

Bethany Sherman  
302-2717 Peatt Road  
Victoria, BC  
V9B 3V2

September 23, 2021

**Attn: Council**  
The City of Langford  
Town Hall  
Langford, B.C.  
V9B 2X8

Dear Council,

**RE: File Z21-0015; Rezoning application from and R2 to CCP zoning status.**

My name is Bethany Sherman and I moved to Langford 2 years ago with my partner after purchasing our first home, in a condo called The 'Blackberry' at 2717 Peatt Rd. Though we are enjoying being in central Langford, for the proximity to most amenities, from day one we have dealt with many unsafe issues on and around Peatt Road, on a daily basis.

I will go into more detail about these issues and my concerns below. Based on my personal experience living on Peatt Road, it is my belief that these very real issues would only be exacerbated by the building of the Central and Gateway proposed buildings for Peatt Rd and Scafe Rd As well as along Arncote Rd and Sundlerland Rd.

We recently received a pamphlet advertising these proposed sites, both situated along Peatt Rd, and I was immediately extremely concerned and disappointed. This letter is being written to address my concerns with the rezoning application for the properties 2739, 2743, 2747, 2749, 2751 Scafe Rd and 2746 Peatt Rd; File Z21-0015; proposing going from and R2 to CCP zoning status. Approving this rezoning status for these proposed buildings is not the appropriate or safe plan. Nor will it benefit Langford or is it in the best interests of its residents in this area and especially around Peatt Road.

While I appreciate and understand that the Council is looking at alternatives for affordable housing in Langford, I do not believe these buildings on Peatt/Scafe Road are the right solution for this particular type of high density housing, especially in this particular area that already comes with some serious traffic and safety issues. The issues that already plague Peatt Rd will only be made worse not better by this plan; they will only increase the already unsafe challenges for all residents in the area.

Some of the issues we see on a daily basis include:

- Insufficient street parking available for current residents living in this area. The existing housing in and around Peatt Road is already high density housing. Unfortunately, when the existing housing was built, there were not sufficient parking spots made available in the townhouses/condos to accommodate the number of current residents in this area. One only needs to drive through the area on any evening and you would see the evidence of this with street parking.
- An excess of traffic (not just at rush hour, but during all hours of the day). Peatt Road is treated as a thoroughfare/short cut from the highway/Veterans Way and there is constant traffic on this road.
- Speed and impatience of vehicles driving down Peatt Road. As such, vehicles/drivers do not treat this road as a residential road, they consider it to be a thoroughfare and routinely speed over the speed limit. Maximized street parking also impedes the safety of the traffic speeding down the road not to mention the safety of pedestrians and children walking in the area.

The proposed building plan wants to add 271 units in 18 and 24 story buildings, with the entire site having a total of 346 parking stalls, in that, only 10 visitor spots.

From my personal experience living in this area for the last two years, this number of parking spots will not be sufficient to accommodate the number of proposed units; it is an unrealistic and risky assumption that families in this area will only have one car per household. For these 271 units there are going to be multiple people occupying each one, and there will be AT LEAST 1 vehicle per unit. Taking into account that these units will most likely be family homes, supported by **dual income households**; to be able to afford to purchase and/or rent the units, there will more likely be 2 vehicles per unit, and that's not taking into account families that have children able to drive. In an area that is already overcrowded with vehicles fighting for street parking spots, adding in another approximately 500+ vehicles, and that's not including the business's that will take up more space, it is definitely not reasonable to approve this rezoning application as presented.

There are many, many young families with children and pets going to and from parks/schools/shops who utilize Peatt and Scafe on a daily basis. As mentioned above, this road is already dangerous due to the quick access to the highway and Millstream overpass, vehicles not stopping at stop signs and crosswalks, the lack of speed limit enforcement and the sheer volume of traffic both pedestrian and vehicular. Scafe Rd is a quiet back road paralleling Peatt Rd and simply cannot handle that mass influx of traffic. Peatt Rd is a connecting/back road used for quick access to Goldstream Rd. People use Peatt and the surrounding roads to bypass the already ridiculous congestion along Veteran's Memorial. The immense amount of vehicles using this road already contributes to unsafe driving conditions with speed and impatience being the main factors. Adding a 271-unit building (727units for both proposed sites) would create an obscene amount of added bodies and vehicles, directly impacting the safety and livability of the families, children, elderly and animals living in this area. It is already exhausting to deal with and **it simply isn't safe.**

