

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Langford Planning General Mailbox](#)  
**Subject:** 890 Walfred Rd  
**Date:** July 18, 2021 2:47:38 PM

---

This is to notify you that we, [REDACTED], owners of [REDACTED], have no issues with, or foresee and problems with the development at 890 Walfred Rd.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]  
Langford, B.C.  
[REDACTED]

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Langford Planning General Mailbox](#)  
**Subject:** Submissions for July 19 - Bylaw No. 1969 File Z20-0030  
**Date:** July 19, 2021 2:09:10 PM  
**Attachments:** [20210719 Submissions re re-zoning 890 Walfred Road.pdf](#)

---

Please see my submissions with respect to the re-zoning application for 890 Walfred Road, which I ask be added to the Council's agenda package.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED], Victoria

July 19, 2021

To the Committee:

**Re Bylaw No. 1969 File No. Z20-0030 Rezoning of 890 Walfred Road**

I am writing to convey my objection to the proposed rezoning of 890 Walfred Road from RR5 to R2 to accommodate 8 lot bare land subdivision.

Subsequent to the Committee meeting in early May, 2021, I had the opportunity to speak with several neighbours on Cuaulta Crescent, including 838 Cuaulta, 852 Cuaulta, and 878 Cuaulta. None of these residents phoned in or wrote to you or to the Committee in advance of the first meeting because, as they told me, it was, in their view, a 'done deal' as they believed to be the case in all instances with Langford re-zoning and development applications. But when I spoke with them further, all shared with me concerns about the development, including increased traffic, safety concerns, loss of trees/habitat, and loss of quietude in our neighbourhood. All of them have lived in their homes [REDACTED]. The resident of [REDACTED] told me she has wildlife in her rear yard that move in and out of 890 Walfred that will be severely impacted. All were very concerned about the removal of the trees which they enjoy, and which will result in much stronger winds that will likely cause damage to their property. The wind buffer has already been severely affected by the active development at 894 Walfred. The residents of [REDACTED] were very concerned about their properties being directly exposed to strong winds once both 894 and 890 Walfred are devoid of trees. After the clearing of 894 Walfred, my neighbour at [REDACTED] had a tree come down (onto my Arbutus) and a couple weeks later a second small fir tree on my property fell onto the same Arbutus. In my neighbourhood, we all have large mature trees on our properties.

**Communications with Rachael Sansom**

I emailed Ms. Sansom on May 15, 2021, to relay my concerns and those of my neighbours as noted above.

I also stated as follows:

I am also very concerned about the loss of habitat and biodiversity in my community. There are numerous trails within the forested areas of Triangle Mountain that are used by deer. We have bears here also on occasion. My property and those around me have owl nests, bat trees, pileated woodpeckers, hairy woodpeckers, flickers etc. There are hawks and eagles. The trees, shrubs, and other native plants support this life and biodiversity. As I mentioned, I would like to have copies of all reports prepared to date by registered professionals, which I understand is required before alteration of the property, because of its designated development permit area. I would appreciate you providing those reports to me. If there are reports that cannot be provided to me under the City of Langford's privacy rules, I would appreciate being informed of the reports that exist but cannot be disclosed so I can make the appropriate FOI request.

I did not hear from her and sent a follow up email on May 28, 2021. After receiving notice of the public hearing, I forwarded my email on July 14, 2021, for her response. She did provide some information, more general to the sequence of development applications after rezoning is approved. This morning I

received the environmental impact report (the "Report") prepared by Cascadia Biological Services (which I will comment on further below). I note that it is dated April 12, 2021. I see no reason why the City does not make such reports available to the public before the first public meeting.

### **Traffic and Safety**

1. Triangle Mountain is a car dependent community. There are no sidewalks, poor lighting, and infrequent bus service. During winter months, we usually experience significant snowfall accumulation which can make travel on Walfred and Fulton Road treacherous and, at times, impassible. The development at 894 Walfred will likely add 20 - 30 vehicles to the road system. It is my position that greater density to Triangle Mountain is imprudent and poor planning in these circumstances.
2. Triangle Mountain is a high fire hazard area. It is known that building clusters of houses that border forested areas create more fire risks when no buffer exists between housing and forest perimeters. Again, it is my position that it is imprudent to allow more density in a high fire risk area of Langford. A fire just occurred on Bear Mountain which had similar features, except very few trees now - just rocks and houses. If such a fire occurred during construction of houses on Walfred Road, the consequences would be catastrophic, particularly in view that we are experiencing locally and globally record breaking temperatures, long stretches without rain and severe drought conditions.
3. Strong winds are characteristic of the mountain, especially from late fall to early spring. The winds can push through at 60 - 100 km per hour when we have storms, with some gusts exceeding that. As a result of removal of most of the trees on 894 Walfred, the wind forces in the direction [REDACTED] have intensified. Almost every tree on my property is a "protected tree" under the Colwood tree preservation bylaw. I am concerned that the trees on my property will fall as a result which could cause disastrous damage to my home and person. This risk will only be heightened by removal of the trees on 890 Walfred. I spoke with the owner of 894 Walfred about this concern and he told me he would have no responsibility for any tree damage on my property because everything was approved by the City of Langford - I assume it would therefore be the City of Langford that is liable.

