

Trina Cruikshank

From: Marie Watmough
Sent: September 13, 2021 1:18 PM
To: Langford Planning General Mailbox
Subject: FW: Proposed Changes to Westhills Development Agreement

Marie Watmough

Acting Director of Corporate Services

250.391.3447

From: Barb MacDonald [REDACTED]
Sent: September 13, 2021 12:44 PM
To: Mayor Young <mayor@langford.ca>; Denise Blackwell <dblackwell@langford.ca>; Lanny Seaton <lseaton@langford.ca>; Lillian Szpak <lszpak@langford.ca>; Matt Sahlstrom <msahlstrom@langford.ca>; Norma Stewart <nstewart@langford.ca>; Roger Wade <rwade@langford.ca>; Marie Watmough <mwatmough@langford.ca>; Braden Hutchins <bhutchins@langford.ca>; Darren Kiedyk <dkiedyk@langford.ca>; langfordvoters@gmail.com
Subject: Proposed Changes to Westhills Development Agreement

I am writing about the proposed changes to the Westhills development agreement. Please say no to the proposal to change the 40% greenspace dedication to "open space" dedication. My understanding is that currently only 10% of the required 40% parkland has been dedicated and that the developer is seeking to change the definition so that they can include things like engineered fill slopes, grass (astroturf?) medians and boulevards, and even the YMCA and adjacent Park & Ride parking lot. This is completely unacceptable. The developer should not be allowed to fall short of their original promises. This type of backtracking on commitments seems to be common in Langford where many things are promised like setbacks, greenspace, number of houses/townhouses/apartments, etc. but then later applications take them away. Please send a message to developers that they will be required to keep their promises.

I request that this letter be provided to the planning committee as a late submission and be part of the package forwarded to council. Thank you for your attention.

Barb MacDonald
2972 Leigh Place
Langford, BC V9B 4G3
[REDACTED]

Trina Cruikshank

From: Leah Stohmann
Sent: September 13, 2021 12:26 PM
To: Trina Cruikshank
Subject: FW: Amendments to Westhills development plan

Westhills correspondence for tonight – thanks!

Leah Stohmann, MCIP, RPP

Deputy Director of Planning and Subdivision, Approving Officer

250.478.7882 x4409

From: Catherine Vanderwereld [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, September 13, 2021 11:35 AM
To: Mayor Young; Denise Blackwell; Lanny Seaton; Lillian Szpak; Matt Sahlstrom; Norma Stewart; Roger Wade; Marie Watmough; Braden Hutchins; Darren Kiedyk; langfordvoters
Subject: Re: Amendments to Westhills development plan

Mayor and Council,

I am writing with regard to proposed changes to the Westhills development agreement.

I have concerns about many of the proposed changes, but the one that stands out most for me is the attempt to change 40% greenspace dedication to "open space" dedication.

My understanding is that currently only 10% of the required 40% parkland has been dedicated, and that the developer is seeking to change the definition so that they can include things like engineered fill slopes, grass (plastic grass?!) medians and boulevards, and even the YMCA and adjacent Park & Ride parking lot! I strongly believe, and am certain that most folks in the neighbourhood affected would agree, that the developer should not be allowed to fall short of their original promises. This company has many an incredible amount of money and should be happy to stick to their original plans and make Westhills an enjoyable place to live.

I request that this letter be provided to the planning committee as a late submission and be part of the package forwarded to council, as I am working tonight and will not be able to call in.

1)

Sincerely,

Catherine Vanderwereld

3484 Happy Valley Rd

Trina Cruikshank

From: Colby Heddon [REDACTED]
Sent: September 13, 2021 1:06 PM
To: Langford Planning General Mailbox; Denise Blackwell; Mayor Young; Roger Wade; Norma Stewart; Lillian Szpak; Matt Sahlstrom; Lanny Seaton
Subject: Sept 13th Westhills Zoning Amendment - Application Z21-0020

Dear Mayor and Council Members,

I am writing to you regarding the proposed amendments to the Westhills CD3 (Comprehensive Development 3 – Westhills) zoning, which will predominantly affect current citizens living in Westhills and the remaining undeveloped lands. I encourage all members of the Planning, Zoning and Affordable Housing Committee to reject this application and to instead direct staff to initiate a public consultation process regarding the proposed changes.

While Westhills was originally touted as a new sustainable addition to our community, I feel that the current course of the master planned development has been anything but. Over the past 15 years, citizens have witnessed a dramatic transformation of previously contiguous forested lands containing wetlands and rocky outcrops into a patchwork assembly of parking lots, astroturf boulevards and isolated single family home neighbourhoods.

In its original vision, Westhills portrayed itself to be a walkable community development that would provide affordable and attainable family orientated housing. And yet as traffic congestion in Langford worsens with residents expressing concerns related to pedestrian and cyclist road safety, the applicant seeks to add vehicle based services including drive-thru banks, restaurants and “parking facilities in enclosed buildings” (parkades). This proposal also requests consideration of a new road connection between Westshore Parkway and Parkdale Road to “alleviate traffic on Alouette”. Though I am happy that this issue is being heard, unfortunately, available research suggests that increasing the road network to accommodate vehicle traffic only works to encourage more traffic and in this case would contribute to further deforestation.

In addition to these concerns, changes to the Parkland Dedication Agreement are being sought by the applicant at a time when residents and community experts are yelling out for better protection and conservation of undeveloped, forested land. Though I recognize the amount of housing that is being built in Langford and the role it plays in addressing the ongoing housing crisis, I am against the continual build out of greenfield developments as they do not support or create transit-orientated communities. Even after 15 years of build out, the details around parkland dedication in the “master planned” Westhills community remain murky at best, with non-descript map attachments and requests for Park dedications to remain negotiable as future subdivision plans advance.

I strongly urge the PZAHC to reject the proposal to include a variety of uses into their parkland dedication, including the request to include the Park and Ride Parking Lot and centre road grass medians as part of their parkland dedication. These lands do not function as public parks in their current state and should not be considered as part of the required land dedication. Moreover, as Westhills has currently only dedicated approximately 50 acres of the 200 acres required for their 40% parkland dedication, it seems reasonable to seek opportunities to ensure the remaining dedicated land requirement is strategically selected to protect remaining ecological connectivity while enhancing public access where appropriate.