Recently we witnessed and participated in an accident that took place on Peatt Rd. A tow truck driver was attempting to attach a car from a street parking spot. When an impatient vehicle tried to pass the

tow truck driver, she hit the tow truck door as the tow truck driver was attempting to exit the vehicle, in turn knocking the driver to the ground and injuring him. As a Registered Nurse I immediately went down to assist in the situation before the emergency services arrived. The tow truck driver was then taken to the hospital. This is just one instance of the result of the unsafe conditions on Peatt Road and the type of incidents we witness on a regular basis.

This road is also a main access point for the Langford Fire Department, as it resides on Peatt, and emergency vehicles that service the surrounding area. It is unrealistic and a major oversight in thinking that by increasing the amount of vehicles and pedestrians in this small area, that emergency vehicles will not be affected negatively and reduce their ability to safely and effectively navigate this already narrow, congested and unsafe roadway, further putting everyone in the neighborhood at risk.

The future traffic plan listed in the Official Community Plan is a nice idea but not realistic in the short term. Langford is a commuting community and they are talking about adding another 2000 people to that commute. Where do you think they are coming from? They are coming from Victoria or Sooke or Sidney because it is becoming less affordable everywhere. There are many people that despite the plans to add businesses to Langford, still have to work in Victoria. This is not always negotiable for many people working in Victoria, and surrounding areas. The amount of changes and promotion in changing the traffic and transportation in Langford will take way longer than it will for these buildings to be built. And the damage and stress on the community these buildings will bring will already have been done by then.

In the Official Community Plan 1200 it states the goal of Policy 5.11.1 is to ensure architecture and landscape design reflects local climate, topography, and history. Two 20 plus story buildings (6 buildings in reality) will be an eye sore but also not adhering to this plan, allowing this size of building is doing the exact opposite. Langford is not Vancouver nor do we want it to be. We live on the island for a reason, not to be overshadowed by unwanted skyscrapers. These buildings do not need to be 20 stories; the lack of privacy on an already busy road will worsen. On a personal note, the lack of sun our building will receive will directly impact our mental health. These buildings will be in our immediate eye line and new view from our balcony; you are taking away trees and replacing it with concrete and glass. This is not the Langford we chose or want. We are all for growth and development, but not this way, this is the wrong direction to take. If the plan is to (Objective 5.11) promote a greater sense of place that celebrates our community's unique setting and people. Passing this rezoning application is the worst way to go achieve this goal.

There is the business and financial aspect of development, but there also needs to be practicality and safety within the progress of a community. I think we can all agree that the purpose of rezoning areas should be a benefit to all of Langford's tax paying and voting residents, not just the pockets of ambitious developers. This plan has asked for the maximum and minimum allowable variances in every instance without any regard for the effects this building will have on our community

I would request that the Council consider the serious implications of passing this rezoning application before approving the new construction of these buildings on Peatt, Scafe, Sunderland, and Arncliffe

Roads. At the very least, I would like to see the Council consider requiring a significant increase in onsite parking spots available for the proposed residents and businesses within the proposed buildings; also performing an actual/realistic traffic assessment. While this will not rectify the existing 'traffic/parking' issues it will help in alleviating the ongoing and any projected future challenges of street parking on Peatt Road. I would also like to see the Council consider implementing some safety measures on Peatt Road to both discourage the use of Peatt Road as a 'thoroughfare/bypass' as well as slow down traffic. Also ask yourselves if these massive buildings are right for our community, do they truly compliment Langford, or will they cause more problems than they are worth.

I thank you for your time and attention in considering my letter and my concerns.

Sincerely,

Bethany Sherman

September 25, 2021

Dear Council,

**RE: Files Z21-0013 and Z21-0015; Rezoning applications from and R2 to CCP zoning status.**

I am writing this letter to address the concerns that have been brought forth with these proposed buildings for Peatt, Scafe, Sunderland and Arncote Roads. I have lived in Langford for 2 years now, my partner and I reside in a Condo called 'The Blackberry located directly on Peatt Rd. We enjoy living in Langford, however I already lose sleep over the stress of and lack of parking along Peatt, and the idea of these buildings going in gives me nightmares.

