does not really address the current traffic gridlock and the need for additional road lanes on our bridges or a third crossing.

Preserving Neighbourhood Character gets limited mention with acknowledging needs further study (this has been on the agenda for a decade with no real progress).

As I said if you agree and you want more time to review and comment on the draft please write and let Council know your thoughts. If not no worries and just ignore my email.

Cheers



Begin forwarded message:

From: Ambleside Dundarave Ratepayers Association
<adrawestvan@gmail.com>
Date: March 30, 2018 at 00:14:04 PDT
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: updates
Reply-To: <adrawestvan@gmail.com>

[View this email in your browser](#)

We anticipate these endeavours will move us significantly closer to obtaining broad-based understanding of the Draft OCP - a key factor before public support can be ascertained - but acknowledge that will be determined by Council at the conclusion of the proposed process.

Scenery Slater

on behalf of

Ambleside & Dundarave Ratepayers' Association



Copyright © 2018 Ambleside & Dundarave Ratepayers' Association, All rights reserved.

You are receiving this email because you opted in via our website

Our mailing address is:

Ambleside & Dundarave Ratepayers' Association

West Vancouver, Bc

Canada

[Add us to your address book](#)

Want to change how you receive these emails?

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



AMBLESIDE DUNDARAVE RATEPAYERS ASSOCIATION

COMMUNITY VOLUNTEER OPPORTUNITY

The District is recruiting ten citizens to serve on a Neighbourhood Character Working Group. Applications are due Monday April 9th. More information is available below:

<https://westvancouver.ca/be-involved/committees-groups/working-groups/neighbourhood-character-working-group>

OFFICIAL COMMUNITY PLAN

Public input into the draft Official Community Plan has now closed. However, we understand staff may still accept emails over this weekend.

ADRA continues to have concerns around the draft plan and the time frame for public engagement and has sent the following letter to Mayor and Council:

Dear Mayor and Council,

We continue to have concerns with the limited time-frame for public input on the Draft OCP and feel the timelines for consultation following the second draft are extremely tight. There is public desire for a better understanding of this important document and a well-informed community is better equipped to provide knowledgeable feedback. As such, we respectfully request that a public hearing be scheduled only after the following takes place:

- The new (second) draft OCP document include (1) a plain language summary document and (2) a comparison document specifying the substantive or key changes between the existing (2004) OCP and the new draft. Ideally the

summary and comparison documents as well as the following suggestions, should be vetted by the Community Engagement Committee.

- The new (second) draft and accompanying summary and comparison documents be widely publicized and circulated. The community would greatly benefit from having hard copies made readily available at Municipal Hall, Gleneagles and West Vancouver Community Centres, the Seniors Centre, the Library, etc. Ideally the summary document will also be made available in a translated copy.
- Once the (second) Draft plan, summary and comparison documents have been circulated throughout the community it would be helpful to hold a series of Neighbourhood Town Hall meetings to both educate and obtain informed feedback. To reach as many people as possible we suggest three Town Hall meetings held in the following geographic areas: (1) Ambleside/Dundarave/Altamont; (2) British Properties/Cedardale/Sentinel Hill; (3) Horseshoe Bay/Gleneagles. All West Van neighbourhood associations should be encouraged to have their members attend. It is also suggested the District utilize the SFU Centre for Dialogue to conduct these meetings.
- The westvancouverITE online forum be used as one means of capturing and sharing public input. The value of sharing comments, questions and ideas cannot be underestimated. We feel this is an integral aspect that stimulates public participation and allows people to consider and build on other ideas.
- The above endeavours to educate and obtain informed public input be held over a minimum 6 weeks (similar to the time frame provided for initial OCP public input).
- The results of the above engagement process will then be incorporated into a third OCP draft, including a revised Summary and a Comparison document specifying changes from the second draft.

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: April-02 18 11:29 AM
To: MayorandCouncil
Subject: Fwd OCP

Dear Mayor and Counsellors,

I would encourage you to go along with the ideas put forward in letter below, as I feel that more community input is required.

The critical issue if traffic congestion has to be included in these discussions, do you remember when the Park Royal expansion and traffic changes were NOT going to worsen the congestion! Ha Ha!

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPad

AMBLESIDE DUNDARAVE RATEPAYERS ASSOCIATION

COMMUNITY VOLUNTEER OPPORTUNITY

The District is recruiting ten citizens to serve on a Neighbourhood Character Working Group. Applications are due Monday April 9th. More information is available below:

<https://westvancouver.ca/be-involved/committees-groups/working-groups/neighbourhood-character-working-group>

OFFICIAL COMMUNITY PLAN

Public input into the draft Official Community Plan has now closed. However, we understand staff may still accept emails over this weekend.

ADRA continues to have concerns around the draft plan and the time frame for public engagement and has sent the following letter to Mayor and Council:

Dear Mayor and Council,

We continue to have concerns with the limited time-frame for public input on the Draft OCP and feel the timelines for consultation following the second draft are extremely tight. There is public desire for a better understanding of this important document and a well-informed community is better equipped to provide knowledgeable feedback. As such, we respectfully request that a public hearing be scheduled only after the following takes place:

- The new (second) draft OCP document include (1) a plain language summary document and (2) a comparison document specifying the substantive or key changes between the existing (2004) OCP and the new draft. Ideally the summary and comparison documents as well as the following suggestions, should be vetted by the Community Engagement Committee.
- The new (second) draft and accompanying summary and comparison documents be widely publicized and circulated. The community would greatly benefit from having hard copies made readily available at Municipal Hall, Gleneagles and West Vancouver Community Centres, the Seniors Centre, the Library, etc. Ideally the summary document will also be made available in a translated copy.

• Once the (second) Draft plan, summary and comparison documents have been circulated throughout the community it would be helpful to hold a series of Neighbourhood Town Hall meetings to both educate and obtain informed feedback. To reach as many people as possible we suggest three Town Hall meetings held in the following geographic areas: (1) Ambleside/Dundarave/Altamont; (2) British Properties/Cedardale/Sentinel Hill; (3) Horseshoe Bay/Gleneagles. All West Van neighbourhood associations should be encouraged to have their members attend. It is also suggested the District utilize the SFU Centre for Dialogue to conduct these meetings.

• The westvancouverITE online forum be used as one means of capturing and sharing public input. The value of sharing comments, questions and ideas cannot be underestimated. We feel this is an integral aspect that stimulates public participation and allows people to consider and build on other ideas.

• The above endeavours to educate and obtain informed public input be held over a minimum 6 weeks (similar to the time frame provided for initial OCP public input).

• The results of the above engagement process will then be incorporated into a third OCP draft, including a revised Summary and a Comparison document specifying changes from the second draft.

We anticipate these endeavours will move us significantly closer to obtaining a broad-based understanding of the Draft OCP - a key factor before public support can be ascertained - but acknowledge that will be determined by Council at the conclusion of the proposed process.

Scenery Slater
on behalf of
Ambleside & Dundarave Ratepayers' Association



Copyright © 2018 Ambleside & Dundarave Ratepayers' Association. All rights reserved.

Want to change how you receive these emails?
You can [update your preferences](#) or [unsubscribe from this list](#)



From: [REDACTED]
Sent: April-02-18 11:33 AM
To: MayorandCouncil <MayorandCouncil@westvancouver.ca>
Subject: Fwd: OCP

Dear Mayor and Council,
I am writing to you to give strong consideration to the letter below from Scenery Slater
I would appreciate more local resident input and more time to consider traffic flow on the North Shore if more population density is being planned for the future.

Sincerely

[REDACTED]
West Vancouver resident

[REDACTED]
West Vancouver, BC

AMBLESIDE DUNDARAVE RATEPAYERS ASSOCIATION

COMMUNITY VOLUNTEER OPPORTUNITY

The District is recruiting ten citizens to serve on a Neighbourhood Character Working Group. Applications are due Monday April 9th. More information is available below:

<https://westvancouver.ca/be-involved/committees-groups/working-groups/neighbourhood-character-working-group>

OFFICIAL COMMUNITY PLAN

Public input into the draft Official Community Plan has now closed. However, we understand staff may still accept emails over this weekend.

ADRA continues to have concerns around the draft plan and the time frame for public engagement and has sent the following letter to Mayor and Council.

Dear Mayor and Council,

We continue to have concerns with the limited time-frame for public input on the Draft OCP and feel the timelines for consultation following the second draft are extremely tight. There is public desire for a better understanding of this important document and a well-informed community is better equipped to provide knowledgeable feedback. As such, we respectfully request that a public hearing be scheduled only after the following takes place:

- The new (second) draft OCP document include (1) a plain language summary document and (2) a comparison document specifying the substantive or key changes between the existing (2004) OCP and the new draft. Ideally the summary and comparison documents as well as the following suggestions, should be vetted by the Community Engagement Committee.
- The new (second) draft and accompanying summary and comparison documents be widely publicized and circulated. The community would greatly benefit from having hard copies made readily available at Municipal Hall, Gleneagles and West Vancouver Community Centres, the Seniors Centre, the Library, etc. Ideally the summary document will also be made available in a translated copy.

• Once the (second) Draft plan, summary and comparison documents have been circulated throughout the community it would be helpful to hold a series of Neighbourhood Town Hall meetings to both educate and obtain informed feedback. To reach as many people as possible we suggest three Town Hall meetings held in the following geographic areas: (1)

Ambleside/Dundarave/Altamont; (2) British Properties/Cedardale/Sentinel Hill; (3) Horseshoe Bay/Gleneagles. All West Van neighbourhood associations should be encouraged to have their members attend. It is also suggested the District utilize the SFU Centre for Dialogue to conduct these meetings.