As you move forward, it is critical to consider how the decisions made by you today will impact our community's long-term social, ecological and financial wellbeing and resilience. Please consider the needs of the citizens currently living in Langford and reject the application to amend the CD3 (Comprehensive Development 3 – Westhills) Zone as proposed in the September 13th Staff Report.

Lastly, I request that this email be included as a late submission letter into today's September 13th meeting package as I am unable to attend tonight's virtual meeting.

Thank you for your time,
Colby Harder

844 Goldstream Avenue


Trina Cruikshank

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: September 12, 2021 8:42 PM
To: Langford Planning General Mailbox
Subject: New submission from Topic Contact Form

Topics

Community Planning, Land Use and Affordable Housing

Name

Esther Sustersich

Phone

[REDACTED]

Address

2139 Gourman Place
Victoria, British Columbia V9B 6C5
Canada
[Map It](#)

Email

[REDACTED]

Message

Good evening,
I am writing in regards to information that I read about Westhills. My understanding is that they want to apply for the following:
Proposing to provide remaining 40% dedication as "open space" rather than greenspace
Requesting to include the YMCA and adjacent Park & Ride parking lot be included as parkland contribution.
Requesting to remove the requirement to have 40% of the lands be dedicated to the City.

These proposals are absurd. To even consider that one would include a parking lot as parkland? Perhaps they do not speak English and they saw the word park in the words parking lot? Langford is building so many residences. People who are moving and living here NEED parks.

Also, if the land is simply dedicated to the City of Langford, how can we be GUARANTEED it will be real parkland? NOT a parking lot for the stadium, NOT artificial turf on a median, or some other equally ridiculous thing that our current Mayor and Council comes up with?

Langford is systematically clear cutting every last tree here. Years ago when Westhills was given the go ahead, and the 40% was in place, it was done with an expectation (by the residents) that this would be honoured. Perhaps our long standing Mayor knew all along that this would not come to fruition? I am SO angry that this is even something that is going to be considered. And by the way, I do not live in a 2 million dollar home, and did not just move here.

Thank you.

Esther Sustersich.

Trina Cruikshank

From: Holly Adams [REDACTED]
Sent: September 13, 2021 2:58 PM
To: Mayor Young; Denise Blackwell; Lanny Seaton; Lillian Szpak; Matt Sahlstrom; Norma Stewart; Roger Wade; Marie Watmough; Braden Hutchins; Darren Kiedyk; langfordvoters
Subject: Council meeting on September13th 2021

To whom it will concern,

I am writing regarding the proposed changes the promised 40% park protection in the Westhills development.

As stated on the municipal website, the City of Langford's elected representatives have strong, and visionary leadership. I would love to see council live up to these aspirations by upholding the previous agreement with the Westhills developer, and not allowing them to renege on their promises and deliver less than was agreed upon. I see no reason for Council to be considering changes to the original proposal.

It is obvious that there are advantages to the developer if Langford agrees to the proposed changes, but I do not see why that should be considered here. The developer is already making a huge amount of profit from this project, so I do not understand why they should be allowed to back out of their commitments.

In the councils view what are the specific benefits to the citizens of Westhills from this proposed change? Will Westhills be a more livable, enjoyable community if Langford allows the promised 40% park protection to include things like plastic grass and parking lots? Will the changes promote walkability in the community, or will changing the 'parkland' definition to include paved parking lots and traffic meridians increase automotive traffic and pedestrian congestion? I know I would prefer to walk to the local bus stop through a wooded park rather than an unshaded and busy parking lot.

This does not even touch on how this proposed change contradicts the Canadian government's climate plan as outlined in 'A Healthy Environment and a Healthy Economy' in December of 2020.

I request that this email be included as a late submission letter into today's September 13th meeting package as I am unable to attend tonight's virtual meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention,
Holly Adams

Trina Cruikshank

From: karla [REDACTED]
Sent: September 13, 2021 2:04 PM
To: Langford Planning General Mailbox
Subject: Proposed Zoning Amendment Z21-0020

Hello,

I live at 3007 Dornier Road and I am writing to oppose the proposed amendment Z21-0020.

While I understand the need to affordable housing, I do not believe the subject properties should be zoned for this use. Westhills is already compact and squished-in community and adding additional housing in this area will worsen this. The roads cannot handle the level of traffic. I am already concerned with the amount of housing being developed north of Mt Wells. I feel there was a lack of foresight with the approval of the houses in this area as the roads cannot handle the volume of cars and trucks. Adding more houses will make this problem worse. In heavy traffic it can take an extra 20 minutes to travel from quality foods to my house.

With the increase in cars, I also worry about the safety of myself and my children. We have had many close encounters and near misses with drivers rushing through our neighbour and not paying attention to people crossing the roads. I am worried that more cars and more houses will make this worse. I have tried contacting the City about this issue but all I have received is rude remarks from staff in return.

I am also concerned about the removal of green space in our neighbourhood. I am worried about the damage that will be caused to the forests and the wildlife that inhabit it. We already have had bear sightings in our neighbourhood. Removing forests will increase these interactions. This area is one of the last green spaces remaining in Langford and I would hate to see it destroyed to cram in more housing.

Please do not add more houses to an already crowded area of Langford.

Thank you for considering this letter.

Karla Ridley

Trina Cruikshank

From: Kevin Johal [REDACTED]
Sent: September 13, 2021 10:52 AM
To: Langford Planning General Mailbox
Subject: Zoning Amendment Z21-0020

To whom it may concern,

I am a resident of Westhills and I am writing in objection to the Zoning Amendment Z21-0020. I object to the zoning amendment for the following reasons:

1) The lack of green space in Westhills

Currently there is a lack of green space in the Westhills area of Langford. Adding housing more, particularly in the subject property that is east of Mount Wells Regional Park will greatly reduce the little forested area remaining in this area. Currently every conceivable plot of land in the Western Communities is being converted to a housing subdivision. I would like to see this green space set aside. Studies have shown that community forests provide numerous environmental, social, and economic benefits.