The developer states with respect to file Z21-0015, that "The applicant has proposed to reduce the onsite parking from the required 356 stalls to 346 stalls. These 10 stalls would be considered 10 visitor stalls, which the applicant is proposing to provide along Scafe Road. Each residential unit would still have their required parking stall allocated to them onsite, so it would simply be some visitor stalls (which double as commercial parking) that would be provided for offsite".

I would like to address my concerns regarding the above proposal:

- we understand that if rezoned to a CCP zone, they are only required to provide 1.25 parking stalls for 0-2 bedroom unit, and 2.25 for 3 bedroom units per the bylaw. However, considering that they plan to add in a total of 727 units combined under both applications, this is not nearly enough parking stalls to manage that type of influx of residents.
- to accommodate the "visitor" stalls they propose taking away from the already meager amount of stalls they are proposing and allowing for 10 "extra"...for all of the visitors and employees/patrons accessing the residence and business sites. They specifically state that they will DOUBLE as commercial parking. I can guarantee that those visitor spots will never be open for visitors, as they will always be occupied by residents of the buildings. Housing, as "affordable" as it proposes, most of the units will be purchased or rented by a dual income household. This means multiple vehicles; based on the existing high density housing on Peatt Road, 1.25 parking stalls per unit is illogical.

I would enquire as to whether a study has been completed to determine if 1.25 parking stalls per 2 bedroom or even 1 bedroom unit is sufficient in this area? Based on my personal experience with 'fighting' for street parking spots on a daily basis, I would suggest that 1.25 parking stalls will not be sufficient.

Also when Reviewing the Developer's application, it states:

**Z21-0013**

A Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) for this development is required, which has already been submitted.

This is currently under review and is anticipated to be approved prior to Public Hearing. Currently, the version submitted recommends the following improvements beyond the immediate frontage:

- A right-turn only from Arncote onto Peatt;
- A designated northbound left-turn lane on Peatt to access Arncote.

**Z21-0015**

A Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) for this development has been submitted. However, the TIA does not state whether or not road improvements beyond the immediate frontage of this site are required. I would also like to enquire as to whether the traffic impact assessment completed, in fact, tracked a 24 hour traffic pattern assessment, both weekday and weekend, as this would generate a more accurate description of what traffic is truly like. I highly recommend that before any decisions are made that this is done, and done appropriately.

With an estimated potential 1500+ residents, added to this condensed area, not only will traffic and parking be a nightmarish safety hazard, but the pedestrian traffic of the proposed residents and children could present a safety hazard as well.

Point in fact, Peatt Road is treated as a thoroughfare/short cut from the highway/Veterans Way and there is constant traffic on this road (not just at rush hour, but during all hours of the day). As such, vehicles/drivers do not treat this road as a residential road, they consider it to be a thoroughfare and routinely *speed* over the speed limit. We have witnessed both speed and impatience of vehicles driving down Peatt Road on a regular basis. Maximized street parking also impedes the safety of the traffic speeding down the road not to mention the safety of pedestrians and children walking in the area.

Has any consideration be given to reducing the speed limit on Peatt Road? Are there any plans in place to not only address the current traffic issues but also the potential future traffic issues that will result from these proposed high density buildings?

This is also a mass increase of people in the community, a community that is already struggling with providing enough room for kids in schools. The developer mentions having daycare spaces in each proposed site. This will only be enough room to accommodate the residents of the building, if that. That's only enough if they can adequately staff it first, and have enough physical space for as many children that will occupy the buildings; 1800 square feet is not that big. The amount of children that could reside in these buildings could fill an entire elementary school, where is your proposed site for adding another school in the area?

As a current resident living in this area, my concerns are very real. I am hopeful that the Council will consider these additional concerns before approving these two rezoning applications.

Thanks kindly for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Brett Smith  
302-2717 Peatt Rd  
Victoria, BC  
V9B 3V2

## Trina Cruikshank

---

**From:** H Sharp [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** September 26, 2021 8:26 PM  
**To:** Langford Planning General Mailbox  
**Subject:** Zoning amendment Sunderland/Arncote/Peatt Rd Z21-0013

Good evening,

I am a concerned owner of a property bordering the proposed development site. While I appreciate and understand the need to build residential buildings higher in order to accommodate the growth in population of our city, the proposed location of these towers are not suitable at all. Peatt Rd already struggles to manage the traffic, and the proposal is to build over 400 units directly in this area? As a neighbour pointed out to me, earthquake safety has not been addressed by the developers given the height they wish to build. Structural safety is of paramount importance and does not appear to have been fully addressed by the developers.