• The westvancouverITE online forum be used as one means of capturing and sharing public input. The value of sharing comments, questions and ideas cannot be underestimated. We feel this is an integral aspect that stimulates public participation and allows people to consider and build on other ideas.

• The above endeavours to educate and obtain informed public input be held over a minimum 6 weeks (similar to the time frame provided for initial OCP public input).

• The results of the above engagement process will then be incorporated into a third OCP draft, including a revised Summary and a Comparison document specifying changes from the second draft.

We anticipate these endeavours will move us significantly closer to obtaining a broad-based understanding of the Draft OCP - a key factor before public support can be ascertained - but acknowledge that will be determined by Council at the conclusion of the proposed process.

Scenery Slater
on behalf of
Ambleside & Dundarave Ratepayers' Association



Copyright © 2018 Ambleside & Dundarave Ratepayers' Association All rights reserved

Want to change how you receive these emails?
You can [update your preferences](#) or [unsubscribe from this list](#)



2517-02

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: April 03-18 2:36 AM
To: David Hawkins
Cc: MayorandCouncil, DWV Senior Staff, DWV Engaged Citizens
Subject: OCP Draft - Comments
Attachments: OCP - Comments on Draft OCP, 2018.03 28.pdf

Hello, David:

- Attached are my comments on the OCP Draft.
- Keep up your good work.

All the best,

[REDACTED]



Virus-free. www.avast.com

DATE: March 28th, 2018.
TO: David Hawkins – Manager, Community Planning & Sustainability
CC: Mayor & Council, Senior Staff, Engaged Citizens.
FROM: [REDACTED] West Vancouver, BC [REDACTED]

West Vancouver's Official Community Plan Draft OCP – Comments

Hello David:

A. PREAMBLE – Introductory Remarks

1. First of all

Heartiest congratulations to you and your OCP Team for your phenomenal work in obtaining impressive amounts of excellent Citizen input through opportunities provided by numerous Workshops, Surveys and Pop-ups. All of this was well organized and highly professional.

2. Incubation & Reflection

The challenge now is to compile the input material into a coherent whole. As John Maynard Keynes said, "I don't start serious writing until I get the first proofs back from my printer." Thus, opportunity for reflection and comments (now & later, p. 53) in the OCP's final stages is essential and welcome.

3. Completion of the OCP must not be delayed by searching for elusive perfection – that would be the enemy of *good enough, done !!* As noted in the Draft (p. 52), *the OCP is a living document ... to be amended from time to time.*

4. Context for the OCP and EDP

West Vancouver is a Paradise – all who live here drew a lucky number in the Lottery of Life. Yet at the same time West Vancouver, despite its good fortune to be well within "the top 1%" in wealth and talent, does not live up to its capabilities and Vision "*to inspire excellence and lead by example*".

The Draft OCP and the Economic Development Plan (EDP) both refer to the challenges facing the District – declining population & departing businesses while the surrounding region is growing; affordable housing; transportation constraints; climate & environment. Progress on meeting these challenges has been slow.

Mayor Smith put this succinctly in his remarks at the West Vancouver Yacht Club on March 8th, 2017: "*we must act to re-invigorate the community, step-up our game, and stop the reports & consultants*".

B. VISION – An Essential OCP Theme

The Draft OCP and the EDP are well done, containing a wealth of background information and suggestions. They are *necessary* for progress, but *not sufficient* (per the logic/math concept of "necessary & sufficient" for something to happen or be true) to drive community and economic development in future.

Both documents lack a clear, overarching vision for West Vancouver as a community – *a grand concept and focal point* – to provide a "*magnet*" for attracting interest and action regarding:

- The five OCP themes – Housing, Economy, Environment, Social Well-being, Transportation, and;
- The three EPD strategies – Visitors, Commercial Areas, Emerging Opportunities.

At the start of Section 2 (p. 14) it would be desirable to include a section on Vision, to "set the scene" and provide a context within which to view and consider the subsequent five OCP themes.

To boost its effectiveness, the OCP must proceed beyond wishful adjectives like "Vibrant, Resilient, Diverse, Engaged, Inclusive, etc." toward clarity and action, by suggesting specifics as to: "*What?*" and "*How?*"

1. Image

West Vancouver currently has no image, beyond being seen as an expensive residential backwater. In the past, creating an image via the motto/catchword "The Waterfront Community" was attempted, but not pursued. Nevertheless, a water-related image along the lines below would be logical.

2. The Oceanside Community – a "What"

Along the way we discussed the need for West Vancouver to adopt a **guiding image** or "gestalt" (an organized whole that is perceived and can function as more than the sum of its parts – two reasons:

- To provide a unifying theme for creating synergy among the many initiatives and activities undertaken by the District and active community groups, now operating largely in separate silos.
- To project an external image supporting development objectives, such as outlined in OCP and EDP.

The word "oceanside" projects a stronger, broader image than "seaside" (holidays, beaches, a huge new luxury cruise ship); while "waterfront" (industrial) is inappropriate since West-Van has none.

3. Ambleside, "West Vancouver's Downtown" – a "What"

While the EDP sees the need to "Establish a clear vision and objectives for the Ambleside Town Centre," (p. 14) it offers only to "Continue to consider needs and opportunities for the Ambleside Village Centre" (p. 58). So, after decades of non-consequential studies, committees, working groups, two years of preparing EDP, plus a new Ambleside Planning Process, all we get is "more of the same" – one is reminded of the legendary Australian Oozlum bird, and its North American Wa-hoo sub-species.

- Let's have a design competition (with honoraria) to see possibilities for Ambleside revitalization. Currently it's largely whatever developers propose.
- A series of models (likely computer-generated images) would produce a great deal of public interest and go a long way to "re-invigorate the community".

4. Maritime Hub – a "What"

West Vancouver has considerable maritime assets – so, to "build on strength" is an obvious strategy. A "Maritime Hub" would provide a focal point (gestalt) and a physical entity supporting "Oceanside".

- Maritime assets include:
 - A "peoples' sailing club", currently in a non-optimal location with deteriorating facilities;
 - Opportunities for "boating, fishing", both launching and renting;
 - A magnificent Marine Park – beaches, amazing views, rich marine life, a small island, diving (glass sponges, Giant Pacific Octopus);
 - Fisheries and Oceans research facility, currently undergoing major changes; possible public participation in sustainability and educational activities;
 - Active community groups like the Shoreline Preservation Society, Stream-keepers Society and Hollyburn Sailing Club;
 - Sea Walk, Spirit Trail, views of the ocean and port activity;
 - Yacht clubs.
- Located "out of the way" at the east-end of Ambleside Park, incorporated as a non-profit society.
- Potential partners could include:
 - Park Royal, Squamish First Nation, Port of Vancouver, West-Van District, North-Van District, Commercial enterprises, Sponsors, Naming rights.

5. Leadership – a "How"

The District must undertake to exert strong, focused leadership – it has the resources, responsibility, and authority to enable and co-ordinate action.

- Community groups would, of course, be active and mutually supporting participants. They are:
- The Chamber of Commerce, West Vancouver Community Foundation, Ambleside Dundarave Business Improvement Association; plus active community groups and resident associations.
- To ensure that OCP/EDP objectives are accomplished, an action oriented "command-post" or a "war-room" would be desirable, with strong, task-focused leadership.

C. PLAN MANAGEMENT

Add to the OCP ideas along the following lines, which are not included in Section 3 of the Draft.

6. Community Engagement – a “How”

A long-standing source of pride and “leading by example” is West Vancouver’s goal and commitment to community participation in civic governance through Working Groups. More than 30 have been completed in the past dozen years, and most produced useful recommendations and analyses.

- A key policy in 2004 directed the District to “engage our citizens in civic decision-making and empower them to have influence in an effective and inclusive local government process.”
- In 2007, the Community Engagement Committee saw CE as “an integrated approach involving citizens, elected officials, and municipal staff in policy formulation and decision making,” and described it as “a three-legged stool”.
- In 2010, the Community Strategic Plan’s vision saw “Collaborative government and a spirit of personal civic commitment (shaping) our shared future ... the strength of this relationship (being) the measure of our success as a community.” The Community Engagement Committee and Working Groups formed effective 2007 were seen to be the means to this end.

7. Operating Principles – a “How”

The District’s operating principles are to:

- Remember West Vancouver’s vision to “inspire excellent and lead by example” in all activities.
- Exhibit strong leadership, undeterred by vocal minorities.
- Actively engage the community in policy formulation and civic decision making.
- Recognize its privileged position of being in the “top 1%” in terms of wealth and talent.
- Strive to be an innovative and pro-active leader in civic governance ... a “test bed” for new ideas.
- Actively manage District operations to be efficient and effective, using the four well established measures of KPIs: Output/activity; Efficiency/cost; Community impact; Customer service.
- Recognize that the key for an organization’s success is a positive culture – good modus operandi.

D. OTHER COMMENTS

- Measurable Targets (p. 14)
 - Show annual targets, in addition to the 2041 total.
 - Report annually on the steps taken, results achieved, and planned next steps.
- In the four Local Area Maps (p. 22-25) – Show existing and proposed land-use designations using colours – residential (detached, attached, apartment), commercial, industrial, institutional, parks.
- In the Housing section (2.1, 2.2)
 - Include guidelines for developers describing the types & designs of buildings West Vancouver wishes to see built ... beyond technical requirements.
 - Similarly, provide guidelines for the desirable attributes of residential properties ... beyond measures like square-foot-ratio, height, set-back.
 - Require that building outlines be shown (with “sticks”) prior to approval, a common practice in some jurisdictions, to avoid offensive designs like “huge hotels” among average residences and “hostile fortification walls”.

