



THE MUNICIPALITY OF THE VILLAGE OF LIONS BAY

Regular Council Meeting: April 5, 2022 - ON TABLE

| <i>Resident Correspondence:</i> | | | | |
|--|--------------|-----------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| <i>Date Rec'd</i> | FROM | TOPIC | ACTION | Page No. |
| 3-Apr-22 | T. Schneider | Herbicide spraying | For Information | 1 |
| 4-Apr-22 | V. O'Keeffe | Tree Bylaw | For Information | 2 |
| 4-Apr-22 | P. Nelson | Herbicide spraying petition | For Information | 4 |
| 4-Apr-22 | C. Dawson | Tree Application 118 | For Information | 8 |
| 5-Apr-22 | M Reuter | Tree Application 118 | For Information | 9 |

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Council](#)
Subject: Herbicide Spraying in Lions Bay Area
Date: Sunday, April 3, 2022 8:44:52 PM

Dear Council,

I would like to express my objection to the dangers of spraying carcinogenic herbicides through out the Lower Mainland and including our own water sheds. The action would basically kill everything that makes up our temperate rainforests for a possible monoculture - of coniferous trees in an area where there is no significant logging industry.

This dangerous broad scale action is one of the greatest forms of pollution done by the BC Government towards its people and the environment.

It just does not target BC Indigenous Peoples food sources but other ethnic people who supplement some of their foods from the wild. This during a time where the UN warns of a looming World Wide food crisis, where also North American Farmers are being more and more impacted by shortages in oil, fertilizers, increased expenses, agricultural land losses, greater restrictions and now - farmers are being critically impacted by new North American government regulations that farms will need to continue to reduce their production . It's just a matter of time until food costs, inflation and food shortages are seen here in Vancouver.

Spraying this poisonous herbicide does not just change the ecosystem of a mixed forest of native plants providing foods to the wildlife, birds, but to the enormous group of pollinators that enable our ecosystem to thrive. Spraying the ecosystem in our mountainous landscape would subject our area to more slides as water absorbing vegetation is destroyed.

As a bee keeper - honey bees will fly up to 3-5km to collect nectar.

Killing the plants that my bees and other pollinators use (Canada has of 700 different kinds of pollinators) is a ground up way of destroying an entire eco-system, including my bee colonies.

Glyphosate affects the gut bacteria of bees and studies have found that the use not just damages the bees ability to locate nectar, but damages the brood for future generations to develop and can cause colony collapse disorder.

Air spaying with wind drift could poison and kill my own fruit, berry plants and other food producing plants within the Village and also could be inhaled by residents and wildlife.

This is not targeted spraying but generalized spraying under the guise of increased tree production and logging.

This leads me to believe there is an alternative motive involved -not just it harming the environment but the human population situated in the Lower Mainland area via cancers.

I request the Village to request the Government for a spray ban of at least 5km around the Village if not protecting the residents and watershed area, but my apiary that is register with Agriculture Canada. As an agriculture entity I need environmental setbacks to protect my livestock, my bees, from herbicide spraying....if the Government won't consider the safety of humans and the potential of getting cancers as a direct result of spraying as enough of a reason.

Thank you.

Kind regards,
Tina Schneider

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Ron McLaughlin](#); [Neville Abbott](#); [Fred Bain](#); [Norman Barmeier](#); [Jaime Cunliffe](#)
Cc: [Agenda](#)
Subject: Letter to Council
Date: Monday, April 4, 2022 1:52:22 PM

Hello council,

Less than a year ago you made changes to our tree bylaw to protect birds in the nesting season. I was thrilled and proud that our village stepped up and that this important change was made. Several reminders have been published in the Village Update and it has been encouraging to see tree permit applications earlier in the year. Before the bylaw change last year, I have no doubt this is tree work that would have happened while birds were nesting.

Reminders to residents that federal and provincial laws apply on private property were well communicated and I thank the village for doing that. Education is a process but we are off to a good start.

However, I notice that more changes to the bylaw are being considered in this week's council meeting. I am not sure why, but these changes seem to dilute council's clear intentions last year. I applaud the change that emphasizes consultation, which has fallen by the wayside in recent months. It is also very concerning that the CAO will now be allowed to make changes whenever she/he sees fit without council's input. I think the application form is part of the bylaw for good reason. It defines the criteria upon which decisions are made by the Tree Committee and council. Those criteria convey the intent of the bylaw. Allowing changes to be made by staff without council's direction leaves it wide open to further dilution and re-interpretation depending on an individual application. This would not only be unfair but would undermine an important part of the bylaw which seems to have been forgotten, which is to protect our trees, the beauty and wellbeing they bring to our neighbourhood, and the habitat they provide for birds and other wildlife which in turn enhances life in Lions Bay.