Forested areas reduce air pollution, reduce temperatures in the summer of urban areas and protect biodiversity and wildlife. Urban forests store water, reduce stormwater runoff, and prevent land erosion (Berland, 2017; Bartens, Day, Harris, Dove, & Wynne, 2008). Studies have shown that urban forests reduce the effects of climate change in urban areas by providing a cooling effect while also helping cities and towns adapt to climate change (Sinnott, 2018; Wang & Akbarib, 2016; Livesley, McPherson, & Calfapietra, 2016). They further reduce air pollution and filter CO₂ out of our atmosphere (Nowak, Hirabayashi, Doyle, McGovern & Pasher, 2018). With the continual weight of climate change bearing down on us, we need to preserve these areas in our local community for our children. Not only that, they provide a habitat for wildlife and preserve biodiversity (Sandström, Angelstam, & Mikusiński, 2006). They reduce interactions between people and animals, keeping both parties safe.

Urban forests provide health benefits to members in the community as they promote mental well-being and reduce stress, heart rate, blood pressure (Kardan et al., 2015). They reduce instances of obesity and asthma (Ulmer et al., 2016), and have been shown to reduce instances of crime and violence (Sandström, Angelstam, & Mikusiński, 2006), while creating a sense of community. I would like my children to grow up in a healthy and vibrant community where they can enjoy the forested areas and nature.

Finally, urban forests provide economic benefits to those of use to live around them. They have been demonstrated to add value of between \$1.88 and \$12.70 for every dollar spent on maintaining them (Alexander & McDonald, 2014), as well as increase property values of the people in the area (Escobedo, Adams, & Timilsina, 2015).

2) Lack of infrastructure in Westhills

There is currently a lack of infrastructure in Westhills to handle the current occupants of this area, let alone the new housing already under construction off Irwin Road and Langford Parkway. Our roadways are already crowded and at capacity. Adding additional housing beyond what is planned will only exacerbate the problem. Traffic in and out of the neighbourhood is already terrible. This will worsen with additional housing in the area.

While I appreciate the need for affordable housing, I ask that the committee please reconsider the area in which it is planned.

Sincerely,
Kevin Johal

3007 Dornier Road, Victoria BC, V9B 0N1

Trina Cruikshank

From: Matthew Baldwin
Sent: September 7, 2021 12:52 PM
To: LARA ALLSOPP; Marie Watmough
Cc: Trina Cruikshank; Julia Buckingham
Subject: RE: Zoning Amendment Notice Z21-0020 - Please provide specific change requests

Good afternoon Ms. Allsopp,

Thank you for your recent email.

The notification procedure for Council's Planning Zoning and Affordable Housing Committee establishes a reasonable radius for notification. It certainly does not preclude you from participating in the discussion around this rezoning. We hope that people will also notice the sign that we post on the property and the advertisement in the paper which will occur before Public Hearing.

Regarding your concerns about electricity, I cannot confirm what BC Hydro has told you, but I am not aware that Westhills sought or obtained a variance from the City's Subdivision and Development Servicing Standards with respect to underground v. overhead wiring. As your concerns about a safe, continuous supply of electricity and how it may affect your job and patient health, I would suggest speaking with your employer and ask them to address this issue directly with BC Hydro. The City does not supply electricity, nor do we maintain the electrical infrastructure.

I feel that I also have to address your claim that Westhills has "already destroyed most of our 40% mandated greenspace of 'natural forest' and walking trails". This statement is simply false. We will provide you with the staff report that we have prepared for next Monday's Planning Zoning and Affordable Housing Committee on this Friday afternoon, and you will see that much of the discussion revolves around how Westhills will dedicate to the City as Park, much of the 40% open space that is required by the zoning. Some of these lands, such as Parkdale Hill will be directly beneficial to you, due to their proximity to your home.

I trust that this information is helpful.

Sincerely,

Matthew Baldwin, MCIP, RPP

Director of Planning and Subdivision

250.474.6919

From: LARA ALLSOPP [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, September 7, 2021 12:22 PM
To: Marie Watmough <mwatmough@langford.ca>
Cc: Langford Planning General Mailbox <planning@langford.ca>; Matthew Baldwin <mbaldwin@langford.ca>
Subject: Re: Zoning Amendment Notice Z21-0020 - Please provide specific change requests

Hi,

Thank you but for the Westhills the re-zoning affects all of us. For example they did the re-zoning without telling us, to allow the developers to build above ground hydro lines in the middle of trees along WSP, which now creates havoc for us left without power for 24-36 Hours in the middle of winter every year with no heat.

I run all the computers in all hospitals in BC and we are now mandated to work from home. The last power outage meant I was unable to deal with a hospital emergency in FHA when their servers went down taking out the NICU. These yearly outages now impact my ability to provide emergency patient care.

I bought in Westhills in 2009 because BCHydro engineers said the subdivision would be entirely underground on its own grid.

As for the changes they already destroyed most of our 40% mandated greenspace of “natural forest” and walking trails when they clear-cut the forest for concrete bike jumps. Now residents have no access to leisure walks through the woods that we used to do.

We are all concerned they are going to remove even more greenspace.

Cheers,
Lara

On Sep 7, 2021, at 10:01 AM, Marie Watmough <mwatmough@langford.ca> wrote:

Good morning Ms. Allsop,

Thank you for your email. The lands for which the rezoning is being sought are those portions of lands within the Westhills area which have not been developed, not the whole of Westhills. The City sends out notices to those owners of properties within 100 m of the property(ies) for which the application has been made, as required by the *City of Langford Public Notification Procedures Bylaw*. In your case, you are outside of this zone and therefore will not have received notice. This item is scheduled to be on the Agenda for the Planning and Zoning Committee meeting on Monday September 13. The agenda package will be available on our website this Friday afternoon and will include all the information being presented to the committee.

If you have any further questions, please do not hesitate to reach out to me.

Regards,

Marie Watmough
Acting Director of Corporate Services
250.391.3447

From: Lara Allsopp [REDACTED]
Sent: September 3, 2021 9:55 PM
To: Langford Planning General Mailbox <planning@langford.ca>; Marie Watmough <mwatmough@langford.ca>
Subject: Zoning Amendment Notice Z21-0020 - Please provide specific change requests
Importance: High

Hi,

I am one of the first 6 residents to reside in Westhills and yet I appear to be absent from the Meeting Notice mailing list with regards to Westhills re-zoning.

