

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Langford Planning General Mailbox](#)
Cc: [denise.blackwell02](#); [amy@gordonngordon.com](#)
Subject: LETTER OF SUPPORT FOR develop a six-storey, 84-unit apartment building on four existing lots on Granderson Road, just off Goldstream Avenue near Veterans Memorial Parkway.
Date: August 11, 2021 1:16:19 PM
Attachments: [Letter of Support Aug 2021 Development.doc](#)

Please find the attached letter of support and supporting documentation for this proposal before Council on August 16th.

**Langford City Hall
2nd Floor, 877 Goldstream Avenue
Langford
British Columbia, Canada
V9B 2X8**

August 11, 2021

LETTER OF SUPPORT FOR *develop a six-storey, 84-unit apartment building on four existing lots on Granderson Road, just off Goldstream Avenue near Veterans Memorial Parkway.*

Dear Mayor and Council:

My wife and I are very supportive of this proposal to be presented at the August 16th Council meeting as just another example of creating walkable compact communities with a mixed residential/commercial core in Langford. We live in a townhouse complex on Massie Drive and as President of the Strata Council there are also owners of Strata Plan 5417 who hold the same excitement.

We are writing in favour of this development as we believe it is beneficial for Langford for the following reasons:

<!--[endif]-->**Mixed Commercial/Residential Development is the most efficient urban design** – The proposed development by Design Build Services, to build two 12-storey apartment buildings at 647 Goldstream Ave. in Langford, creating more than 200 units of housing will be emulating the best practices of urban design. Empirical evidence has borne out the mixed commercial/residential development with lower floors dedicated to commerce and trade and upper floors dedicated to domiciles provide for vibrant and prosperous communities. The next most efficacious design concept is followed by adjacent commercial-residential corridors, such as is emerging along Goldstream Avenue. This type of design was very common in many parts of Europe and Asia and the eastern Canada and the United States. Queen Street in Toronto is only one example of such design dating back over 100 years. Moreover, such development has experienced exponential growth once again in many cities worldwide.

The proposed design fits this model of development very well:

<!--[endif]-->**Consistent with Rail proposal to Victoria** – The proximity of this redevelopment to the Langford Station is mutually advantageous to both proposals and provide further densification for the route. *As per the attached, there is much empirical evidence that people will not walk beyond a certain threshold to a mass transit station. The attachment is based on Gravity Modelling/Separation Factors from the Institute of Transportation Engineers dating back to the 1970s.*

<!--[endif]-->It facilitates greater densification, and helps to **curtail urban sprawl**. The proposed medium to high density structures have the following benefits:

<!--[endif]-->Reduced Fuel Consumption – This would be achieved by concentrating a greater number of people in one area rather than promoting a greater number of origin trips that would be case if the population is dispersed further from the main shopping and commercial areas in Langford and also Victoria.

<!--[endif]-->Reduced Emissions- The reduced emissions are a function of the reduced number of trips under a higher density scenario vis-a-vis the dispersed (urban sprawl) scenario and also the rail option I mentioned above.

<!--[endif]-->Aesthetic benefits of more green space – The reduced footprint on the site would facilitate greater green space for this development than for instance a series of smaller structures.

<!--[endif]-->The fewer number of origin and destination trips would also reduce future rehabilitation and maintenance costs on the existing Langford City road network.

<!--[endif]-->The proposal fits in with the recommended suggestions of Dr. Avi Friedman (McGill University) about walkable communities and other principles of Urban Planning. Urban planners and economists are united in the basic principle that the most efficient urban design is the higher density compact walkable communities’ model, where people can choose to use their vehicles rather than be forced to do to conduct their daily activities. Moreover, this model also saves individuals money through reduced operating costs.

<!--[endif]-->The City of Langford has been very successful in accommodating the demand among Millennials towards higher density compact communities. There is much empirical evidence that boomers and the millennial generation, the two largest demographic groups in North America are converging in a time-of-life moment where what they want is walkable, compact, higher density, service-rich, transit-oriented communities and destinations.