Most importantly, only Council can change bylaws.

In my letter to you last year I wrote: I have also seen a concerning lack of enforcement of the Tree Bylaw in recent years, resulting in the loss of birds and bird habitat, as well as the natural beauty which is characteristic of our village. I would encourage council to ensure all residents are made aware of the Tree Bylaw and the need for permitting BEFORE work is commenced. We now have full-time bylaw officers who should be enforcing the bylaw and assisting with educating residents. It is disappointing to see that the Tree Bylaw is still not being enforced and that it now seems to be the norm that private lots and neighborhoods are being clearcut instead of preserving the natural beauty of Lions Bay. My street is one example. We even lost the big, beautiful trees in Wade Park last year. We had full time bylaw officers last summer and yet there were many instances of tree work being carried out without a permit. It is obvious to neighbours when unpermitted work is being done. It happens because it is common knowledge there will be no enforcement and when the trees are gone, it is too late. Clearly this needs to change.

I am asking you to stand firmly behind the bylaw as you intended it to be last year. We are off to a good start and need to see it through before making hasty decisions that reverse the good work being done to protect birds and their habitat and also our natural heritage.

Thank you,
Vivienne O' Keefe

[REDACTED]

Confidentiality Warning: This message and any attachments are intended only for the use of the intended recipient(s), are confidential, and may be privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any review, retransmission, conversion to hard copy, copying, circulation or other use of this message and any attachments is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately by return e-mail, and delete this message and any attachments from your system. Thank-you!

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Ron McLaughlin](#); [Fred Bain](#); [Neville Abbott](#); [Jaime Cunliffe](#); [Norman Barmeier](#)
Cc: [Agenda](#)
Subject: BC Timber Sales" 5-year South Coast Pest Management Plan
Date: Monday, April 4, 2022 4:08:12 PM
Attachments: [Petition to Council re BC Timber Sales" Spraying Plan 4Apr22.pdf](#)

Dear Council,

I am attaching a call to action endorsed by 113 signatories to date with regards the above. We are calling on Council to ACT NOW to stop the spraying of herbicides around Lions Bay and other areas as part of BC Timber Sales' 5-year South Coast Pest Management Plan.

This is an extremely important and urgent matter that deserves Council's attention: the spraying was due to start on April 1st, so this is timebound. Whether this spraying takes place in our backyard or elsewhere, it is simply unthinkable that it be allowed to go ahead. Myself and 112 others would like to see it added to tomorrow night's agenda so that a plan of action can be determined now.

Signatures are still coming in, but I wanted you to have time to read this and add it to tomorrow night's agenda.

Thanks,
Penny (on behalf of many others)

Call for Council to ACT NOW to stop the spraying of herbicides around Lions Bay and other areas as part of BC Timber Sales' 5-year South Coast Pest Management Plan

We the undersigned are asking Council to take whatever measures they deem the most appropriate and effective to stop the spraying of herbicides, including around and in Lions Bay, that will target indigenous plants and deciduous trees - and hence severely impact people and wildlife. Deciduous species are crucially important for biodiversity and wildlife and also reduce wildfire risk. They are vital to the health of our already fragile eco-systems.

According to a story posted by the North Shore News (<https://www.nsnews.com/local-news/outcry-grows-as-bc-government-agency-plans-widespread-south-coast-herbicide-spray-5196024>) glyphosate is one of the poisons that will be used. This is known to remain in vegetation for as long as 12 years.

It is simply unthinkable that forests included in Metro Vancouver's Sensitive Ecosystem Inventory and designated for conservation will be sprayed with pesticides, including Lions Bay's green belt, which is not only designated for Environmental Protection in our OCP, but is also our watershed. The sprays are also likely to enter our creeks and from there, the ocean.