Parking is already a significant issue in our neighbourhood with the number of residents that we currently have. Adding such a huge increase with these towers will cause many more issues with parking, since the surrounding streets will be directly impacted.

Many of us purchased properties knowing that townhouses and condos are the way of the future for Langford; but to build such high towers in an already densely populated neighbourhood without the necessary transportation networks to support it is ridiculous. Peatt Rd cannot support the large number of residents proposed; please consider a smaller number of units at a greatly reduced height of buildings.

Thank you,  
Helen Sharp

Owner: 102 – 2669 Deville Road, Langford, BC V9B 0C1

## Trina Cruikshank

---

**From:** Janis Walker [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** September 27, 2021 10:01 AM  
**To:** Langford Planning General Mailbox  
**Subject:** Sept 27 Planning and Zoning Meeting letter

From: Janis Walker and Grant Simpson  
861 Arncote Place (residents for 15 years)  
Homeowners

After participating in a public meeting approximately 5 years ago around the proposed rezoning and development on Peatt-Arncote-Sunderland, we were surprised to learn that the height has now changed from around 12 stories to 22, with increased towers. **Some confusion as the developers sign looks like 2 towers, but your meeting Notice lists four?** The residents did not like the idea 5 years ago, and this proposal is even larger. The following are concerns:

1. Not consistent with the area - The buildings should **reflect the surrounding area**. Up to 22 storeys on a small area of land adjacent to 3 level townhomes, single family homes, and 4 storey apartment buildings is not good community planning.
2. Traffic and Parking – it would be naive to think that marketing a complex as live and walk would mean most people wouldn't have cars and visitors with cars. Peatt Rd is only 2 lanes and the major intersection at Peatt and Veterans is already congested. Current parking is insufficient for the area.
3. Park/green space area - No park/green space seems to be connected to a complex that will have so many residents and their dogs. Our small park on Arncote Place cannot service all these families and their dog waste alone, as it already services surrounding area. **A development of this size needs greenspace.**
4. Noise - we have had continuous building noise and blasting over the years.

The city of Langford does not have to solve **all of the CRD's** affordable housing concerns. **Please consider a smaller development with some greenspace for all to enjoy.**



## Trina Cruikshank

---

**From:** Mary Wagner [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** September 24, 2021 4:26 PM  
**To:** Langford Planning General Mailbox  
**Subject:** Regarding the Planning Committee Meeting Sept 27, Specifically the Langford Gateway Development Rezoning

I am a Langford resident and would like to formally submit a few points for discussion during the meeting on September 27th regarding the rezoning application for the Langford Gateway Development. If it is not possible to address all the points in the meeting, then can they please be considered by the Planning, Zoning and Affordable Housing Committee and the Council.

1. I am deeply concerned about the shadow of the buildings impacting the neighbourhood, and I would request that a shadow study be provided by the applicant's architect prior to Public Hearing.
2. I would like to endorse the use of solar power wherever possible in any new developments including this one. For example, solar-powered street lights, solar-powered air vents etc.
3. I commend Council for working towards EV charging for residential parking spaces, and request that some EV charging stations be included for the visitors, and the commercial space, if this is not already the case.
4. I understand that the City's Official Community Plan does not have any height limits at this time, but I request that some restrictions be considered such as 12 storey towers, to be in line with other taller buildings in the area and not overburden any one area with such a large, sudden increase in density, light pollution, noise pollution, vehicle traffic, pedestrian traffic etc..

Sincerely,

Mary Wagner

104-2669 Deville Rd., Victoria, BC V9B 0C1

## Trina Cruikshank

---

**From:** Mary Wagner [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** September 26, 2021 3:14 PM  
**To:** Langford Planning General Mailbox  
**Subject:** Suggestions for Developments in Langford

Hello, I would like the Planning Committee and Council to ensure that new developments do not have unnecessary lighting, particularly above the ground floor. Signs and other lighting features create unwanted light pollution in the neighbourhood.