<!--[endif]-->Finally, as Langford is actively wooing Amazon and other such technological and warehousing companies to Langford with the potential of over 50,000 highly skilled (professional) people, it behooves us to consider transportation solutions around mass transit. Moreover, such individuals have a higher propensity (most likely Millennials) to use mass transit. We should not lose this opportunity to accommodate the burgeoning demand.

Once again, I would like to congratulate council on your very progressive yet cautious perspective on development and growth. I believe that since Langford has become such an attractive place to live, due in large part to Council’s foresight.

Sincerely,

Avi Ickovich (Transportation Economist)

Langford City Hall
2nd Floor, 877 Goldstream Avenue
Langford
British Columbia, Canada
V9B 2X8

August 11, 2021

LETTER OF SUPPORT FOR *develop a six-storey, 84-unit apartment building on four existing lots on Granderson Road, just off Goldstream Avenue near Veterans Memorial Parkway.*

Dear Mayor and Council:

My wife and I are very supportive of this proposal to be presented at the August 16th Council meeting as just another example of creating walkable compact communities with a mixed residential/commercial core in Langford. We live in a townhouse complex on Massie Drive and as President of the Strata Council there are also owners of Strata Plan 5417 who hold the same excitement.

We are writing in favour of this development as we believe it is beneficial for Langford for the following reasons:

- Mixed Commercial/Residential Development is the most efficient urban design** – The proposed development by Design Build Services, to build two 12-storey apartment buildings at 647 Goldstream Ave. in Langford, creating more than 200 units of housing will be emulating the best practices of urban design. Empirical evidence has borne out the mixed commercial/residential development with lower floors dedicated to commerce and trade and upper floors dedicated to domiciles provide for vibrant and prosperous communities. The next most efficacious design concept is followed by adjacent commercial-residential corridors, such as is emerging along Goldstream Avenue. This type of design was very common in many parts of Europe and Asia and the eastern Canada and the United States. Queen Street in Toronto is only one example of such design dating back over 100 years. Moreover, such development has experienced exponential growth once again in many cities worldwide.

The proposed design fits this model of development very well:

- Consistent with Rail proposal to Victoria** – The proximity of this redevelopment to the Langford Station is mutually advantageous to both proposals and provide further densification for the route. *As per the attached, there is much empirical evidence that people will not walk beyond a certain threshold to a mass transit station. The attachment is based on Gravity Modelling/Separation Factors from the Institute of Transportation Engineers dating back to the 1970s.*

- ☑ It facilitates greater densification, and helps to **curtail urban sprawl**. The proposed medium to high density structures have the following benefits:
 - Reduced Fuel Consumption – This would be achieved by concentrating a greater number of people in one area rather than promoting a greater number of origin trips that would be case if the population is dispersed further from the main shopping and commercial areas in Langford and also Victoria.
 - Reduced Emissions- The reduced emissions are a function of the reduced number of trips under a higher density scenario vis-a-vis the dispersed (urban sprawl) scenario and also the rail option I mentioned above.
 - Aesthetic benefits of more green space – The reduced footprint on the site would facilitate greater green space for this development than for instance a series of smaller structures.
- ☑ The fewer number of origin and destination trips would also reduce future rehabilitation and maintenance costs on the existing Langford City road network.
- ☑ The proposal fits in with the recommended suggestions of Dr. Avi Friedman (McGill University) about walkable communities and other principles of Urban Planning. Urban planners and economists are united in the basic principle that the most efficient urban design is the higher density compact walkable communities’ model, where people can choose to use their vehicles rather than be forced to do to conduct their daily activities. Moreover, this model also saves individuals money through reduced operating costs.
- ☑ The City of Langford has been very successful in accommodating the demand among Millennials towards higher density compact communities. There is much empirical evidence that boomers and the millennial generation, the two largest demographic groups in North America are converging in a time-of-life moment where what they want is walkable, compact, higher density, service-rich, transit-oriented communities and destinations.
- ☑ Finally, as Langford is actively wooing Amazon and other such technological and warehousing companies to Langford with the potential of over 50,000 highly skilled (professional) people, it behooves us to consider transportation solutions around mass transit. Moreover, such individuals have a higher propensity (most likely Millennials) to use mass transit. We should not lose this opportunity to accommodate the burgeoning demand.