Can I please be added to the mailing list. 1196 Parkdale Creek Gdns, Victoria, BC V9B 4G9

It appears that there was an Zoning change meeting notice sent out Z21-0020 to some Westhills Residents (but not all) that does not appear on the City Hall Public Notices, nor on your planning committee website links.

The Proposed Zoning is to “make various changes to the Westhills Zone and Master Development Agreement” and yet there was nothing included in the letter as to what specifically the changes were to entail. I have read and studied both documents fully (attached) and we as Westhills residents in our Westhills residents group would like to know specifically and exactly which wording in the attached documents has been requested to be changed.

Can you please upload the required specific documents to the Public Notices with the exact wording so that we know what changes the developer wants to make.

<https://www.langford.ca/city-hall/public-notices/> No reference to Z21-0020

<https://www.langford.ca/city-hall/planning-zoning-and-affordable-housing-committee/> No reference to Z21-0020

Cheers,
Lara Allsopp


1196 Parkdale Creek Gdns, Victoria, BC V9B 4G9

“This is our time to be kind, to be calm and to be safe” Dr Bonnie Henry

Trina Cruikshank

From: Lara Allsopp [REDACTED]
Sent: September 11, 2021 11:57 PM
To: Trina Cruikshank; Langford Planning General Mailbox; Langford Engineering General Mailbox
Cc: Matthew Baldwin; Leah Stohmann
Subject: RE: Westhills Report

Hi,

Thank You.

I would like to submit an official concern that what WAS a requirement of 40%-50% "greenspace called Parkland and natural space" is now being removed and being replaced by 40% "open space" which includes the Concrete buildings like YMCA, concrete parking lots, the Bus Stop, the concrete bike park and non "GREEN NATURAL" spaces that were included in the original Master Agreement. Concrete parking lots and concrete bike jumps are NOT Greenspace, neither is artificial turf.

The Master Agreement should NOT allow the removal of the 40% greenspace mandate. That is why we purchased in Westhills and why many other families have too.

We also want to see the agreement to include traffic safety upgrades implemented at Langford Lake Road and Langford Parkway (near Tim Hortons) that includes trimming the bottoms of the trees so that you can see the oncoming cars to turn left off LPW onto LLR, and cars can see the pedestrians.

The other day a pedestrian was hit by a car due to the negligence shown by Langford at their refusal to address the lack of visibility at that intersection. The RCMP have repeatedly raised it as a concern as have many residents. That intersection needs a traffic control light or a stop sign or a roundabout or something. I did pass along to the pedestrians family that if they wanted to sue the city for negligence I will happily testify and provide my emails from the past years and the RCMP who also raised concerns could be called as witness too.

I read that the new Tech Building going in by the YMCA is going to house 100 employees and all of those people are going to be exiting via that same intersection and I am not sure if they are aware at how dangerous it is to be moving into that location where you risk your life walking the crosswalk.

This is from the current agreement:

3.3 Parks and Open Space

Forty percent of the plan area is proposed as park land.

Most of the park land is contemplated to be kept in a natural state and is proposed to be improved through the removal of invasive species. Recreational trails throughout will provide the residents opportunities to walk and bicycle.

One of the significant features of the plan is the provision of a public fishing pier and beach on Langford Lake.

An emphasis on compact, high density development will conserve land: 40% of the area will be preserved as parkland and 100% of wetlands and streams will be protected.

...with approximately 84 ha (207 acres) of the subject property being designated as park (equivalent to 40% of the total land area).

Protect Regional Green and Blue Space. Approximately 40% of the Westhills site is designated as green space, while areas of protected forest will provide wildlife corridors and largely maintain natural viewscapes from across Langford Lake.

The layout of the Westhills Green Community is approximate so that the location of land uses can be shifted to protect sensitive ecosystems provided that approximately 50% of the total area subject to the Westhills Master Plan is preserved as park

4.2.1 Imperiled Species and Ecological Communities: The Westhills Community should protect imperiled species and ecological communities. Implementation of development should incorporate the guidance of biologists during site specific designs.

4.2.2 Parkland Preservation: The Westhills Community should preserve significant portions of the property as new parklands.

4.2.9 Site Disturbance: The development of the Westhills Community should seek to minimize site disturbance. This objective is furthered by the high density of the development, particularly in the commercial core and the large portion of land left as open/green space.

This is what we were promised and is clearly outlined in the Bylaw and the Westhills Owners said and was guaranteed to those that purchased because it part of a Bylaw.



This is what we got? NO trees left. No park, no grass, no walking space at all? This is NOT Greenspace. This is concrete and fake grass.



Cheers,
Lara

"This is our time to be kind, to be calm and to be safe" Dr Bonnie Henry

From: Trina Cruikshank <tcruikshank@langford.ca>

Sent: Friday, September 10, 2021 2:42 PM

Cc: Matthew Baldwin <mbaldwin@langford.ca>; Leah Stohmann <lstohmann@langford.ca>

Subject: Westhills Report

Good afternoon,

You recently requested a copy of the Westhills report. Planning, Zoning, and Affordable Housing Committee Agendas are posted to our website the Friday afternoon prior to the Committee Meeting. The Agenda was just posted and here is the [link](#).

Trina Cruikshank

Assistant Land Development

City of Langford

☎ 250.478.7882 x4606

2nd Floor, 877 Goldstream Avenue | Langford, BC V9B 2X8

Langford.ca 

Langford | where **it all** happens.

Please review our email privacy policy at Langford.ca/privacypolicy

Trina Cruikshank

From: Laurie Plomp [REDACTED]
Sent: September 13, 2021 3:03 PM
To: Lanny Seaton; Norma Stewart; Matt Sahlstrom; Lillian Szpak; Roger Wade; Denise Blackwell; Mayor Young; Langford Planning General Mailbox
Subject: new Westhills agreement

Dear Mayor and Council:

I would like to express my opposition to the existing agreement with Westhills being amended, particularly without any extensive neighbourhood consultation before any conditions are agreed to. In particular, the redefining of the 40% requirement for parkland to now include SPEAs, engineered fill slopes, public plazas, medians and boulevards, and parking lots is contrary to the intention of the original requirement and is not what the residents of Westhills or Langford were told would happen.