Comments are Encouraged & Appreciated

Other Submissions:

Some residents provided their feedback directly to staff via phone calls, one on one meetings and counter enquiries, between February 13 and April 3, and are presented below:

Support Taylor Way - using Community Amenity Contributions build a tunnel underneath for regional traffic and greenway above
Support for duplex and subdivision
Support for duplex and subdivision
Support for smaller houses on smaller lots
Against apartment forms on Duchess and 11th
Concern over traffic and parking
Want to see stronger regulations around parking and coach houses and duplexes having at least two parking lots each
Want to see speed bumps and pavements in the Duchess and 11th area
Strong support for social well-being policies, recognizing the need to address the risks of seniors isolation
Interest in mixing community uses and housing opportunities, to be a more complete community and bring younger people back
Questions around Ambleside and what is happening here and process
Town homes allowed in Ambleside
Wondering heights and densities in Ambleside
How did we come up with 1200 units
Wondering where Part 2 is
Wondering heights and densities in Ambleside
Wished to ascertain when the OCP will be adopted
Coach Houses and stratifying
Where this might occur
When will this happen
Support for the plan, but need for greater number of units in Ambleside (concern 1000-1200 is too few)
Imperative the plan is moved to adoption this year before the summer – need for a plan of action now
Concern “NIMBY” groups have restricted change in West Vancouver and have too much influence
Confirmation that housing is the most important topic and pressing issue to address
Appreciation for how easy and convenient the online comment form is to use
Compliments on how much more readable the draft plan is compared to the 2004 OCP
Support for draft plan moving forward
Desire to see more specific clarity for Taylor Way in the LAP process, and want to see the process move forward as quickly as possible

Suggest to encourage more low-rise apartments and townhome options on Taylor Way
Wished to be shown where heritage section was
Discussed how best method of feedback from her immediate community and neighbours
Maintain restrictive covenant in her area
Does not feel that we have reached the entire community
Support for the plan, but need for greater number of units in Ambleside (concern 1000-1200 is too few)
Imperative the plan is moved to adoption this year before the summer – need for a plan of action now
Concern “NIMBY” groups have restricted change in West Vancouver and have too much influence
Wanted to know what the format of the info booths were - will attend and looking forward to talking to someone
Support Coach House Stratification
Support Duplex, sub-division
Support for allowing 3-storey mixed-use development on existing commercial sites in places like Dundarave
Interest in the much greater flexibility being proposed for detached residential lots
Support for Taylor Way redevelopment and interest in participating in its planning process
Confirmation that housing is the most important topic and pressing issue to address
Compliments on how much more readable the draft plan is compared to the 2004 OCP
Appreciation for how easy and convenient the online comment form is to use

SECTION V: INFORMATION BOOTHS

Phase 4 used an "Information Booth" format to provide the community with opportunities to learn about the Draft Plan. A series of 13 "Information Booths" were held across the District at various times of day to encourage participation from a broad cross-section of the community. At the "Information Booths" residents were able to review a visual summary of the Draft Plan and its key policies organized around the five OCP topics: Housing & Neighbourhoods, Local Economy, Transportation & Infrastructure, Parks & Environment, and Social Well-being. Citizens were able to discuss the Draft Plan with Planning staff and get answers to their questions about the Draft Plan. These one on-one conversations were recorded by staff and many attendees took this opportunity to provide their feedback to staff directly. All questions and comments provided at the "Information Booths" are below:

Thursday, 15 Feb, West Vancouver Community Centre: 4 hours

Compliments regarding how clearly the draft plan has been laid out and how easy to read the display boards are

Support for allowing duplexes on single family lots and questions around how quickly this could be implemented

Concern about loss of property value if private views are impacted by new development

Appreciation for the engagement process to date and thanks for providing an opportunity to discuss further

Questions around how the District expects to respond to legalization of retail recreational marijuana

Support for the proposed planning area boundaries for the Taylor Way corridor and interest in this process advancing

Questions regarding presumed or anticipated development applications

Compliments on the display materials, in particular the use of maps and graphics

Questions regarding the Ambleside Local Area Plan Process and how the built form guidelines will be used while that process is ongoing

Support for the Cypress Village Planning process and its potential to increase dedicated park land

Questions regarding how the OCP addresses transportation and congestion

Support for using incentives like parking reductions to secure more diverse housing, in particular more rental

Questions about how autonomous vehicles have been considered in relation to parking requirements and building design guidelines

Support for infill options and requests to consider parking relaxations for secondary suites, duplexes, triplexes located on local transit routes

Questions regarding presumed or anticipated development applications

Support for the proposed planning area boundaries for Horseshoe Bay Village and an interest in that planning process advancing
Questions regarding the scope of an OCP, what it needs to include and how it is implemented
Support for allowing more supportive housing and affordable housing for lower income families
Support for adopting the OCP and enabling residents to exercise new bylaws
Support for greater active transport efficiency in particular buses and more frequent transit
Concern around loss of views and maintaining views
Not in support of any other housing forms in single family neighbourhoods other than detached single family housing
Support for new housing types like townhomes and duplexes in town and villages centres
Support for more rentals and supportive housing
Support for more affordable housing options to enable downsizing and aging in place
Support for a more vitality in town centres and villages, with more nightlife and things to do
Support for increasing marina industry and enabling, investing in this market
Support for diversifying the local economy (support for independent stores)
Support for a more diverse local economy and services in Horseshoe Bay
Support for increasing and enhancing marine recreational activities in Horseshoe Bay
Support for encouraging and enabling entrepreneurship in any form (i.e. food carts, coffee carts, studio spaces, art spaces, and marina services)
Support for allowing light marine industry i.e. another boat lift
Query on what would it take to make a vibrant marina industry?
Allow greater height and density to achieve substantial rental and supportive housing
Support for sensitive infill housing in the form of coach houses, duplexes and triplexes
Concern over loss of views from development
Commended on boards and graphics, visual representation is particularly engaging and highlights issues and facts
Support for sustainable development i.e. green buildings and more building efficiency
Support for stronger policies to enhance and contain recreational activity while also protecting sensitive ecological areas (i.e. mountain biking trails)
Support for capitalizing on mountain biking trails
Support for more affordable housing options like multifamily housing, mid rises, high rises giving the ability to down size
Support for new transport options including water taxi and ferry to down town Vancouver
Support for stronger environmental policies i.e. electric charge ups in car ports
Support for stronger policies in new builds concerning parking i.e. restricting parking immensely

Support for encouraging innovative transport systems i.e. car sharing
Support for more mixed use buildings i.e. commercial, residential and office spaces or art spaces
Support for separating bikes and cars along Marine Drive
Concern about wildfire risk and District plan to remove fuel from Upper Lands
Questions regarding the type of service on Marine-Main rapid transit corridor
Concern about declining shops and services in community
Interest in expanding coach house opportunities
Questions about Grosvenor context
Encouragement for a passenger ferry connecting Ambleside and Kitsilano
Concern regarding loss of neighbourhood character through development
Interest in Taylor Way proceeding and identifying appropriate building forms for the area
Questions about transferring existing regulations to revised OCP
Concerns about vehicle traffic
Support for rooftop decks for improve liveability
Questions about the municipal versus regional direction of land use
Support for OCP engagement process
Monday, 19 Feb, West Vancouver Memorial Library: 4 hours
The Plan should convey a sense of urgency: we need to do something now to keep the community from dying
Supportive of looking at apartments in town centres and increasing all housing options in those locations
Strongly believe we need more density and quickly
Support for townhouses in hubs along Marine Drive, but questions about if there are additional sites (potentially those with larger frontages or corner lots) that could also be considered for townhouses/row houses
Support for duplexes across the District and support for rezoning all single-family neighbourhoods to allow duplexes taking the burden off of individual property owners to come forward and make an application
Support for continuing to restrict development above the 1,200 ft contour
Support for Cypress Village, and a planning process that will prioritize the natural environment, in particular the creek corridor of Rodgers Creek
Support for the Horseshoe Bay Local Area Plan and comments that it will need to ensure local services (in particular a grocery store) are provided in the village to decrease the need for residents to drive to Caulfield or further afield
Support for all the housing strategies: in particular townhouses that can be appropriate for families
Suggestions around restoring passenger rail service through West Vancouver, like we had in the 1970s and 1980s
Support for looking at providing more support for ebikes including electric charging stations in Ambleside