Once again, I would like to congratulate council on your very progressive yet cautious perspective on development and growth. I believe that since Langford has become such an attractive place to live, due in large part to Council’s foresight.

Sincerely,

Avi Ickovich (Transportation Economist)

Avi and Nora Ickovich
134-710 Massie Drive
Victoria, BC.
V9B 3A9

SEPARATION FACTORS AND TRANSPORTATION PLANNING FOR GREATER VICTORIA

The attached excerpt from the “Introduction to Transportation Engineering”¹ explains how trip distribution models and separation models apply to increasing the efficacy of proposed solutions to transportation problems facing the Greater Victoria area, through urban planning and multi-modal systems. I chose this earlier version dating back to 1978 to illustrate that the precept of URBAN DENSIFICATION was known as a key element of effective transportation systems dating back over 30 years ago. As highlighted (A) in the excerpt and the formulae indicate:

The model distributes a proportion of the trips generated in any zone to all other zones on the basis of their relative attractiveness and in an inverse relationship to the separations between the zones. Travel time is the most descriptive measure of separation, but cash outlays for tolls, parking and transit fares, and the inconvenience of walking and waiting can be included.

This explains why San Francisco back in 1978 and more recently Portland and many cities worldwide have moved towards density and the creation of walkable compact communities. The intent is to minimize the negative influence of the separation coefficient. More specifically, walking is inconvenient and very time-consuming if it is beyond a threshold, as many people will not walk 4 miles with inclement weather. The same principle applies to LRT or Commuter Rail stations, people have a limit as to how far they will walk, cycle, or drive to a station and thus we need to keep this in mind as we move towards implementing rails systems. Empirical evidence has shown that people (commuters) will walk on average 500m to 1 kilometer to a transit station, cycle a couple more kilometers, but drive great distances.

When we refer to higher density we are thus referring to medium density so as to make mass transit viable. High-rises are automatically associated with urban densification which in most cases is a fallacy. We need urban development that is mixed commercial and residential. Commercial on bottom and 3 to 5 floors above of residential as is the norm in many European and Asian cities is just one development permutation.

The other interesting aspect of examining the separation coefficient is that its influence can be minimized through offering alternative modes of transportation. People with alternative trip modes will have choices in cases where one mode is inconvenient or blocked on any given day. This will increase productivity and mobility for health and education appointments as there are

¹ Everett C Carter and Wolfgang S Homburger, Institute of Transportation Engineers, “Introduction to Transportation Engineering”, Arlington, Virginia, 1978

fewer missed trips or avoided. It all comes down to offering choices that are more available if we have population clustered around transportation corridors.

Once again I am referencing a Gravity Model from 1978 to show that the critical elements date back to 70s, of which the separation factor is paramount. Since then many variables have come and gone, but the separation factor has remained. Highlighted (B) also shows that through urban planning we can create new separation factors when they indicate:

The assumption is made that the F factors [separation factors in the formula] change with time only in response to changes in the transportation network (new separation values).

More specifically, with the advances in telecommunication since 1970s there are alternatives to cars that did not exist in the 1970s such as: smartphones, emails, faxes, video-conferencing and so on. In other words, when presented with tolls or higher parking charges, people have new separation factors in revised multi-modal transportation systems (networks) in respective cities across the world.