It is now 15 years since the Westhills CD3 plan was developed, and in that time only 10% of the required 40% has been provided. This should no longer be allowed to be the final step before a development is completed, but rather Langford residents should be shown up front where the remaining 30% will be located and what they will consist of, after being allowed input into those decisions.

Sincerely,
Laurie Plomp

Trina Cruikshank

From: Lisa Carlson [REDACTED]
Sent: September 12, 2021 8:06 PM
To: Langford Planning General Mailbox
Subject: Zoning Amendment to Development - Westhills CD3

To the Planning, Zoning and Affordable Housing Committee, City of Langford

Re: Westhills Development Zoning Amendment (CD3)/ and pending Parkland Dedication Agreement.

The timing of this meeting and the failure to properly notify the community of its occurrence is incomprehensible. Many in the neighbourhood did not get the mail out or only received paperwork photocopied on one side and therefore missed pieces of the communication. The request put forward from community members for the complete package via email was not honoured for many and for others was received on Friday afternoon essentially providing one business day for review prior to this meeting.

It appears the developers are trying to reduce the amount of green space required of them in their development. The 40% land dedication needs to be strongly considered here. The proposal for a park & ride railway platform and parking lot to be included as a portion of the 40% should not constitute parkland in any reasonable person's mind. Nor does it appear that a train of any kind will come to fruition, so this seems to be a handoff of space shrouded as Public Use.

The original development plan suggested wetlands and streams would be protected but this has clearly not been a priority. They are requesting approval in their Appendix based on a best guess/rough draft. But as their past has shown they will then ask to significantly redraw maps included in the Appendix and alter what constitutes a percentage of Parkland after the fact. In addition, the plan is for undefined areas to be further developed based on speculative future needs. Shouldn't there be a master plan put forward that outlines the project in detail based on their biological impact assessments and traffic assessments so that they can accurately understand what the impacts will be before starting? Here we are looking at their request to redraw maps after the fact so that they now look like a development that is significantly different from what was sold to the public. My understanding is that most of the Parkland was to be kept in a natural state and proposed to be improved through removal of invasive species; however, adding paved pathways and synthetic turf and calling it green space is not quite what was proposed by natural state. As a resident who chose to live in this area for its proximity to nature I am beginning to feel I have been sold a false bill of sale by the developers. Suggesting that they are protecting wildlife corridors is laudable. The previous allocations including the bike park have resulted in stream bank erosion, further deforestation (including trees in close proximity to the watershed), constant unsanctioned trail additions, dust creation which impacts the watershed and has been a mess in adjacent neighborhoods, and habitat loss for many of the species that live here. What used to be a wildlife corridor is no more. The section of land at the East end of Commander Court has become an narrow

channel with little protection between houses and watershed. The deforestation of mature trees that already started with the additional quad trails has been noted as destructive. One request would be for consideration of Parkland dedicated at the East end of Commander Court in alignment with the green spaces farther up the street to ensure a wildlife corridor is preserved and mature trees remain standing.

Further, including what they are labelling as a rock climbing area in the proposed percentage is just area difficult for them to develop. The Westhills developer's original commitment to being a leader in green development has been scrapped entirely in this new proposal. There used to be a vision of being a community that other regions of Canada could look up to for its green development. The revised commitment to only achieve bronze LEED standards is yet another example of lowering the bar.

Planning drive-through banks and fast food chains will only further increase traffic to an area already suffering from overuse. If the City wishes for Langford to rid itself of the stigma of being the ghetto of the CRD, perhaps they shift gears from the garbage producing fast food chain plans and provide the community with restaurants with a little class. The last thing this neighbourhood wants is french fry wrappers and pop cups blowing into Langford Lake. Students at the local high school would benefit from the City approving something other than fast food and poor nutrition.

I understand traffic caused by construction occurring at Westshore Parkway and Sooke Road impacted neighbourhoods negatively; however, adding a road from Alouette Drive to Westshore Parkway is unnecessary and based faulty logic about traffic movement patterns and where people are going to and coming from. The additional proposed road merely reroutes people farther around where they are actually trying to get to. This plan simply shifts the issue of traffic flow from one neighbourhood to another.

In addition, once the elementary and middle schools open and the poorly designed and limited access points on the roadway will become evident at pick up/drop off times, the City can expect traffic jams at the roundabouts, which already happen regularly from Highway 1 through Westshore Parkway past the junction with Langford Parkway and down towards Jacklin Road. A larger Traffic Assessment of the traffic, not just in this area, but how it intersects with the surrounding areas is warranted before proceeding.

I apologize if this comes across as negative but my intentions are for the City of Langford to be a place we are all proud to live, work and play in.

Respectfully,

Lisa Carlson
1407 Commander Court
Victoria BC
V9B0T1

September 13, 2021

SENT VIA EMAIL

City of Langford Mayor & Council
2nd Floor, 877 Goldstream Avenue
Langford, BC V9B 2X8

Dear Langford Mayor & Council:

I am writing to voice my concerns around proposed amendments to the CD3 (Comprehensive Development – Westhills) Zone, as outlined in the [Staff Report](#) provided for this evening's Planning, Zoning, and Affordable Housing Committee's meeting. Please include this letter as a submission in the agenda for consideration during tonight's meeting.

My main concern is the proposed Parkland Dedication Agreement (PDA). First of all, I think the City needs to have a separate "Green Space" category in the PDA and not lump everything into an Open Space category. Including playing fields, trails, Streamside Protection Enhancement Areas, engineered fill slopes, public plazas, untouched greenspace, and a Park & Ride in the same Open Space category is unacceptable and diminishes the quality of actual green spaces. Actual green spaces provide habitat for wildlife and support healthy ecosystem functioning. Green spaces in Westhills act as habitat corridors to connect to surrounding green spaces such as Sooke Hills Wilderness Regional Park and Goldstream Provincial Park. Westhills residents deserve better natural spaces than a Park & Ride.