Also, with larger and larger development projects being proposed, I request that the Planning Committee and Council notify residents in a wider radius than the 100m that I believe is currently notified. The larger developments greatly impact a wider radius of the neighbourhood and residents should be informed within at least 200m or more.

Thanks for your consideration,

Mary Wagner

104-2669 Deville Rd., Victoria, BC V9B 0C1

26 September 2021

LAND DEVELOPMENT  
CITY OF LANGFORD

Langford Council

Although I would like to participate in your Monday night Sept 27 meeting we have found while surveying the immediate neighborhood, almost 100 walk, knock and talk so far (we are fully vaccinated, masked and take all precautions, we even ask people to use their own pen), within a one block radius of these proposals, HOME OWNERS indicate to us that the multitude of letters you are going to receive Monday Sept 27, which most have shared copies with us, cover pretty much the whole spectrum of why these developments are so inappropriate and unwanted, even with people in nice houses?

We are finding the response to our Reducing the Density petition of both these developments is overwhelming, and as you should know, going door to door talking to every HOME OWNER, listening to all their stories is very time consuming (but I really like it) and to answer your first question, YES, I Have nothing better to do!

Even though we have learned that many residents in the area are Federal employees or in the military and can not participate in a petition (lots of talk about attracting Federal employees lately?) a lot wished they could. We still have though, at this point, of doors answered 90% oppose 75% of which can and have signed in person, face to face.

So, of course, Monday I will be Surveying out a little further in the neighborhood, especially after the meeting. Just an idea, how about a town meeting out side at your soccer stadium when this comes up, we are going to need a big space, COVID Friendly and all. If we can go to games why not Town Halls?

I must confess, that's not my idea, but we will all support it!

My question? Who is going to assure people in a serious way, not in a pass the buck way, that these affordable housing units are going to people that need affordable housing not to investors that are going to hold on to them in numbered companies until nobody's looking and sell for a big profit. I all ready know your answer, but people really have to hear it for themselves. I remember back in the day when we were told to allow the big box stores and their taxes so we wouldn't have to expand like this, oh the good ol days

THANK-YOU

Your friend and neighbor since 1966

Rick Cuthbert

2648 Sunderland Rd.

Victoria B.C.

## Trina Cruikshank

---

**From:** Vafa J [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** September 27, 2021 1:29 PM  
**To:** Langford Planning General Mailbox  
**Cc:** Vafa J  
**Subject:** Preconditions on: Zoning amendment (File Z21-0013)

**To: Langford City Hall, Council & Planning Department**

**Subject: Zoning amendment File Z21-0013 , Mega towers project bordering Peatt Rd, Arncote Ave, Sunderland Rd.**

Dear City Council,

As an owner and tax payer of a residence across from this mega project from our townhouse complex (827 Arncote - Pura Vida, Strata 6445), I want to ensure that the current owners of our Strata maintain the property value and liveability of our properties. I ask the City of Langford to ensure that the following basic four items listed below form part of the preconditions for the developer in order for their project to be approved:

1. ensure the developer and the future *Langford Gateway Strata* guarantees "Pura Vida" (Strata 6445) at least 9 reserved visitors parking spaces (1 for each unit in our complex) within their parking facility with 24-hour access to it by the Strata 6445 units in perpetuity, without incurring any maintenance & strata fee costs.
2. ensure the developer and the future *Langford Gateway Strata* gives tenants of "Pura Vida" un-restricted access & use of their common area amenities (playground, gym, etc) at no cost of maintenance or strata fees to Strata 6445.
3. the zoning changes approved by the City Council must ensure that the developer and the future *Langford Gateway Strata* does not allow any of their commercial/office storefronts (CRU) to have tenancy that is not Family friendly such as but not limited to; Cannabis/Marijuana stores, Liquor stores, Sex shops, bars, night clubs, HazMat storage, Noisy/foul smelling factory, etc.
4. Ensure the City of Langford immediately designates the 4 existing street parking spaces in front of Units 102,104,106,108 (frontage of our complex on Arncote Ave - Strata 6445) as reserved residential parking space for Strata 6445 complex only. This has to happen before any demolition/construction begins. The developer that built "Pura Vida" complex, was required by the City to build these 4 parking spaces for the use of "Pura Vida" tenants & visitors. This status quo must remain intact.