I should note that these principles are still being advocated by transportation economists and engineers almost 50 years later as per a recent guidebook promoted by the National Cooperative Highway Research Program (NCHRP)². In fact, in sections 12.4.3 Walkability. 12-12 and 12.4.4 Greater Access for Transit-Dependent Populations there are recommendations that transportation planning begin to embrace compact walkable communities, which is the basis of most of efficient transportation systems.

What this means is that through density not only can we reduce the separation factor, we can change and manipulate it by creating new networks through multi-modal transportation choices. The implications of this premise are significant as they affect our health, mobility, educational opportunities, and productivity.

Recommendations:

We need to encourage and support multi-modal transportation systems that allow for efficient and seamless transfer among the modes. Under this approach people will be able to choose the most efficient mode of transportation on any given day (automobile, walking, cycling, and transit). Each mode is important.

² Understanding How to Develop and Apply Economic Analyses: Guidance for Transportation Planners Final Guidebook, November 2011. . Prepared for: National Cooperative Highway Research Program, Transportation Research Board of The National Academies
Toni Horst, PhD, Principal Investigator and Sara Carini AECOM Arlington, Virginia, November 2011

The point to remember is as populations grow, congested facilities are a productivity drain. Without offering alternatives, congested facilities will affect GDP. It's all about choices to create mobility and eliminate impediments to the movement of people and goods and services.

We need to begin to understand that traffic congestion is not just an environmental issue, it is more importantly a huge impediment to productivity.

trips, each having a specific origin zone and destination zone. The output is a trip table in which the number of trips by purpose between any pair of zones is given.

The model distributes a proportion of the trips generated in any zone to all other zones on the basis of their relative attractiveness and in an inverse relationship to the separations between the zones. Travel time is the most descriptive measure of separation, but cash outlays for tolls, parking and transit fares, and the inconvenience of walking and waiting can be included.

A number of different trip distribution models have been used in transportation studies. A typical, widely used one is the gravity model. Trips are again stratified by purpose, and separate formulae are developed for each. The model hypothesizes that the number of trips between two zones i and j varies directly with their level of trip generation and inversely with their separation. The formulation is

$$T_{ij} = P_i \frac{A_j F_{ij} K_{ij}}{\sum_{k=1}^N A_k F_{ik} K_{ik}}$$

where

T_{ij} = the number of trips between i and j for a specific purpose.

P_i = total trips generated in i for that purpose.

A_j = total trips attracted to j for that purpose.

F_{ij} = inverse function of separation between i and j .

K_{ij} = a zone-to-zone adjustment factor used to take into consideration varying socioeconomic characteristics of i and j that affect travel between i and j .

N = total number of zones in the study area.

The F and K factors for a specific study area must be determined through a process called *calibration*. The factors are adjusted until it is possible to synthesize existing travel patterns by means of the model. The assumption is made that the F factors change with time only in response to changes in the transportation network (new separation values). The K factors may or may not remain constant with time depending on predicted changes in the socioeconomic characteristics of the zones in the future.

Modal Split

The purpose of modal split analysis is to predict the proportional use of two or more modes of travel. In urban areas, the basic split analyzed is between the use of mass transit and the private automobiles. However, submodal split models are sometimes developed to describe the relative use of different forms of mass transit.

In the early years of traffic estimation, modal split was considered an issue of choice among competing alternatives, and models formulated the relationships of the choice to characteristics of the trip maker, of the trip, and of the performance of each of the modes. Modal split was either used immediately after trip generation, by splitting trip ends, or after distribution by splitting zone-to-zone trip interchanges. The former method (the trip-end modal split model) was found to be computationally simpler and statistically on a sounder data base, while the latter (trip-interchange modal split model) was more sensitive to system performance, and therefore, was more useful in testing the consequences of proposed changes in the networks of each mode.