I strongly recommend that the City dedicate the remaining 30% of the 40% parkland dedication in Westhills before further development occurs. This will ensure this land is protected from development and doesn't become a parking lot. Langford could opt to protect a swath of natural areas in Westhills that all residents could enjoy and that could include trails for families to explore and hike. A large undeveloped park space would help Langford become a world class City – Vancouver has Stanley Park; Victoria has Beacon Hill Park; what would Langford like to be known for?

Due to the concerns outlined above, I strongly encourage Mayor and Council to choose Option 2 and reject this application to amend the zoning of the CD3 (Comprehensive Development 3 – Westhills) Zone.

Sincerely,

Matt Rodgers

2711 Windman Lane

Trina Cruikshank

From: Omid Aghaei [REDACTED]
Sent: September 12, 2021 6:32 PM
To: Trina Cruikshank; Langford Planning General Mailbox
Cc: Matthew Baldwin; Leah Stohmann; sara nikoofard
Subject: Re: Westhills Report

Hi Trina,

Thanks for the document regarding the changes to the Westhills zone and Master Development agreement. Regarding this proposal, we have the following concerns. We would appreciate it if these are communicated with Westhills and possibly raised during our meeting on Monday.

Westhills has made great effort to make this community an exemplary green built and sustainable environment. However, I would appreciate if they can clarify/comment on the followings:

- a. It seems Westhills could not fulfill the LEED ND V2009 on time (certification sunset of June 2021). I was wondering why it is not changing to LEED ND V4 or V4.1 which has no prerequisite on brown field to stop the certification for moving forward. They are rather credits that can be achieved or compensated with other credits (as far as I understood). Is the current development not able to get certified under either of those versions due to lack of points? or has the applicant lost interest? The newer version of LEED (V4.1), for example, allows for grid harmonization which can help reduce the load on the utility and shift the peak load in the community.
- b. What green standards is planning to be achieved? It is not clear to me at this point. However, deciding on one standard that can be certified by a third party like LEED or WELL would be much better than a "Sustainability Statement" that is not clear how or on what grounds it assesses the sustainability of a building. "Submitting a Sustainability Statement" as mentioned in page 24, to me, is not a good choice to move forward with.
- c. As these buildings will be constructed over the next decade I would suggest going for higher than certified LEED or Bronze level of Green built rather than lower possible certification level. These buildings are going to be built and left here for the next century. As climate change is an urgent problem, now is the time to tackle it while we have the opportunity. The today new built will be the future existing buildings. It is easier to build a greener, more efficient building today rather than fixing it as an existing building down the road. In addition, in a few years step code will move on to higher levels and there is nothing to stop us to build higher step levels today (i.e. net-zero energy ready building). Studies show that the technologies needed to achieve that level are already existing and the cost of building will not be more than 5 to 10% of the current industry norm (depending on the climate zone). We are in the perfect position to showcase that building a green community is not only possible but also it is economically feasible. This will be a great part of the demonstration project as it was originally outlined.

Thanks,

Dr. Sara Nikoofard, PhD, PENG, LEED Green Associate, CMVP

Dr. Omid Aghaei, PhD, PGEO

1483 Commander Crt

Langford, V9B 0T1

BC, Canada

On Fri, Sep 10, 2021 at 2:42 PM Trina Cruikshank <tcruikshank@langford.ca> wrote:

Good afternoon,

You recently requested a copy of the Westhills report. Planning, Zoning, and Affordable Housing Committee Agendas are posted to our website the Friday afternoon prior to the Committee Meeting. The Agenda was just posted and here is the [link](#).

Trina Cruikshank

Assistant Land Development

City of Langford

t 250.478.7882 x4606

2nd Floor, 877 Goldstream Avenue | Langford, BC V9B 2X8

Langford.ca 

Langford | where **it all** happens.

Please review our email privacy policy at [Langford.ca/privacypolicy](https://langford.ca/privacypolicy)

Trina Cruikshank

From: Peter Howland [REDACTED]
Sent: September 13, 2021 9:47 AM
To: Trina Cruikshank; Langford Planning General Mailbox
Cc: Matthew Baldwin; Leah Stohmann
Subject: RE: Westhills Report

Hello Trina and the Planning Committee,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed changes to the Westhills Comprehensive Development Zone.

I've had an opportunity to take a look at the staff report in the Link below. My wife (Mary Jane), my daughter, and I have lived in Westhills (on Parkdale Creek Gardens) for the past three years and will likely be directly impacted by some of the proposals included in the staff report.

Below are some of our comments related to the report.

Page 2 of 11, Changes to Area 5, We agree that the construction of a clubhouse at the Jodie Lunn Park is a good idea. The park is great and we have been regular users. However, we don't agree that the area presently shown as Area 5 "Langford Lake Foreshore" in Appendix B should include allowances for any commercial activities. This could allow for the unintentional development along the lake shore. We (and I expect that most residents of Langford) would be opposed to development between the rail corridor and the lake.

Page 5 of 11, Removal of LEED-ND compliance. While the removal of the LEED-ND certification from the MDRA is understood, it is unfortunate that Westhills appears to have strayed from attempting to be leader in more sustainable development, (e.g. district energy). Presently, all new construction appears to be destructive, with little thought to new sustainable options. The District Energy system was built over 12 years ago; did the system work, has it been a benefit to the environment and the community? If yes why is it not being replicated? Has anyone asked the questions? Are there any options being proposed or implemented? e.g. better transit access within Westhills, charging stations for electric cars, parking for car shares?

I would urge the committee to push for Westhills and all development within Langford to strive to higher standards in sustainability. Most new developments in Langford (including Westhills) are all centered on cars and as a result traffic in Langford is often extremely congested.

Page 5 of 11 – Regarding a road connection between Parkdale Road and West Shore Parkway, it is requested that the City ensure that when approving new roads that appropriate traffic calming measures are implemented during the design process, opposed to after the fact.