Suggestions regarding looking at intersection timing and if our current streetscapes are promoting walking and supporting pedestrians
Suggestions regarding increasing the width of sidewalks in Ambleside and increased maintenance funds to replace sidewalks on an accelerated schedule
Questions regarding the process of the Marine Drive Local Area Plan and the active development applications in the plan area
Support for economic strategies that support the distinct character of the District's commercial areas, but concern around the continued viability of Ambleside when it must compete with Park Royal
Questions regarding the unit counts and population figures in the Draft Plan
Questions regarding traffic and congestion and how the draft Plan addresses transportation
Commended on boards being informative and visually pleasing
Support for diversifying our local economy (i.e. a hotel was suggested)
Support for reviewing and streamlining development legislation
Support for greater bus efficiency particularly from North to South
Support for dedicated bike and vehicle lanes
Support for smaller buses that run more frequently
Support for light commercial infrastructure like a boat ramp or recreational marina economy (paddle boarding etc.)
Support for spot rezoning and enabling stratified coach houses allowing more options on ones lot to age in place
Suggested that the plan be adopted and implemented without delay
Suggested to have more dog waste disposable sights in Ambleside and along the seawall
Praised for being out in the community and reaching a wide and diverse audience
Praise for a comprehensive engagement process that is focused on the community at large and not the minority
Support for moving forward and enabling missing middle housing types to bring in more young families
Support for allowing bonus density and high rises to accommodate rental and non-market housing
Support for Marine Drive revitalisation (i.e. side walk maintenance / redevelopment, enhancing public realm and pedestrian orientation)
Support for decreasing / restricting traffic along Marine Drive in favour of a more pedestrian and public realm focused street
Greater vibrancy and nightlife in Ambleside
Supportive housing and non-market housing should be a priority, urgency is required
Increase walkability of Ambleside area
Separate biking route for recreational cyclists and commuters
Concern about pedestrian accessibility and sidewalk condition
Concern that Ambleside waterfront will be developed with building form similar to Grosvenor

Emphasis on the value of parks and environment
Value of trees, landscaping and other elements to define the cityscape
Concern regarding loss of neighbourhood character through development
Interest in increased cycling infrastructure
Questions about plans for future British Pacific Properties development
Questions about Cypress Village extents and access
Concern about slope stability where tree removal and development
Interest in consideration of historical tax benefit as a constraint to change use of institutional land
Emphasis on balancing community/institutional use and housing
Interest in expanding coach house opportunities
Concern about limited use of cycling infrastructure, aging population and terrain
Questions about commercial property ownership
Suggestion that the District should have a more direct role in compelling retail renewal along Marine
Concern about declining shops and services in community
Tuesday, 20 Feb, West Vancouver Community Centre: 4 hours
Comments regarding the ambulance service and improving their existing station in Ambleside to better integrate with the fire hall. DWV should be pressuring the province for reforms to the ambulance service to ensure these first responders have the same access to buildings that the fire department has, especially considering West Vancouver's aging population
Excited for the Ambleside Local Area Plan and want to get involved with that process
Support for all the infill housing options: West Vancouver needs things like this
Questions about public art and the process of securing community amenity benefits through development
Support for the "Information Booth" format that feels like coming to Municipal Hall and gives all residents a chance to talk to staff
Support for heritage protection and incentives
Suggestions that heritage protection incentives should include the ability to sell air rights to preserve heritage properties as this can provide both the funds to ensure houses can be maintained and protected in perpetuity. Topography, and landscaping are such important aspects of heritage properties in West Vancouver. This option allows for those to be maintained, as opposed to other incentives which see additional buildings added to the property and potentially large changes to these properties that we want to protect
Unsure about what can be done – have been thinking about various examples that West Vancouver could follow including Oakridge (in Vancouver), but am still not sure what is going to be the right option
Support providing more options for downsizers in Ambleside
Support the housing options shown for our town and village centres
Support putting high-rises all along the water
Questions about the transportation strategies

Suggestions for expanding the use of mini-busses on local routes – in particular service to Cypress Park Estates, where the bus route should be extended further north
Comments that West Vancouver needs affordable housing urgently
Support for non-market rental housing
Glad to see something happening since things have been left for so long: West Vancouver absolutely needs to do something to address the housing crisis now
Support all the housing strategies listed in the revised OCP
Questions about the OCP Review process and next steps
Concerns re Ambleside being a "dump" and support for its revitalization
Comments regarding Council's lack of decision making and are viewed as lazy and unjust
Support for more relatively affordable housing in apartment form that is not a 4million condo
Support for more efficient bus service to decrease single car occupancy drivers
Suggested mandating charging stations in new developments
Support for greater and more diverse commercial use of the waterfront
Stronger tree policies to protect trees
Encourage social activities in evening time by encouraging growth and development of a more diverse local economy
Suggested Ambleside is a village not a town centre
Supportive of missing middle housing types including mixed use, mid and high rise buildings
Praised for being out in the community and reaching out to people
Support for restricting development above 1200ft.
Support for smaller lot sizes and infill housing in Ambleside
Support for maintenance of bike trails and monetizing mountain biking
Concerns re: traffic congestion and questions surrounding how OCP process can make positive influence on transportation issues
Support for car share options
Support for more intense density in Ambleside in the form of midrise and high rise buildings
Compliments for an involved process that reaches the broad based community
Support for streamlining development process
Support for more affordable housing options in Ambleside - missing middle options
Pro density and sustainable living
Would like to see CAC used for more child care
Compliments on boards and how clearly they represent process to date, issues the community faces and voice of the majority.
Suggestion that West Vancouver should not grow and should emulate Carmel, California
Questions about Cypress Village, its extent and development
Concerns about vehicle traffic

Concern that separation between houses is insufficient
Concerns about safety given the condition of pavement lining and curbs
Questions about the timing of Cypress Village
Support for OCP engagement process
Support for protection of trees and vegetation on private land
Concern about declining shops and services in community
Questions about exercise of existing Ambleside guidelines with revised OCP
Suggestion that transit service should be in place prior to Cypress Village development
Concern that there are too many people in West Vancouver
Interest in Taylor Way proceeding and the appropriate building forms for the area
Concern regarding loss of neighbourhood character through development
Wednesday, 21 Feb, Gleneagles Community Centre 3.5 hours
Questions about the OCP Review process and the next steps
Support for the policies to allow subdivisions
Support for expanding commercial opportunities in Horseshoe Bay and a desire to get involved in that Local Area Plan
Interest in the Horseshoe Bay Local Area Plan and questions about when that process will start
Support for new cycling connections, especially those planned for above the highway
Questions about the timing of the Spirit Trail and support for its immediate implementation
Questions about the Information Booth Schedule and what other facilities the display has been at
Questions about Coach Houses and the types of incentives proposed
Concerns over traffic heading through West Vancouver and coming from North Vancouver and questions about how the OCP can address these issues
Support for the Spirit Trail and for making its implementation a priority
Support for all of the neighbourhood infill options you show
Excited about Cypress Village and feel it is absolutely necessary
Support for a range of housing types in Cypress Village to allow residents from Horseshoe Bay to downsize and stay in the area
Need to be thinking about opportunities for the next generation and focused on creating opportunities for West Vancouver children to have a future in this community otherwise it will continue to decline
Questions about traffic and transportation and how the OCP can address these issues
Support for Cypress Village and using the density transfer provision to protect more of the hillside
Support for more services above the highway and concentrated at Cypress Village
Support for duplexes in neighbourhoods: used to be against this, but I have come around to see how they can fit in
Support for the townhouse strategies and would like to see more of these across the District.

Support for greater density in village and town centers, particularly midrise buildings and subdivision
Support more green buildings and stronger regulations on building code and efficiency
Support for stronger regulations against vacant homes
Support for local business development and incentives for business start ups
Concern over traffic congestion
Support for better transit efficiency
Support for smaller lots and subdivision
Support for a more efficient development permit process
Support for stronger Council action on sustainability and moving forward
Support for adoption of OCP and enabling the community
Comments surrounding the validity of Council decisions and lack of action in the past
Disillusionment of Council decision process and lack of faith in the bureaucratic system and how nothing ever happens
Comments around lack of faith in the bureaucracy of the development process
Support for more affordable housing particularly - midrise apartments in commercial areas
Support for density transfer options to save Whyte Lake Park area
Support for allowing a buffer area above Cypress Village beyond the 1200ft line to protect other areas
Support for subdivision along Marine Drive
Support for town homes on Marine Drive by Gleneagles Golf Course
Thursday, 22 Feb, Municipal Hall Atrium 3.5 hours
Questions about the Local Area Planning process, in particular Horseshoe Bay
Support for looking at centres and corridors through Local Area Plans
Suggestions regarding changing the proposed order of Local Area Plans to complete Horseshoe Bay faster
Questions about the objectives and targets included in the Plan and how they were determined
Questions about where bus service will be improved and when the improvements will start
Suggestions about adding more infill options, specifically converting existing houses to multi-unit building to make more efficient use of the current building stock
Support for greater density in village and town centers, particularly mid-rise buildings and subdivision
Support more green buildings and stronger regulations on building code and efficiency
Support for stronger regulations against vacant homes
Support for local business development and incentives for business start ups
Concern over traffic congestion and support for greater transit efficiency
Support for smaller lots and subdivision
Support for more efficient development permit process

Support for stronger council action on sustainability and moving forward
Support for housing options, especially single-level living options for seniors
Reflections on the general decline of neighbourhoods and neighbours moving out of West Vancouver as they seek for housing options that better meet their needs as they age
Question about Marine Drive Transit Corridor – Desire to see triplex and townhomes options elsewhere as well, not just on the corridor
Specific question about potential for townhome development around a community centre
Support for continual community uses, not just those limited to churches and community facilities, but also those of other non-profits and community organizations like the sailing club
Support for more youth programs, and more recreational opportunities for all local residents alike
Compliments on the current OCP process, attendee reflected on the amount of engagement that they have seen throughout the year. They liked that the District is reaching out to the community and liked that consultation opportunities are brought to them.
Question about the process and remaining timelines, desire for getting the OCP completed and implementation as soon as possible
Support for more townhomes and apartment forms, options for downsizers
Concern that the District will still not have enough options and the speed of implementation may be too slow to address the current housing crisis that is worsening
Desire for more flexible housing, like homes that are designed to allow for reconfiguration overtime as life stages change
Support for smaller homes on smaller lots and duplex options to gently densify all single-family neighbourhoods
Desire to remove any unintended incentives to build overly imposing single-family homes
Support to review single-family size, but need quicker actions and implementations
Time for new OCP
Concern over population loss over time, it is impacting the neighbourly feel that was experienced years ago
Need rental options and incentives to support more affordable housing
Concern for luxury homes everywhere, that is not what the community wants, and there is a need to change since the current system is not working
Support for making housing more affordable, even if it's not affordable for low-income people, they should not be as expensive and exclusive as they are today
Support for seniors housing options, good to see that there would be incentives to create more seniors and supportive living
Suggestion to look into invasive plants issues on sites, but understand that this may be too specific for OCP