However, it is now agreed that modal split procedures must recognize the existence of two distinct groups of transit riders: *captives*, who cannot avail themselves of transportation by automobile, and *choice riders*, who can. The classic models are based on choice, and are therefore inadequate to describe the behavior of captive riders.

Most captive riders come from households where there is no car available. Their travel pattern can be described by generating transit trips through multiple regression or category analysis, and then distributing them among zones. Transit accessibility is a variable in the generation stage, reflecting the need for captive riders to live in zones with some transit service. In the distribution stage, separation is calculated for the transit network costs and times, and trips are distributed only between pairs of zones connected by transit service.

Choice riders are not separated from automobile drivers and passengers until after trip distribution. Once the trip interchange matrices for various trip purposes have been produced, a choice model is used to estimate the proportion of trips between any pair of zones likely to use transit. The trip-interchange modal split model is such a choice formulation. Some of the variables used are relative travel time by each mode, relative travel cost, relative inconvenience in terms of walking and waiting involved, and economic status of the trip maker. The dependent variable in

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Langford Planning General Mailbox](#)
Subject: Submission to public hearing re. Files z20-0008, z20-0026
Date: August 11, 2021 4:17:56 PM

To whom it may concern,

My name is Jeff Heslop and I'm a tenant at 905 Bray Ave. I am writing to have my voice heard at this public hearing regarding the rezoning permits, File numbers: Z20-0026, and Z20-0008.

I am a husband and a father of a five member family. We are a single income household due to my wife having Trigeminal Neuralgia. This is a neurological disorder that causes extreme pain to the face, with resulting debilitating effects that make it impossible for her to get a job. We have requested any kind of help from both the provincial and federal governments, yet according to them I make too much. We require a home that has four bedrooms and allows pets, as pets are family too.

I understand the need for more housing, however we also need to have housing for larger (often blended) families. Every single apartment and condo built in the area does not allow for larger families. The largest unit I have seen is a 3 bedroom. With today's market it is next to impossible for a single income family to be able to afford the rental costs that people are demanding. We moved to the Langford area a couple years ago and found a nice home that was adequate for our needs and fitted into our financial budget. We were told that they wanted to have long term tenants, as this was their retirement income. Then just under 2 years the housing market spiked and the owners decided to jump on the opportunity to triple their investment and sell. This sent my family into a panic to try and find a new home. We find it very important for our children to live in the same area throughout school and want to keep a stable living environment. However, even searching farther, we couldn't find any rental.

If this application to change the zoning gets accepted, it will remove us from yet another home, sending us into another frantic hunt for the next impossible home. The thing is, there are no houses out there that are available and large enough for any larger family. My neighbours all have families and struggle to find homes in this market. I am asking for this request to be denied as it will send at least 13 families out of the homes that they know. It will cause at least 13 families to uproot their children from their schools and friends. With all the new construction, building apartments for bachelors, couples, and "small" families, they are taking homes away from the larger families. The current housing shortage is a strain for many, this I understand, however families like mine are left out of any new constructions. There is nothing being done to accommodate us.

I have made applications at many of the co-op housings in the area, but the waiting lists are years long. The City of Langford needs to build more affordable housing for larger families, especially with the increase in blended families. The City of Langford needs to have new co-op housing developments built for families to come together, in an affordable and community driven environment. They need to start thinking about the families who struggle, who live paycheque to paycheque. The ones who are worrying if they will be able to find a place that will fit their family and still afford it. They need to start thinking about the hard working father who works long days to keep a roof over his family's head, one he can barely afford as it is.

Please, I would like to speak for the entire area under the rezoning permit and strongly request the permit to be denied. There are other places that a mixed-use residential development can be built. There are no places for all of us to move to, regardless of affordability. I truly hope you will take this into consideration when you make your decision upon the conclusion of this hearing.

Thank you, very much, for your time.