We are asking that Council act immediately in whatever ways possible to halt the proposed spraying program, which is due to start on April 1st.

| # | First Name | Last Name | Are you a resident of Lions Bay? |
|----|-------------|------------|----------------------------------|
| 1 | Penny | Nelson | Yes |
| 2 | Dawn | Hope | Yes |
| 3 | Andrea | Bradshaw | Yes |
| 4 | Celia | Dino | Yes |
| 5 | Tamara | Leger | Yes |
| 6 | Lyn | Black | Yes |
| 7 | Danielle | Wills | Yes |
| 8 | Oliver | Ganske | Yes |
| 9 | Alexander | Ganske | Yes |
| 10 | Valerie | Morton | Yes |
| 11 | Stewart | Morton | Yes |
| 12 | Christopher | Ganske | Yes |
| 13 | Michael | Emmott | Yes |
| 14 | Marcus | Richardson | Yes |
| 15 | Christina | Lee | Yes |
| 16 | Alexnader | Ganske | Yes |
| 17 | Kate | Cummins | Yes |
| 18 | Martin | Richmond | Yes |
| 19 | Rebecca | Starr | Yes |
| 20 | David | Stark | Yes |
| 21 | Charlie | Bradbury | Yes |

| | | | |
|----|----------------|-------------|-----|
| 22 | Archie | Hardy | Yes |
| 23 | Harry | Hardy | Yes |
| 24 | Maria Vivienne | Keefe | Yes |
| 25 | Rebecca | Caspersen | Yes |
| 26 | Carol | Langley | Yes |
| 27 | Susan-Bree | Stoddart | Yes |
| 28 | Noelene | Searle | Yes |
| 29 | Jane | Paddon | No |
| 30 | Monica | Fitzpatrick | Yes |
| 31 | Carol | Brien | Yes |
| 32 | David | Lee | Yes |
| 33 | Tibor | Zombori | Yes |
| 34 | Leslie | Nolin | Yes |
| 35 | Shakil | Kassam | Yes |
| 36 | Nancy | Richmond | Yes |
| 37 | Michael | Pandher | Yes |
| 38 | Marilyne | Cary | Yes |
| 39 | Ardis | Reveley | Yes |
| 40 | Peter | Hefti | Yes |
| 41 | Marcus | Reuter | Yes |
| 42 | Katharina | Loebich | Yes |
| 43 | Stefanie | Reuter | Yes |
| 44 | Rod | Baker | Yes |
| 45 | Jan | Schneider | Yes |
| 46 | Nicole | Alagich | Yes |
| 47 | Cooper | Richmond | Yes |
| 48 | Karen | Jeffery | Yes |
| 49 | Holly | Richmond | Yes |
| 50 | Emilie | Montgomery | Yes |
| 51 | Nicole | Stevens | Yes |
| 52 | Noelene | Searle | Yes |
| 53 | Michelle | Osry | Yes |
| 54 | Megan | Knaak | Yes |
| 55 | Kerstin | Schneider | Yes |
| 56 | Elke | Schneider | Yes |
| 57 | Elise | Montgomery | Yes |
| 58 | John | Dudley | Yes |
| 59 | Peter | Marklund | Yes |
| 60 | Regina | Marklund | Yes |
| 61 | Christine | Little | Yes |
| 62 | Nelson | Publicover | Yes |
| 63 | Susan | Publicover | Yes |
| 64 | Greg | Little | Yes |
| 65 | Lorraine | Surcouf | Yes |
| 66 | Lyn | Black | Yes |
| 67 | Joan | Lemmers | Yes |
| 68 | David | Shore | Yes |
| 69 | Grace | Sredzki | Yes |

| | | | |
|-----|------------|-----------------|-----|
| 70 | Mark | Coghlan | Yes |
| 71 | Lee | Harrison | No |
| 72 | Carmen | Sullivan | Yes |
| 73 | Michele | Povill | Yes |
| 74 | Beata | Newall | No |
| 75 | Petra | Matheson | No |
| 76 | Trudi | Luethy | Yes |
| 77 | Lieselotte | Ganske | Yes |
| 78 | Riley | Darr | Yes |
| 79 | Deirdre | McNeill | Yes |
| 80 | Marek | Sredzki | Yes |
| 81 | Bernadette | Riedijk | Yes |
| 82 | jane | paddon | No |
| 83 | David | Black | Yes |
| 84 | Ken | Berry | Yes |
| 85 | Odette | De Moor | Yes |
| 86 | Chris | Thompson | Yes |
| 87 | Helen | Nogatch | Yes |
| 88 | Ingrid | Wray | Yes |
| 89 | Jason | Darr | Yes |
| 90 | Judith | Jordan | Yes |
| 91 | Lily | Bolus | Yes |
| 92 | Cayla | Brooke | Yes |
| 93 | Warde | Ashlie | Yes |
| 94 | Rose | Dudley | Yes |
| 95 | Edith | Goetsch | Yes |
| 96 | Hardy | Goetsch | Yes |
| 97 | Arlene | Halstrom | Yes |
| 98 | Wayne | Halstrom | Yes |
| 99 | Heather | Mossakowski | Yes |
| 100 | Teresa | Brandvold | Yes |
| 101 | Fran | McNichol | Yes |
| 102 | Alison | Mead Richardson | Yes |
| 103 | Jonathan | Thompson | Yes |
| 104 | Joanna | Koponka | Yes |
| 105 | Melissa | Warkentin | Yes |
| 106 | Ken | Gordon | No |
| 107 | Betty | Birrell | Yes |
| 108 | Yuko | Godoy-Toku | Yes |
| 109 | Colleen | Dickinson | Yes |
| 110 | Max | Dancs | Yes |
| 111 | Chris | Cauac | Yes |
| 112 | Alexis | Ratz | Yes |
| 113 | Sonia | Foster | Yes |