Support for multi-plex options for existing homes, not just heritage homes if possible. Good to see coach houses, maybe duplex + coach house should be allowed in more places
Support for dividing large homes and lots up to smaller rental options
Suggestion to be less restrictive in housing regulations to allow more flexibility and designs
Suggestion to add Gleneagles Community Centre as blue on the Marine Drive Transit Corridor map to reflect existing use
Saturday, 24 Feb, Heritage Fayre: 3 hours
Questions about how the OCP can help save heritage buildings and the process
Support for more regulations and incentives to save heritage buildings
Support for heritage as a tool for tourism
Support for promoting WV heritage through events and advertising
Support for expanding programs and services that facilitate inclusion
Support for expanding programs and services to assist with residents to age in place
Support more cultural events that celebrate WV heritage
Support for wayfinding program of heritage buildings in community
Support for more cultural and heritage events especially along waterfront
General questions about OCP and what an OCP is
Support for more programs and educational programs around WV local heritage
Support to recognise our diverse community and assist them through programs that support their transition into a new community
Support for more educational programs in parks celebrating LHP and WV beloved natural assets
Support for protecting Hollyburn Cabins through allowing renovations, rentals and subdivision
Wednesday, 28 Feb, West Vancouver Memorial Library: 4 hours
Questions about Part 2 of the OCP including various questions about the Marine Drive Local Area Plan, it's engagement process and the projects it addresses directly
Support for the approach to planning for Ambleside and support for maintaining existing policy until the new plan is developed
Statements that West Vancouver needs more rental units
Interest in opportunities for more rental units presented by the Local Area Planning processes.
Concern over West Vancouver looking like the City of North Vancouver with high-rises along the water.
Supportive of the Draft Plan and its policies.
Believe the community needs to change.

Support the concept of West Vancouver containing a series of charming villages (Ambleside, Dundarave, Horseshoe Bay), but revitalization needs to happen for this to be successful
Support for the neighbourhood infill strategies, in particular for projects like Hollyburn Mews
Interested in the Gleneagles golf course: recent improvements to the course by the Parks department have been greatly appreciated and would like to see this lovely course continue to thrive into the future
Concern about the lack of playing fields and the condition of certain fields within the District: the West Vancouver High track is in need of improvements and this kind of collaboration (between the District and the School Board) should be encouraged by the OCP. A repaired track will be something that the whole community can use. The field inside the track is also in disrepair and if this could be fixed at the same time could offer another space for youth soccer, which is rapidly increasing in West Vancouver.
The OCP should champion community collaborations that will produce amenities that everyone can enjoy into the future.
Support revitalization and new public spaces in our centres, particularly in Ambleside. These spaces can have a range of programs and activities throughout the year: from pop-up ice rinks with warming huts in winter to communal picnic tables in the summer. We can't just have our people heading over to North Vancouver or Vancouver to live and play. We need to give them opportunities here.
Questions about affordability and when potential affordable housing projects could come online and how they will be managed.
Concerns over Ambleside becoming like Yaletown with too much potential development and support for revisiting the unit targets
Questions regarding some of the figures presented (population, percentage of young workers and commuting stats) and the demographic projections presented in the Draft Plan
Questions about why the Draft Plan includes three mentions of hotels and where support for these policies came from
Concerns about housing and transportation, adding housing before the transportation issues is addressed and skepticism over the connection between land use and transportation
Concerns over the emphasis on active and public transportation, given West Vancouver's topography, demographics and affluence.
Support for the District taking more action on empty homes
Support for more neighbourhood infill options including the ability to stratify existing homes into multi-unit buildings
Support for active modes of transport
Concerns over traffic congestion build up
Support for innovative transit options including car share services like Evo
Support for sensitive infill in towns and centers and transition areas

Concerns over high rises in village and town centres
Concerns over loss of views
Supportive for more housing and affordable housing options particularly row homes and town homes for young families
Support for supportive housing
Concerns over traffic
Support for a sky train
Support for a water taxi
Suggested another bridge will relieve traffic congestion
Support for coach houses in eagle harbour
Support for more effective policies for a diverse range of housing options and a simplified development permit process
Support for a sky train
Support for allowing a variation past 1200 ft. within Cypress Village area
Support for traffic calming measures along marine drive (i.e. 30km per hour enforced throughout marine drive and widening for a dedicated cycle lane)
Support for affordable housing i.e. subsidized by DWV and cooperative housing options
Support for public realm enhancement that foster well-being and inclusion for community building
Support for enticing younger families to move into area through offering a variety of multi-family housing types in community hubs
Praise for being here out in the community, praise for succinct boards that depict a true representation of West Vancouver
Support for density transfer to Cypress Village and saving Whyte Lake park area
Support for less restrictions on development permits and a more efficient process (i.e. less setbacks and smaller lots to subdivide)
Support for mixed use building at all intersections in HSB
Support for greater light commercial zoning i.e. breweries
Support for increase in population and bringing more people into community to tackle vacant home lots
Support for greener building codes
Support for stronger tree bylaws
Support for intense densification throughout West Vancouver's towns and village centres
Compliments on exceptionally informative boards.
Do not support with high rises and more density or zoning changes in Ambleside

Support stratifying coach houses
Support pets and children in apartment complexes
Support for townhouses in Ambleside
Support for allowing basement suits and coach houses on one lot
Support for vacant property taxes
Support for row homes in transition areas
Support for smaller homes for the aging population, care and independent living options should be provided in the long term
Need to be open to transportation innovations, such as self-driving vehicles
Need to preserve the natural environment, better tree protection
Support for regulating large homes, they disrupt the character of the neighbourhoods
Need more attainable and smaller options that is suitable for families, the community will degrade overtime if there is no new families who join us
Concern about impacts to congestion if more people move into the community
Support for better and new regional travel options like a water-taxi, that can be independent of cars
Need to decrease car occupancy
Support for draft plan, the overall direction is appropriate and reflective of what the individual has heard through past events
Support for visitor accommodations
Need to find more options to get people out of cars
Need more activities and entertainment, like evening activities and marina in Ambleside
Need better regional connections, like a new bridge connection or rail and train options to Vancouver
Need families back to revitalize our neighbourhoods
Support for the plan, it reflects the necessary big steps that need to happen in West Vancouver
Consider being more aggressive in tackling the housing crisis and economic issues. We need to start somewhere. If we don't, our current issues will only get worse.
Support for single-level living options and flexible housing that are not imposing to the neighbourhood
No more "monster homes" that destroy character, support for review of existing regulations and exemptions that created the "monster home" issue
Need more and immediate actions, cannot allow people who keep complaining about views ruin West Vancouver's vitality
Support for plan, especially need to active our local centres and provide more commercial spaces

Concern about transportation issues from Cypress Village, need to provide reasonable and attractive alternatives to driving for the new neighbourhoods, a bus every 60 minutes won't do
Support for supportive housing incentives, there is increasingly homelessness issues and more people are at risk as they age and lose stable income, this needs to be addressed in the plan
Support for protecting 1,200 foot contour and preserving environmentally sensitive lands and assets throughout the Upper Lands, also support transferring density to create more compact communities if that would protect ecological assets permanently
Support for higher density in Ambleside
Desire for new, purpose-built rental high-rise apartments, higher density for rental and affordable housing
Happy to see that the plan addresses emergency preparedness for the homeless
Concern about traffic
Appreciate separate area planning process for local areas
Want to see more regional transportation connections
Desire for more apartment and townhome options for workforces and students
Support for health care sector expansion, especially along Taylor Way
Support for increasing density along Taylor Way, as long as there's proper consideration for traffic
Support for plan, except that tax payers' money should be used carefully when it comes to incentives
Concern about any monetary incentives for heritage homes, non-monetary incentives are okay
Disagree with using tax money to purchase vacant lots for protection, should use regulation and other tools to restrict uses
Development should not be constrained to locations with transit, should densify areas to establish ridership and get transit to go where people are
Desire to establish an intra-municipal transit system, especially better connections between the north and south of Highway 1 to move people out of cars, right now it takes more than 1 hour to get from the British Properties to the Community Centre when it only takes 10 minutes to drive.
Need to explain terminologies, like subdivisions and other terms that are less clear to the public
Concern over adequate infrastructure for Cypress Village, question about the process to deal with that
Suggestion to add duplex as multi-family uses on the north side of Marine Drive by Dundarave Park to reflect existing uses
Suggestion to clarify that uses highlighted on the Marine Dr. map are existing
Suggestion to clarify on map that all unit estimates projected in the LAP map are for 2041

Thursday, 1 March, Gleneagles Community Centre: 3 hours
Concerns over traffic congestion
Support for connector trails particularly biking
Supporting for redirecting vehicles from Marine Drive
Support for more efficient TransLink service
Support for a more varied local economy particularly mixed use buildings in HSB
Support for ferry service and water taxi service
Support for a frequent bus service from HSB
Support for a local economy more focused around marina industry
Support for saving Whyte Lake Park Area through density transfer
Questions surrounding density transfer and what exactly it is
Questions around how fast these can be adopted
Support for adoption of OCP and enabling the community
Support for higher density in Cypress Village (as much that needs to happen to save other environmentally sensitive areas i.e. Whyte Lake Park)
Support for higher density and height to gain CAC contributions that meet needs of community
Comments around lack of faith in the bureaucracy of the development process
Support for more affordable housing particularly - midrise apartments in commercial areas
Questions about the area covered by the Draft Plan, the OCP Review Process and the Local Area Planning processes.
Support for townhouses throughout West Vancouver: particularly in Horseshoe Bay.
Support for the neighbourhood infill strategies, particularly subdivisions and coach houses.
General support for the Draft Plan and its policies.
Support for better and more integrated use of District-owned facilities.
Support for looking at opportunities to provide more services and housing on District owned lands.
Questions about Cypress Village and Rodger's Creek areas and what is proposed for Cypress Village.
Support for using density transfer at Cypress Village to protect environmentally sensitive areas in the western Upper Lands.
Support for options to better move east to west above the highway using all transportation modes.
Support for increasing recreational activity in the Upper Lands, in particular mountain biking through the provision of a mountain bike chairlift that could end in Cypress Village.