### **Please refer to:**

*What Langford shares in common with Fort McMurray*

[https://www.capitaldaily.ca/news/could-langford-be-setting-itself-up-for-catastrophic-fire?fbclid=IwAR3Ar\\_e7v4MAY1yRHavlgwwGiFBKaCuo7V6UI9yM57c3syhAmE\\_5Upjq-eA](https://www.capitaldaily.ca/news/could-langford-be-setting-itself-up-for-catastrophic-fire?fbclid=IwAR3Ar_e7v4MAY1yRHavlgwwGiFBKaCuo7V6UI9yM57c3syhAmE_5Upjq-eA)

*Trees make Rain - there is now science to prove it!*

[https://www.learningfromnature.com.au/drought-proof-increasing-rainfall/?fbclid=IwAR0LzLKt4QsryAW6KxQF-QC4Xz2-dTypZmoN6iEINBjPjM1T66V\\_RE4AC\\_g](https://www.learningfromnature.com.au/drought-proof-increasing-rainfall/?fbclid=IwAR0LzLKt4QsryAW6KxQF-QC4Xz2-dTypZmoN6iEINBjPjM1T66V_RE4AC_g)

## Habitat and Biodiversity

1. As the subject property is within the Habitat and Biodiversity and Wildfire Hazard Interface DP area, I understand that certain professional reports need to be prepared. The Report indicates as follows:

"....older second-generation forest habitat consisting of approximately 40 Douglas fir trees and a dozen arbutus.... Overall, the ecosystem provides some habitat for birds and other small/large mammals including raccoons, deer etc. *Overall, given the isolation of the ecosystem and fragmentation of available habitat, the ecosystem is considered of low-moderate value.*"

[Emphasis added]

Given the continuing pressures of development in forested areas such as Triangle Mountain that have existing large lot single family homes, fragmentation already exists. By removing the habitat on this property, this trend will only accelerate. I disagree with the biologist's statement (emphasized above) - the subject property's greenspace is part of a corridor that connects through the largely undeveloped area toward Drummond Way to the north and to Happy Hill in the west. The loss of Garry Oak habitat is directly related to this trend and what remains of this threatened ecosystem is largely on privately owned land that is being lost to development, I argue, under the rationale of low value due to fragmentation. The Report does not consider how this development, with others surrounding it and others that will likely follow, will have a cumulative negative impact on habitat and biodiversity on the mountain. By assessing the potential impact of a single development on the property's natural habitat in isolation, this has the effect of minimizing the broader impacts and gives justification to approving the development. I understand that environmental impact assessments are to identify "rare elements", but if that is the only basis for protecting habitat areas such as this property, then anything of low to moderate value will certainly be lost and such rare elements identified elsewhere will not survive. Introduced species of other plants, grasses, and the like will continue to encroach, including invasive species, on areas that do have high value. There is no reason why the subject property could not be revitalized (obviously by rejecting the rezoning for small lots) with a re-introduction of native species in disturbed areas. I am doing this now on my own property. Douglas firs and Arbutus are protected trees in Colwood and other municipalities but appear to have no environmental value in Langford.

The "typical value of the natural state area of the property" as per the photos appended to the Report are beautiful and can be revitalized by removing invasive plants and planting more native species. There is a growing interest and volunteerism among residents of the Westshore to do this in our communities.

As per the Langford OCP, the concept for hillside or shorelines areas integrates environmentally sensitive areas, parks and key view points, as well as recreational trails and green network links, yet I am not aware of the City having any plans to incorporate trails and green networks for the area, just more small lot houses. It appears to me that the Committee considers each rezoning application in isolation without any broader vision of how a particular community will evolve over time as successive developments proceed, which I argue is contrary to the OCP.

See attached Photos 1, 2 and 3, which represent what is to be visited upon 890 Walfred if rezoning is approved by this Committee.

Community Interests

1. The developer's request for rezoning to accommodate 8 bare lot stratas is obviously out of financial interest. However, the developer has not made any cogent argument for why this is also beneficial to the neighbourhood and existing residents. It is my position that Council must take into consideration whether permitting the rezoning is beneficial to the larger community, without regard to the financial interests of the developer. I can see no benefit to the larger community by granting the rezoning. The meager amenity contributions per lot does not merit approving the rezoning application. The "bonus for increased density" should be rejected. The rezoning will result in a further degradation of our natural forest canopy and important habitat for wildlife on the mountain.
2. I have not heard the Committee engage in any debate whatsoever. I have no idea of the reasoning of the Committee to accept this proposal. It is undemocratic and against public interests.

I care very much about protecting the habitat that exists on Triangle Mountain and strongly feel that this development application should be rejected because it is contrary to the intent of the OCP and community values.

Respectfully submitted,

██████████

██████████, Colwood

APPENDIX TO SUBMISSION OF ELIZABETH MARKUS

Photo 1 - The undeveloped lot abutting my property lot line, which is characteristic of the habitat of 894 Walfred before the machinery came in.



Photo 2 - View to the left of photo 1 - 894 Walfred - it's a huge pile of dead trees, shrubs, moss, approximately 15 - 20 feet high that has been sitting there for weeks after all the trees were cleared. This is [REDACTED] every morning.



Photo 3 - View from the undeveloped lot (as per photo 1) looking toward the huge pile (as per photo 2) - these are deer trails that exist throughout the treed areas of the mountain. The trail is now completely cut off because of all the clearing that took place earlier this month. It is now terminated at the dead end where the development begins.