Efforts along Alouette Dr. are greatly appreciated as they appear to have reduced some of the high speeds and high volumes of traffic, however it's our understanding that it took years to implement and only after a significant effort on the part of the residents on Alouette. If a new road is to be constructed at Parkdale Rd. appropriate measures need to be implemented to ensure the safety of kids accessing Lighthouse School and the trail to Westhills playground.

Page 11 of 11 – Appendix D. It appears that Westhills is including a portion of Langford Lake within the proposed public space. It is not clear if Westhills is attempting to include a portion of the Lake within the 40% allocation for Public space. This area should be excluded.

General Traffic Concerns / Recommendations

It's our understanding that last week a child was struck in the crosswalk on Langford Parkway. Most roads in the area are congested with traffic often travelling at high speeds. There are a number of road infrastructure improvements that we would like the council to consider:

- Traffic calming and/or better signage on West Shore Parkway (Raceway?) for traffic travelling north and entering the 40 km/hr zone at Westhills. That crosswalk can be terrifying as vehicles (often large trucks) travelling at high speeds slam on their brakes while trying and stop for pedestrians.
- Crosswalk (with flashing lights) across Glen Lake Rd. at Glenview for safer access to Glen Lake Park.
- We would recommend installing a guardrail on the road side of the sidewalk at the trail exiting Jordie Lunn Park at Westshore Parkway (parallel to Commander Crt.). Bikes exit the trail up a hill and at a blind corner and may inadvertently go on to the road.
- Remove the restricted parking on Glenview and ShoreView Dr. The "Permit Holders" only parking restrictions are not consistent with nearby areas (i.e. Westhills) where parking is extremely limited. The parking restrictions are a privilege that is not afforded to other Langford residents. Some residents near Glen Lake Park are also installing rocks and traffic cones outside their property limits effectively claiming public road allowances at part of their private property.

Thanks Again,
Peter and Mary Jane Howland

From: Trina Cruikshank <tcruikshank@langford.ca>

Sent: September 10, 2021 2:42 PM

Cc: Matthew Baldwin <mbaldwin@langford.ca>; Leah Stohmann <lstohmann@langford.ca>

Subject: Westhills Report

Good afternoon,

You recently requested a copy of the Westhills report. Planning, Zoning, and Affordable Housing Committee Agendas are posted to our website the Friday afternoon prior to the Committee Meeting. The Agenda was just posted and here is the [link](#).

Trina Cruikshank

Assistant Land Development

City of Langford

t 250.478.7882 x4606

2nd Floor, 877 Goldstream Avenue | Langford, BC V9B 2X8

Langford.ca 

Langford | where **it all** happens.

Please review our email privacy policy at [Langford.ca/privacypolicy](https://langford.ca/privacypolicy)

Trina Cruikshank

From: Marie Watmough
Sent: September 14, 2021 8:57 AM
To: Langford Planning General Mailbox
Subject: FW: Changes to Westhills Greenspace designation

Marie Watmough

Acting Director of Corporate Services

250.391.3447

From: Rod Stiebel [REDACTED]
Sent: September 13, 2021 3:28 PM
To: Mayor Young <mayor@langford.ca>; Denise Blackwell <dblackwell@langford.ca>; Lanny Seaton <lseaton@langford.ca>; Lillian Szpak <lszpak@langford.ca>; Matt Sahlstrom <msahlstrom@langford.ca>; Norma Stewart <nstewart@langford.ca>; Roger Wade <rwade@langford.ca>; Marie Watmough <mwatmough@langford.ca>; Braden Hutchins <bhutchins@langford.ca>; Darren Kiedyk <dkiedyk@langford.ca>; langfordvoters@gmail.com
Subject: Changes to Westhills Greenspace designation

To: Mayor and Council,

I am writing about the proposed changes to the Westhills development agreement. Please say no to the proposal to change the 40% greenspace dedication to "open space" dedication. The understanding is that currently only 10% of the required 40% parkland has been dedicated and that the developer is seeking to change the definition so that they can include things like engineered fill slopes, grass (astroturf?) medians and boulevards, and even the YMCA and adjacent Park & Ride parking lot. This is completely unacceptable. The developer should not be allowed to fall short of their original promises. This type of backtracking on commitments seems to be common in Langford where many things are promised like setbacks, greenspace, number of houses/townhouses/apartments, etc. but then later applications take them away. Please send a message to developers that they will be required to keep their promises. I request that this letter be provided to the planning committee as a late submission and be part of the package forwarded to council. Thank you for your attention

Rod Stiebel
3270 Hazelwood Rd
Langford, BC
(FYI not a \$2 million dollar address)

Trina Cruikshank

From: Steffan McInnes [REDACTED]
Sent: September 12, 2021 6:57 PM
To: Langford Planning General Mailbox
Subject: RE: City of Langford Meeting, September 13, 2021 - Resident Statement

Dearest Langford Council members,

As a resident of Kettle Creek Crescent, my husband and I purchased our home because we fell in love with the amount of untouched, natural green space available right behind our house. When looking around our development there is little to no green space which we all need more of.

The forest of healthy, mature trees adds a level of privacy and opens up the feeling of our small home. We take joy in walking on the trail with our dog that runs the length of the ridge in this planned development area. We have seen bears, cougars, deer, owls, ravens, squirrels, bats, frogs, and rabbits regularly call this area home. [REDACTED] and are worried that we are about to lose this luxury by the addition of new neighbors looking down upon our property.

Many of the residents on Golden Spike sold the homes when the trees were cut down, and blasting started to make room for the school behind them. Now residents along Kettle Creek Crescent are starting to look at this as a consideration we will need to make ourselves. It would be nice to see the trail system and the green space left in tack or enriched for all to enjoy.

We hope the council will make some requirements for the developer to keep as much of our natural green spaces already available for its residents who enjoy them.