Comments that the Draft Plan looks "robust"
Support for the heritage protection strategies
Concern over the continuing construction of "monster homes" and hopes that the District will address this
Suggestions that a development permit requiring the removal of invasive plants be implemented to give the District more tools to deal with invasives and property owners that have not dealt with these plants on their property
Support for a more robust tree bylaw
Support for townhouses throughout West Vancouver
Monday, 5 March, Municipal Hall Atrium: 3 hours
Questions about the Taylor Way and Ambleside Town Centre local area plans including timing, unit counts and potential future land uses
Support for infill housing options, particularly for duplexes and subdivisions
These policies should be focused on sites that are near transit and amenities, but may be just outside the boundaries of the Local Area Plans
DWV Needs to give people more options for their lots, otherwise we will just continue to see the building of larger and larger single family homes
Policy should be more encouraging for owners of lots that are obvious candidates for subdivisions or duplexes
Support for expanding coach house policy and some suggestions: need to look at a coach house policy for lots above the highway where the lots are much larger and mostly do not have lanes. These lots need a different approach as it doesn't make sense to build a 1,100 sq. ft. coach house on a 20,000 sq. ft. lot, especially if the goal is to allow for smaller houses. These lots could potentially support two full houses
The Draft OCP seems to only reluctantly call for some modest increases in housing options in neighbourhoods, and places the onus on property owners to instigate a process, I feel like the plan should be more aggressively promoting these things and taking the burden off of individual property owners
Believe there should be opportunities for larger lots dispersed along transit routes (other than Marine Drive) to be considered for more multi-family options on a case by case basis. This doesn't mean that it will work for every site, but the OCP should not dismiss the potential of sites beyond just Marine Drive and include criteria that could allow them to be considered as well
Questions about potential locations for new seniors housing
Concerns regarding the continued replacement of single family dwellings with larger homes and support for the upcoming neighbourhood character working group
Compliments on easy to read and informative boards - suggestion to make them available online
Questions around Town Centre Villages and Marine Drive
Support for missing middle in transition areas

Support for greater density in all forms in Town Centres and Villages to increase population
Suggestion to remove Caulfield Covenant
Support for stronger incentives for heritage protection
Questions around heritage process
Suggested commercial growth and more commercially zoned land in Thunderbird Marina
Questions surrounding population increase statistics
Questions around unit number increases in certain areas
Support for completion of Spirit Trail
Support for revitalization of Ambleside
Support for getting on with the OCP and implementing new policies
Comments around lack of Council Direction in the past
Comments around community needs not being met
Comments around concerns for aging in place
Support for buildings with universal accessibility design
Support for a more commercially viable town centre (Ambleside) i.e. night market, more music and events, more restaurants
Support for commercially utilizing WV Waterfront with recreational activities and cafés bars etc.
Support for traffic calming procedures
Support all of the draft OCP, glad to see changes, hope that this will get through to Council what we want
Scepticism that Council are not listening
Support smaller houses on smaller lots and subdivision
Move forward
Tuesday, 6 March, West Vancouver Community Centre: 4 hours
Support for small homes and infill options
Concern that BPP land holdings are too large and allow too much development
Concern about crowding in Ambleside
Concern about demand for street parking in neighbourhoods
Concern that good quality homes are being demolished
Support for coach houses and accessory dwelling units
Concern about housing affordability
Support for more job creation in Ambleside

Interest in more specific focus on vibrant Ambleside with lifestyle/entertainment/nightlife
Concern about cycling/pedestrian safety, particularly along Marine drive
Questions about broader provision of cycling/pedestrian connections
Interest in continuing the Seawall west for pedestrian use
Questions about timing of Cypress Village
Questions regarding transit viability in Cypress Village
Concern about development of Rodgers Creek
Concern about Upper Lands forest and wilderness loss
Concern that the presentation of the draft plan was confusing and did not clearly reference the existing OCP
Interest in intensification of blocks between Ambleside and Squamish First Nation
Questions about existing Ambleside Plan
Support for up zoning lands to support a vibrant and prosperous community
Questions about timing of Rodgers Creek buildout
Questions about new and upcoming developments
Support for increasing number of townhouses and row houses
Interest in a 3rd crossing of Burrard Inlet
Questions about the purpose of an OCP
Interest in increased Marine Drive development
Support for encouraging non-market housing provision on church lands
Good to see long term planning. Encouragement to plan ahead as the community ages.
Expressed that the community cannot stay static and not respond to changes happening. Not planning is irresponsible.
Concerns about blocked views for the individual's home.
Desire to see more terraced forms of buildings that complement the shape of the mountains and slopes.
Suggestion to protect and encourage smaller commercial spaces, as they are important to support small businesses. Tailoring commercial space sizes for large anchor tenants would harm local small businesses.
Support draft plan and like the info booths. Happy to see things move forward for the community.
Concerns expressed about views and lighting, and construction workers creating impacts (e.g., littering, smoking, drinking and excessive noise from talking in the morning). Suggest to lower heights of apartments between Marine Dr and waterfront to maintain view, and community should give up on renters, seniors and non-market

housing so that the apartment heights are lowered or at most maintained during redevelopment.
Suggest to regulate construction processes so that they are faster and buildings get finished quicker to reduce construction nuisance.
Question about the general process and timeline.
Support for future planning.
Support for moving process forward and adopting plan according to current timeline.
Suggests earlier adoption the better in order to implement plan as soon as possible.
Suggest to see more things for youth, from housing to services.
Concern that if plan doesn't get adopted, it means the youths of today won't have housing options 25 years from now and will be forced to leave the community.
Desire to see apartment and townhome options for the future, especially for the attendee's children who will grow up and have their own housing needs.
Suggestion for more consolidated townhome development around the District, not just restricted to Marine Dr and locations close to amenities and schools.
Suggestion to active townhome and low-rise apartment development near Highway #1 where there is quick access off the Highway.
Support for small homes on smaller lots, and review of subdivision standards. Expressed that these are much needed to give people more options than simply to build a big house on a large lot.
Support for townhomes and apartments to provide options for young families.
Encourage stronger housing policies to attract young families and workers to support businesses.
Suggest to increase options to downsize in Sentinel Hill area.
Support for allowing exemptions for rental coach house. Coach houses aren't economic today because they compete with the main building and is costlier to build.
Support for 2 houses on 1 large lot, this should have been allowed before but it's taking too long. Expressed that no one needs a large home but current policies don't support them to build anything other than a large home on a large lot.
Support to see the OCP to move forward and draft policies to be adopted.
Support for Local Area Planning process to move forward as quickly as possible.
Support for increased density in general, this means that it will increase the values of land, but at the same time provide more housing options and allow more people to live on the same land area.
Support for draft plan, feel that it will be good for the community and help revitalize the declining neighbourhoods.
Expressed that population decrease is a huge risk for the community, we cannot let this trend continue or else the community will eventually die and become abandoned town.
Currently losing our sense of community at the moment with the declining neighbourhoods, action needs to be implemented quickly.