Jeffrey Heslop
905 Bray Ave.
Victoria, B.C
V9B 2S9



From: [Matthew Baldwin](#)
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [Suzette Chapman](#); [Julie Coneybeer](#)
Subject: Re: New apartments concerns
Date: August 11, 2021 5:37:47 PM

Good afternoon Mr. Ojala,

Thank you for your recent email regarding development in Langford. Unfortunately, I find it hard to even acknowledge inflammatory comments such as "relentless and careless pace of development" and "Hockley and Peatt is an example of overkill", not to mention "unfair congestion, noise and disruption" except to provide assurances that there is nothing careless or unfair about the manner in which the City is developing, and that our community that is growing and diversifying due to its popularity, supported by the popularity of the region. The ongoing development of Langford is likely to continue for the foreseeable future.

That said, I believe that the root question in your email is in regards to service vehicle access and parking, which is something that I can address directly (and yes, it does register in our minds as Planners, as well as in the minds of Architects, Traffic Engineers and Developers). You seem to be of the opinion that there is no consideration given to delivery vehicle parking, and that somehow we would be better served by returning to wasteful land use practices that may be found in the subdivision designs of the 1970s in Colwood (also available in parts of Langford too). The reality is that your need for delivery vehicle parking has been considered in each new multi-family residential building and it should be clearly marked for you as "visitor" parking. If you find that your customer's buildings do not have visitor parking that is available for you to use, then that is another matter, and you should ask your customer's to address with their strata board, or their landlord. It is not the City's responsibility to police parking on private property. If the situation cannot be addressed to your satisfaction with your customers, I believe you are within your rights as a business operator to refuse service.

To your question about a "traffic and mobility upgrade fund", the answer is most definitely yes. All new development pays money, depending on the proposed density, towards the City's Roads Development Cost Charge program. You can review the DCC bylaws on the City's website and see the rate at which new development pays, and the infrastructure upgrades that will be funded with these monies. In addition to the DCCs (which also include payments for parks and park improvements, water and schools) new development is obligated to complete road improvements along their frontages to Municipal standards and the satisfaction of the Director of Engineering. Were it not for the contributions made by new development in these two ways, I would imagine that you would find it even more difficult to navigate the streets of Langford, or that your property taxes would be significantly higher.

In closing, if you are opposed to development in Langford (which is your right), then I have little to offer in the way of comfort. If you look at the City's Official Community Plan and the

CRD's Regional Growth Strategy, you will see that the City Centre of Langford is on a path towards growth, densification and redevelopment. I thought you should know this.

Sincerely,

Matthew Baldwin, MCIP RPP
Director of Planning and Subdivision

From: Bwayne Powa [REDACTED]
Sent: August 11, 2021 12:51 PM
To: Langford Planning General Mailbox <planning@langford.ca>
Subject: New apartments concerns

As a resident of Langford close to Jacklin and Goldstream, I am frustrated with the relentless and careless pace of development here. A recent and ongoing situation at the intersection of hockley and peatt is an example of overkill. Developing three high density buildings simultaneously has caused unfair congestion, noise, and disruption in the area, and difficulty for service vehicles to access and park. **Another example is the perpetual disruption of traffic flow at peatt and brock. I hope** Langford can take a more paced approach to development in the future.

Another concern is the increase of traffic density these developments will bring. Do developers pay into a traffic and mobility upgrade fund?

Finally, as a delivery driver working often in the Langford westshore area, I encounter a DEFINITE disregard for delivery vehicle parking provision at these new apartment buildings. Even the new detached homes on bear mountain, and the westhills lack adequate street parking. City planners must be cognizant of the surge in online ordering and how many things are being delivered to residents now. However, this apparent fact does not seem to register in the minds of architects and planners. I hope this changes.

By contrast, I find areas in colwood to be very delivery friendly, as there is adequate spacing and road shoulders to pull over.

If we are going to see more of these practices, then I am opposed to more 'development' in Langford.

Thank you for your understanding,

Sincerely,
Wayne Ojala
Langford, BC