Sincerely

Vafa Javanmardi (Owner & Taxpayer)  
106 - 827 Arncote Ave, Langford, BC (Strata 6445)  
[REDACTED]

## Trina Cruikshank

---

**From:** Wendy WA [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** September 26, 2021 7:57 PM  
**To:** Langford Planning General Mailbox  
**Subject:** Zone Proposal Z21-0013

Good Sunday evening,

Thank you for the meeting notice and for giving neighbours a chance to make submissions.

I will start by saying I am stunned at the idea of such tall buildings to house the many additional people being proposed in this area that has three No Through roads. I hear many say there isn't the infrastructure here for this addition.

Neighbourhoods shouldn't have to suffer through months of noise, disruption and detours. Just look at Hockley Avenue. I see a Pioneer Luxury Homes sign also at the corner of Arncote and Peatt.

My recommendations are:

Langford puts a cap on the height of buildings to six stories. Tall buildings bring darkness and shadows below.

Blend with or match the buildings that are already in the neighbourhood making it an attractive neighbourhood instead of an eye-sore.

Buildings be built with privacy space between them rather than building them so close tenants lose privacy, light and use of balconies.

Enough parking stalls for the number of units, plus space for mail trucks who deliver at least once a day.

Green space be left or created along with benches bringing a sense of community, sanity and a little wildlife to view and learn from.

Start construction loud noises (blasting, jack hammering) by 8:00am instead of 7:00am.

Please give some thought to your neighbours; not just how many can be crammed into Langford and how much more money can that bring in. If Langford keeps squeezing people in our taxes should be lowered.

Greater Victoria is not responsible to provide homes for anyone who may want to live here. Yes, it's been an ideal place, but if it keeps crowding, it won't be. There is a whole world out there.

Thank you again.

Wendy Ackinclose  
107-2685 Deville Road  
Langford BC V9B 0G5

September 28, 2021

I have some concerns about the new development on Peatt road. I have run my business, Chiropractic for Life, out of the above address for 21 years and when I first opened Peat road was closed on and off for my first year of practice. Water would dig up the road and leave it closed for weeks and when they finished sewer would do the same then the gas lines. No coordination, no interest in the lessening the impacts on local traffic.

Recently, Peatt road is again closed for months for a traffic circle that seemed to take an inordinate amount of time and now sewer and water need to continue the road closure for the new apartment buildings?

It would be greatly appreciated if some coordination was done to minimize the road closures and some notice given to the businesses along the road. As well if there are no workers on the road for a week at a time why leave it closed?

Finally, when any of these buildings are being constructed there is a large increase in work vehicles parked everywhere, all day including the dedicated visitor sites in my parking lot, making it difficult for the patients of the clinic to find parking.

Is there a plan for parking and can the road closures be minimized and will this information be available to business owners? Thanks for your consideration,

Dr. John Vedova  
100-2778 Peatt Road  
Langford, British Columbia V9B 3V3

September 28, 2021

I understand that the City of Langford's Official Community Plan does not have any height limits at this time, but I request that some restrictions be considered such as 12 storey towers. Currently, most newer apartments are 6 storeys or less, and many areas have increased density by adding townhouse complexes that are attractive but don't drastically alter the neighbourhood. Even in the areas of the Official Community Plan designated as high density, building heights of 12 storeys are in line with the other tallest new buildings in the area. These larger buildings go a long way to increase density without overburdening any one neighbourhood with years of construction followed by a large, sudden increase in density, light pollution, noise pollution, vehicle traffic, pedestrian traffic, dog waste etc.. Other regions of Victoria have more "neighbour-friendly" policies and height restrictions even in higher density areas. For example, in the Esquimalt Official Community Plan it states: "Consider new high density residential development proposals with a Floor Area Ratio of up to 3.0, and up to 12 storeys in height."

I urge council to consider the current residents of Langford, many of us who chose not to live in the denser areas of Victoria. I appreciate modest growth in our area while still enjoying a suburban feel rather than a loud, busy city with reduced sunlight to our homes and increased noise and light pollution, traffic congestion and adding unwanted stress to our lives.

Mary Wagner  
104-2669 Deville Rd  
Langford V9B 0C1