Support for smaller units, like apartments and other single-level living options for seniors who don't want to live in a house with high maintenance effort and costs.
Suggest stronger options to support young people, including more incentives like bonus densities to support rental units.
Suggest more young worker housing; expressed that there should be enough demand from Downtown workers who would want to live in West Vancouver with easy transit and bike access to Downtown, if only the District provides the smaller, apartment living and townhome options for these demographics.
Suggest for stronger rental and non-market housing support to combat income disparity and segregation amongst the community.
Suggest to increase densities in areas further away from Marine Drive, so that the community and property owners have full options going forward.
Maintain Village like Character of West Vancouver
Keep mid-rise scale along Marine Drive
Like the small scale Commercial stores
Compliments on boards and placement of information, and seems like we have captured so many of the community and listened
Concern over lighting and street lighting if density increases, also should have environmentally friendly lighting throughout West Vancouver and be following in dark.org footsteps
Support for Coach houses and stratifying
Concern over traffic
Questions surrounding CV when will it occur, traffic and how to add density.
Move forward and implement plan
Appreciation for review and moving forward with plan
People like to have options and the ability to think about the future
Dedicate Whyte Cliff Park areas as Park Land
Support for Cypress Village and implementing a sustainable transport plan
Support commercial and mixed use buildings
More community gatherings and events
Artists support our economy, we need to fix the traffic with a ferry and build sustainably
Stratify Coach Houses
Use surplus owned lands to meet community objectives
Community Pot lucks and food as a tool to integrate the community and build community spirit and values
Bring a boat ramp back
More young families would be nice

Put the boards online
Reinstate railway for commuters
Allow incentives for commercial businesses to thrive and therefore the local economy to grow, give people the opportunity to earn a living
Thursday, 8 March, Gleneagles Community Centre: 3 hours
Agree with all heritage policies - protect and preserve our heritage
Praise for being out in the community, and boards are a great representation of our community and what we want
Allow Stratification
Feedback has been unanimous and it is time to move forward to address the challenges that this community faces
Praise for being out in the community
Support for a separate green bike path
More bike lanes are required
Ambleside to have a separate green bike path
Questions about OCP review process and the LAP for Horseshoe Bay
Support for the Spirit Trail and more cycling options
Support for Cypress Village and more services close to western residents
Support for considering duplexes across the District and expanding the boundaries of the existing duplex zones
Support for bold leadership from Council when considering the OCP
Against all policies related to infill options in neighbourhoods and particular concern that these policies include Gleneagles. Belief that these policies will change neighbourhood character and that there should only be one single family dwelling allowed per lot (against coach houses and secondary suites)
Support for heritage preservation and the proposed incentives to protect heritage properties
Support for increased and expanded bus service
Support for coach house incentives, specifically strata titling
Monday, 12 March, West Vancouver Memorial Library: 4 hours
Declining population and too many people commuting, fully support density increases in any form to tackle these issues
Job opportunities and having enterprises in West Vancouver is the number one attractant for young people
We need lower income housing to help young people stay and give downsizers options
West Vancouver Council needs to enable its people

Use incentives to attract enterprises and top 100 companies into West Vancouver
Do not agree with the Cypress Village buffer
Fully agree with this entire plan and its long term solutions to our issues
We need to ensure we have parking by the waterfront for people who require easier access
Allow subdivision
We should do everything in our power to reduce traffic and car dependency
I do not agree with any of this - I don't want change or any more people moving here, leave it the way it is
Stop chopping down trees
Another bridge is the only answer
We should where possible acquire monster homes and turn them into supportive housing, mixed use and co-operative housing units
Stronger regulations to decrease and deter monster homes is urgently required
Stronger requirements for Tree Bylaws and saving as many trees as possible
We need to hire people who are trained in trail management and maintenance
What is environmental art? 2.7.6 - this makes no sense and should not be in the plan
Concerns over traffic and more density - do not build until we have more infrastructure
Cypress is the busiest park in the province our trails are really under pressure
Nice idea to collaborate with BC Parks etc. but you are not able to do this justice as there is no funding
Great Plan - thank you for being out in the community
Save our heritage and architecture
Fully agree with infill housing to save our heritage buildings
Traffic is terrible we need a bridge, or a ferry
We require a commercial node in the Upper Lands
Better bus service for the Upper Lands
We need more Parks
Housing affordability is the most important thing in the plan
We need to take action now to provide more housing for young people
My biggest transportation concern is with access to Park Royal: work with the Squamish Nation to improve access and limit the ability of cars to use the bus priority lane to cut in front of cars waiting at the Taylor Way/Marine Drive intersection
Questions about the Taylor Way Local Area Plan and how traffic will be dealt with as part of that Local Area Planning process

Questions about the timing and schedule of each Local Area Plan
Questions about the Hollyburn Cabin Community and support for policies geared towards protecting and supporting the continued maintenance of the existing heritage cabins and the Hollyburn Ridge Association
Support for new arts and culture facilities at Cypress Village
Support for economic development policies that support local, independent businesses
Support for developing arts and culture facilities across West Vancouver to create a distinct "artist district" that will act as a regional and international tourist draw
Support for the Ambleside Local Area Plan and adding new housing units and housing types to Ambleside
Concern that what the Draft Plan proposes is not going to help the community: Neighbourhoods have already started hollowing out and the community has already been lost. This plan is about 25 years too late.
Support for townhouses and duplexes
Concern about adding high rises
Support for a boutique hotel in Ambleside and at Park Royal
Concerns regarding traffic currently throughout the District
Concerns that new development should not happen until the traffic situation has been improved
Support for maintaining the Silk Purse art gallery and against the removal of the parking along Argyle Avenue
Concerns that it will be difficult to secure afford rental housing going forward
Support for the expansion of public transit across the District
Support for the creation or expansion of rapid transit across the North Shore including sky train or light rail
Support for building more affordable housing, but you need to make sure the infrastructure is in place to move the new people
The region needs a new and expanded tax base to fund transit improvements
Tuesday, 13 March, West Vancouver Community Centre: 4 hours
Support for coach houses and questions about when some of the proposed incentives will be implemented
Questions about the Horseshoe Bay Local Area Plan
Concern that the unit estimates for Horseshoe Bay are too high and don't take into account the traffic issues and the need for additional policing
Concerns about Horseshoe Bay being in a state of transition
Support for the neighbourhood character policies and recent action to form a new working group addressing housing bulk
Support for the heritage protection policies and the formation of a new Heritage Advisory Committee

Questions about Rodgers Creek development and whether the development is as environmentally friendly as it was proposed to be
Support for changing the development patterns above the highway with a mixed-use Cypress Village
Cypress Village planning must include consideration of potential downstream traffic impacts and the provision of public transit
Support the idea of connecting land use with transportation in practice, need to ensure public transportation system supports this
Support for the Horseshoe Bay Local Area Plan and adding more housing and amenities in HSB village
Excited about the plan – in particular support for the housing policies as we need to be providing more housing all across the District, but particularly in areas that are close to transit and amenities
West Vancouver is part of one of the major metropolitan regions in Canada: traffic is simply a fact of living in this context and is much better than in the two other major metropolitan regions (Toronto and Montreal)
Improved connections between Bowen Island and HSB, in particular later ferries going both ways
The District needs to consider who they are accepting donations from and naming facilities after
Support for more townhouses and the expansion of areas where townhouses can be supported, in particular sites close to schools and local bus routes or on existing large lots within neighbourhoods
Questions about Ambleside and the its LAP process
Concerns that the unit estimates for the Ambleside Town Centre LAP are too high
Support for more coach houses and the incentives that would allow for coach houses to be strata titled
Support for considering subdivision standards that could allow coach houses to be subdivided
Support for allowing more subdivisions and reviewing the subdivisions standards across the District and the belief that this will protect neighbourhood character while allowing for more people to stay in the community and potentially allow new families to buy into existing neighbourhoods
Support for duplexes and all infill housing strategies'
Questions about how the infill housing strategies will be implemented and the potential timelines for each
Concerns that the Draft Plan will negatively impact their quality of life
Concerns regarding traffic impacts that will be created by the Draft Plan
Against any development at all and any changes within the District
Believe more people add increased safety concerns
Concerns there was not enough engagement throughout the OCP Review process and that residents were not adequately informed of the process

The boards provide a number of very good points and are very informative
Support for all the housing policies
Suggestion to work with Park Royal to close the main street in the Village to traffic and create a pedestrian mall/promenade
Support for four plexes in existing multifamily zones (where there are currently duplexes) as this could create more appropriate transition zones between our centres (particularly between Park Royal and Ambleside and Ambleside and Dundarave)
Support for locating additional density near transit services
Questions regarding the age of rental buildings in West Vancouver and why so little rental has been built in the District in recent years
Support for the District to continue advocating at the federal and provincial levels for additional funding to support affordable and rental housing
Interest in transit scheduling and routes
Interest in a 3rd crossing of Burrard Inlet
Concern about crowding in Ambleside
Interest in increased Marine Drive development
Support for up zoning lands to increase housing capacity
Questions about Ambleside Plan
Interest in increased mixed use building forms
Concern about tax implications of land use change
Concern about struggling local businesses
Interest in coach houses
Support for greater provision of accessory rental units
Support for B-Line to Dundarave
Questions about the purpose of an OCP
Support for increasing number of townhouses and row houses
Questions about new and upcoming developments
Questions about timing of Rodgers Creek buildout
Questions about timing of Cypress Village
Questions about broader provision of cycling/pedestrian connections
Concern about housing affordability
Support for more job creation in Ambleside
Support for coach houses and accessory dwelling units
Support for separate LAP process to allow for dedicated discussions for local centres

Happy to see support for health sector under local economy, suggest to consider and encourage cosmetic industry like those of Korea instead of just focusing on tourism and visitors
Support for the OCP in general
Support for housing options that are smaller and open up more possibilities for younger people.
Comment on the need to open up doors and create housing that welcomes new people into the community – the history of blocking people from coming in led to the decline of our neighbourhoods.
Support for increasing housing as means to increase in transit ridership potential and better leverage to argue for more transit services in West Van.
Support for strong support for businesses and housing to bring in new vitality and regular customers for businesses, and generally regenerate the local community.
Support for more options to use land. Comment that enabling more housing options to be built on the same piece of land would help support achieving the best land uses, and support not only people who may live there but also property owners.
Comment on dilemma in a history of subdivisions applications being rejected, which led to property owners selling and builders flipping large properties into monster homes, and in return hearing complaints from the same community which rejected the subdivision to now complain about large imposing homes being built.
Support for appropriate subdivisions that would result in smaller homes being built.
Support for protecting lands above 1200' foot contour from further development
Support for the OCP in general, excited to see positive changes rather than a decline of neighbourhoods as the status quo
Desire to see more happening in the community, including events, evening entertainment, and social gathering places
Support for transferring currently allowed residential development potential from sensitive ecosystems in the Upper Lands to Cypress Village and concentrating the development there with amenities to serve that population
Comment on that the Cypress Village with its amenities can alleviate traffic contributed by residents on BPPs lands needing to travel to Ambleside and Park Royal for their needs
Support for townhome options
Suggestion to enable townhomes around all schools
Comment on the need to address bridge traffic, but understand that it's under Provincial jurisdiction
Support for Cypress Village vision and the potential it would create in alleviating traffic pressures off the highway and southwards in the community once residents have options to shop above the Highway
Support the plan, express desire to see it implementing quicker
Support for creating housing options that are more attainable for younger people, and incentivizing rental options for those who cannot afford to own.