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Ron McLaughlin; Council](#)
Subject: In regards to April 4th Meeting
Date: Monday, April 4, 2022 4:12:44 PM

Hi Ron and councillors,

I hope you are well and your week is off to a great start. I saw that discussing the arborist's report is on the agenda for tomorrow night. I'm trusting that council makes a decision based on the village-hired arborist's report of topped (by nature or otherwise) or untopped as was stated in the March 15th meeting.

I want to make it clear that I am still looking to top this tree as it impacts my view and property greatly. I know I haven't gone to the (rather questionable) lengths of one particular community member, because I am relying on council to stick to the rules in this case - that a topped tree can be re-topped.

Additionally, I'm surprised that no one has removed the sign that said community member **nailed to the beloved tree** on Mar 27, as it's extremely inappropriate and makes it seem like council has made a decision and has a strong stance on the matter.

Lastly, in future meetings, if there is a 2 min rule for the public portion, this should be enforced for everyone.

Thanks,
Cassandra Dawson, MSc

[REDACTED]

From: [Karla Duarte](#)
To: [Karla Duarte](#)
Subject: FW: 2nd Arborist Report for Doug Fir at Stewart Rd & Bayview Rd, Lions Bay
Date: Tuesday, April 5, 2022 3:48:31 PM
Attachments: [Arborist_Report1\(241_Bayview_PI\).pdf](#)

From: marcus reuter [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, April 4, 2022 9:15 PM
To: Ron McLaughlin <mayor.mclaughlin@lionsbay.ca>; Fred Bain <councillor.bain@lionsbay.ca>; Neville Abbott <councillor.abbott@lionsbay.ca>; Jaime Cunliffe <councillor.cunliffe@lionsbay.ca>; Norman Barmeier <councillor.barmeier@lionsbay.ca>
Subject: 2nd Arborist Report for Doug Fir at Stewart Rd & Bayview Rd, Lions Bay

Dear Mayor and Council,

I've attached an email I received from Nai this evening, in which he included a copy of the arborist's report commissioned by the Village. This report reaffirms and underlines the findings made by the arborist commissioned by the residents of Stewart Road, which I sent to you on March 22nd.

Essentially, both arborists find that the tree is vigorous and in good health, with an intact canopy and healthy crown, and that it poses a "low hazard." There is agreement that the double crown is significantly higher than any of the mechanical toppings done in adjacent trees, and that this double crown is not the result of mechanical topping but likely the outcome of wind, snow load, or birds. Further, it is recommended that the tree **not be topped**, and there is reference to the role this tree plays in mitigating wind dangers posed to the area (a concern expressed to by residents at the last Council meeting).

Finally, the second arborist confirms what the first arborist found: that this tree must be considered, by virtue of its diameter, a Significant Tree under our bylaws. Again, the standard of care that must be met to alter a Significant Tree is significantly higher than would normally be the case: Clause 3.4.4 of our Tree Bylaw states that **"the removal or cutting of any Significant Tree shall only be allowed by special exemption, and when no other compromise can be found"** and that exceptions can only be made **"in cases where such cutting or pruning is *unavoidably required* for reasons of safety or through exceptional circumstances."** (emphasis mine)

It appears abundantly evident at this time that there is no legitimate case that can be made that cutting, pruning, or topping is required for safety reasons or by reason of exceptional circumstances. Nor is it the case that an exception must be made because no compromise can be found: as I've written to you before, the applicant's work is substantially complete, they've gotten everything else they asked for, and all that the resident's of Stewart Road are asking for is that this single tree remain as it is. By any metric of fairness--and the need to navigate competing interests--this, I would offer, is the right thing to do.

Cordially,
Marcus Reuter