Thank you for your consideration,

Mrs. Elizabeth Mary McInnes
3137 Kettle Creek Crescent
Victoria, BC

Trina Cruikshank

From: Marie Watmough
Sent: September 13, 2021 1:44 PM
To: Langford Planning General Mailbox
Subject: FW: PROPOSED CHANGES TO WESTHILLS DEVELOPEMENT AGREEMENT

Marie Watmough

Acting Director of Corporate Services

250.391.3447

From: Island Designated Drivers [REDACTED]
Sent: September 13, 2021 1:35 PM
To: Mayor Young <mayor@langford.ca>; Denise Blackwell <dblackwell@langford.ca>; Lanny Seaton <lseaton@langford.ca>; iszpak@langford.ca; Matt Sahlstrom <msahlstrom@langford.ca>; Norma Stewart <nstewart@langford.ca>; Roger Wade <rwade@langford.ca>; Marie Watmough <mwatmough@langford.ca>; Braden Hutchins <bhutchins@langford.ca>; Darren Kiedyk <dkiedyk@langford.ca>; langfordvoter@gmail.com
Subject: PROPOSED CHANGES TO WESTHILLS DEVELOPEMENT AGREEMENT

September 13, 2021

Hello Mayor and Council:

I am writing in regards to the proposed changes to the Westhills development agreement. I am concerned about the attempt to change 40% greenspace dedication to "open space". From what I understand we still have 30% of the greenspace for dedication. The definition that the developers are proposing to change (greenspace to open space) will really have nothing to do with greenspace. It will give the developers more free reign to do what they want in lieu of greenspace, i.e. engineered filled slopes, plastic grass on boulevards and medians, as well as parking lots. The agreement of 40% greenspace was part of the original agreement and the developers should stick to that "Agreement". There has already been so much lost due to the development of Westhills such as trees, eco-systems, lack of well-planned infrastructure where traffic is being routed through small streets and the safety of residences at risk, peaceful living due to traffic, continual noise, blasting, drilling, dust etc. Also the health of beautiful Langford Lake that is most definitely deteriorating due to lack of vision around the Lake. The list goes on and I am sure this has all been brought to the attention of the Mayor and Council. As usual it appears the Developers are calling the shots for yet another "amendment" which seems to happen on a regular basis and it appears Mayor and Council support and choose the Developers over the citizens of Langford. I urge Mayor and Council to not pass this new proposal and stick to the original Development Agreement and keep greenspace at just that. Please add this letter to the planning committee as a late submissions as I may not be available to speak at tonight's council meeting.

Sincerely,

Stephanie Parsons
Goldstream Avenue

Trina Cruikshank

From: Sue Harper [REDACTED]
Sent: September 10, 2021 6:47 PM
To: Langford Planning General Mailbox
Subject: File Z21-00200 - Submission to Council

Subject: Text to amend to the Comprehensive Development 3 - Westhills (CD3) Zone.

As of 6:45 pm on Friday September 10th - I have not received any actual documentation regarding the proposed changes as promised by Matthew (the Planning Department), as I requested to Planning on September 3rd via email.

I have also checked my spam/junk email and there is nothing.

This is extremely disappointing as I am a resident of Westhills and it is impossible to be able to comment on any 'mystery' changes, by the deadline.

In addition to my complaint, I have heard from many neighbours they only received a 1 page single sided map, with the other side completely blank with no information on what is happening, or how to comment.

I am highly suggesting to the Chair of the Planning Zoning and Affordable Housing Committee that discussion of this Agenda item be delayed until the Planning Department can appropriately communicate those specific changes to ALL Westhills residents in an appropriate manner.

To put it bluntly, communication from the Planning Department has been abysmal and disgraceful at best. To knowingly move forward, without such appropriate communication, and opportunity to comment, would suggest that the Council is not interested in what affected residents actually think, which I hope is not the case.

Sue Harper
1210 Clearwater Place
Victoria, BC
V9B 0J2

Trina Cruikshank

From: Marie Watmough
Sent: September 14, 2021 8:56 AM
To: Langford Planning General Mailbox
Subject: FW: Westhills Land Proposal

Marie Watmough

Acting Director of Corporate Services

250.391.3447

From: Tina Clark [REDACTED]
Sent: September 13, 2021 4:59 PM
To: Braden Hutchins <bhutchins@langford.ca>; Denise Blackwell <dblackwell@langford.ca>; Darren Kiedyk <dkiedyk@langford.ca>; langfordvoters@gmail.com; Lanny Seaton <lseaton@langford.ca>; Lillian Szpak <lszpak@langford.ca>; Mayor Young <mayor@langford.ca>; Matt Sahlstrom <msahlstrom@langford.ca>; Marie Watmough <mwatmough@langford.ca>; Norma Stewart <nstewart@langford.ca>; Roger Wade <rwade@langford.ca>
Subject: Westhills Land Proposal

To City of Langford Mayor and Council:

I am writing about the proposed changes to the Westhills development agreement. Please say no to the proposal to change the 40% greenspace dedication to "open space" dedication.

We bought in Westhills over ten years ago when the original community plan was to be the first green "walking" community in North America. Initially, we were excited that Langford was supportive this green initiative and we were proud to be part of it. Since that time, we have witnessed the destruction of our natural surroundings, ponds, lakes, mountains and a complete movement away from the Green Community plan.

Westhills has moved away from geothermal energy and brought in gas, something that Westhills insisted would never happen. Westhills was so confident that gas would never be brought in that it actually states this on our house sales contract. This has left a few hundred homes stuck in an energy monopoly situation, paying for the capital costs of a failed "green" energy system and failed business plan.

I am a 49 year old life long resident of Langford and grew up on Langford lake. I was excited to share the beauty of this area [REDACTED] and create our own family memories. Now we are forced to drive 30 minutes to find a nice peaceful area with trees, nature and real grass to walk in.

My understanding is that currently only 10% of the required 40% parkland has been dedicated and that the developer is seeking to change the definition so that they can include things like engineered fill slopes, grass (astroturf?) medians and boulevards, and even the YMCA and adjacent Park & Ride parking lot. This is completely unacceptable. The developer should not be allowed to fall short of their original promises.

The entire reason we bought in Westhills was because of the green initiative. The City of Langford has a responsibility to its tax payers and residents to hold developers accountable to their originally proposed community plans.

I respectfully request that you turn down Westhills proposal to change from a green built community to a bronze built community.

I formally request that this letter be provided to the planning committee as a late submission and be part of the package forwarded to council. Thank you for your attention.

Best regards,

Tina Clark
3005 Waterview Close
Victoria BC
V9B0L9