Support for duplex and townhome options across neighbourhoods to give people options to downsize
Support for protecting lands west of Eagle Creek for the long term and for future generations to enjoy and preserve
Support for apartment options in centres, want to see more mixed-use and apartments that allow more people with walkable access to amenities and their needs
Support for long term planning to meet changing community and the challenges before us as best as possible
Support for townhomes, want to see more assemblies that would lead to more housing units, rather than a giant view home, argue that more people should be enjoying the opportunity to live in West Vancouver and not just preserving the way of life for existing residents
Concern that the government is just allowing builders to do whatever they want, desire for more regulations and enforcement of better regulations
Desire to see more areas pre-zoned to allow for townhomes, including the Rena Crescent area just off the highway
Desire for a far better transit service, more routes and more efficient timeline
Agree with the entire Draft plan however has concerns that this will have negative impacts on traffic
Support for townhouses in areas that are close to services and amenities
Complete the Spirit Trail - we desperately need separated bike routes
Fear that the OCP will increase rents in commercial area, opposed to OCP if this will be the outcome
Allow duplexes in transition areas
Ambleside needs more rental units and at lower costs - both housing and commercial spaces
Do not agree with ATC boundary and would like to see this lowered to Inglewood
Questions on process and the %'s that will be mandated to rental units, potentially using a step phased approach could be helpful
Praised for being out in the community
Agree with all these housing options and like that I will have more options especially for the future
Against the draft plan unless we get better infrastructure and address traffic congestion issues
Against draft plan and do not want to see any change
Agree with duplexes and want to see more zoning for duplexes
Against having duplexes and suites and basements and coach houses

SECTION VI: YOUTH STAKEHOLDERS

Phase 4 included 6 youth stakeholder meetings with the Youth Advisory Committee, the Whatever Youth Committee, the Student Work and Advisory Team, the Preteen Advisory Committee, the Library's Teen Advisory Group and a drop-in session at the Ambleside Youth Centre. The sessions included a presentation on the Draft Plan and how it relates to previous youth input, discussion, and a brainstorming session on the OCP and youth. Results of the youth events are reported below:

The Draft Official Community Plan & Me: I want the Plan to let me....				
I want to live here when I'm older	I want to afford a house	I want to go on hikes that have views	lights in large at the soccer field	I want WV to be environmentally friendly
I want to get a job here	I want to go swimming nearby	Underground/covered turf field	More Library locations	Cheaper housing options
Tree houses	Basketball Hoops	Protect Nature	Rock climbing options	Wi-fi Hot Spot
More buses Downtown	Places to ride my bike	Bus Connection to Bowen	New stores & places to buy	More Affordable
More Neighbourhood Grocers/Stores	Tree Protection	Sophisticated Play - Softballs	Services for the Homeless	Less Congestion - bus traffic
Live in my community	Not sacrifice my future for character	Affordability	Less Luxury Housing	More things to do
Thrive here as a young adult	Raise a family here	Safe, smart, good schools for family	Walk everywhere	Enjoy the beach
Enjoy nature	Outdoor Recreation Hiking, trails	Enjoy the Spirit trail	More ground quickly on transit	Learn More (education)
Use community facilities	Employ youth (in facilities)	Beach	Take more interesting things	Take things through the school board
better collaboration between schools & community	Encourage Youth to Open Businesses	Afford housing as a young adult	Get around without a car	Open a Business
Find work as a young adult	Entertainment (can watch movie screen)	Access to Clinics (Accessible)	Access Buses better via a transit	Access Sexual Health Clinics

Translates Housing

*More Arts like Van and Away
Agitation Centre
Theatre (community)
Learn about Finance
Life skills*

Phase 4 "Draft Plan" Comments from Youth Events	
Event	Comment
Pre-Teen Advisory Committee 14 – Feb - 18	Live in West Vancouver when I'm older
	Afford a house
	Go on hikes that are close to where I live
	Play longer on the soccer fields, because the lights are left on longer
	Get a job here
	I want West Vancouver to be environmentally friendly
	Go swimming nearby (at local beaches)
	Play on an underground or covered turf field
	Use a library closer to home (more libraries)
	Cheaper housing options
	Live in a treehouse
	Play on more local basketball courts
	Protect nature
	Go rock climbing
	Use Wi-Fi hot spots in our town centre'
	Take more busses downtown
	Ride my bike more places
	Ride my bike more places
	go to new and more affordable stores
	Hang out in new public spaces
Shop and neighbourhood grocery stores	
Use more sophisticated play grounds (cool play grounds, rope courses etc.)	
Provide services for the homeless	
Move through the community faster (less traffic and congestion)	
Teen Advisory Group Library 14 – Feb - 18	Live in my community
	Have housing options and not be only concerned with neighbourhood character
	Live here affordably
	Less luxury housing
	Do more things in my community
	Thrive here as a young adult
	Raise a family here

	Enjoy safe schools, a safe community and a good place to raise a family
	Walk everywhere
	Enjoy the beach
	Enjoy outdoor recreation, hiking and trails
	Enjoy the Spirit Trail
	Move around quickly on transit
	Learn more (lifelong learning that includes programs for youth and young adults)
	Keep using community facilities
	Work in our facilities as a youth
	Take more programs through the school board
Whatever Youth Committee 1 – March – 18	
	Better collaboration between schools and community
	Encourage youth to open businesses
	live in affordable housing as a young adult
	Get around without a car
	Open a Business
	Find work as a young adult
	Entertainment, like movie theatres for all ages or a theatre like the Commodore
	Accessible clinics (better hours, make it easier for youth to get help)
	access busses better, maybe with a larger transit hub
	Access sexual health clinics
	Transition housing, for youth aging out of provincial care
	take more arts programs (like the Vancouver Music Academy)
	Learn more life skills (like finances, job applications) through partnerships with the school board
	Lifelong learning for all ages, including youth
Student Work and Advisory Team 8 – March - 18	
	Have job opportunities
	Hang out with friends
	Go to entertainment options like movie theatres and escape rooms
	Move through the North Shore easier with more busses and new bus lanes
	Use busses with better frequency of service
	Have chances for car free living
	Play at a water park

	Get out on new trails
	Have better access to trails and better connections to existing trails
	Use more small neighbourhood parks
	Be safe out at night with well-lit public spaces
	Use designated fire pits at the beach
	Go to more restaurants (X2)
	Access more services near Sentinel High School
	Get to Sentinel high school easier (with better transit service)
	Go to an all ages movie theater
	More apartments
	More rental housing options
	A range of different unit sizes
	Live in a green or a natural building
	Live in an hobbit building like an earth ship
	Use outdoor badminton courts
Ambleside Youth Centre Drop In Session 9 – March - 18	
	Use more parks across the District
	Affordable housing
	Densification - small lots and coach houses \
	Live in a stratified coach house or a small subdivision
	More entertainment
	Use small busses that run hourly
	Seabus to Dundarave (environmentally friendly like the Aquabus)
	Stores that offer student discounts
	School bus service - Run from all the high schools to Ambleside and Park Royal
	Use more multicultural services and programs
	More public washrooms to accompany new public spaces
	Public washrooms open later (like Jericho Beach in Vancouver)
	More rental housing
	Affordable housing
	Office spaces need youth to drive creative industries
	Youth needed to drive tech hubs and a tech community
	More activities in the evenings - especially in summer
	More variety of stores
	Stores that are open later
	Need to make it easier to move across the District
	Need to lessen commute times
	Need to allow for more workers to live here
	Especially in Town Centre

	Composting should be available in all parks
	District should be offering soft plastic recycling across the district and in Parks
Youth Advisory Committee 14 – March - 18	
	Keep on supporting Park Royal
	Need to keep having a range of community spaces across the District
	Need to have retail hubs across the District
	Need to have redevelopment and rezoning
	Support for more affordable housing
	Most important things for youth are housing
	Support for services above the highway
	Support for a Caulfeild Village in the Hollyburn area
	Need more services near Sentinel School
	Need better bus service and connections to Sentinel School
	Support for mixed use in Cypress Village
	More opportunities for local small-scale villages
	Civic space in Horseshoe Bay Village for Youth - could work with BC Ferries
	Better development and more things near schools
	Mulgrave School needs to be serviced by bus
	Cypress Mountain should have a bus
	Things open later - need to have something (maybe Park Royal) open later
	Extended library hours maybe until 1:00-2:00 am - Students need more places to work
	More study spaces in the library
	Potential to use available space in other District facilities as temporary study spaces
	24 hour Starbucks
	Night club (some kind of entertainment open a night)
	Millennial Social Hub
	More rental housing