

Sammy Paulus

From: Joanne Kent [REDACTED]
Sent: November 26, 2021 3:35 PM
To: Langford Planning General Mailbox
Subject: Re PZAH Meeting Agenda Nov. 29, 2021 File No. Z21-0012 3216 Happy Valley Rd. Fwd: MAYOR & COUNCIL, PLEASE READ THIS Re: Time sensitive re 2715 Sooke Rd.
Attachments: Letter to City Enclosure - Site Plan Proposal 2715 Sooke Rd. Layout with neighbors.pdf
Categories: Correspondence

Hello,

I just reviewed the Agenda package for the upcoming meeting on Monday and noticed you only included 1 of the 2 letters I wrote with respect to this matter. My second letter of Nov. 2nd was omitted. I have included it below for your reference.

Please ensure it is included.

Thank you,
Joanne Kent
2715 Sooke Rd.

Begin forwarded message:

From: Joanne Kent [REDACTED]
Date: November 2, 2021 at 1:42:07 PM PDT
To: Matthew Baldwin <mbaldwin@langford.ca>, Stewart Young <mayor@langford.ca>, Denise Blackwell <dblackwell@langford.ca>, Matt Sahlstrom <msahlstrom@langford.ca>, Lanny Seaton <lseaton@langford.ca>, Norma Stewart <nstewart@langford.ca>, Lillian Szpak <lszpak@langford.ca>, Roger Wade <rwade@langford.ca>
Cc: Michelle Mahovlich <mmahovlich@langford.ca>, Darren Kiedyk <dkiedyk@langford.ca>, Robert Dykstra <rdykstra@langford.ca>, Leah Stohmann <lstohmann@langford.ca>, John Horgan <John.Horgan.MLA@leg.bc.ca>
Subject: MAYOR & COUNCIL, PLEASE READ THIS Re: Time sensitive re 2715 Sooke Rd.

With all due respect, Matthew, you are missing the critical point so I will emphasize it for everyone's benefit here.

MAYOR & COUNCIL,

I PUT FORWARD A SOLUTION IN MY LETTER OF OCT. 27TH AND ATTACHED A SITE DRAWING* OF THE PROPOSAL THAT SATISFIES ALL PARTIES CONCERNS: *(drawing reattached below)

- WITHOUT "ECONOMIC REPERCUSSIONS" TO EITHER [REDACTED] OR [REDACTED] PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT PLANS ON THE TWO ADJACENT HAPPY VALLEY ROAD PROPERTIES;

AND

- IT WILL PROVIDE AN ADDITIONAL [REDACTED] FOR THE COMMUNITY OF LANGFORD ON [REDACTED] !!

AND

- IT RESOLVES SAFETY & TRAFFIC CONCERNS WITH RESPECT TO LEFT-HAND TURNS FROM EACH PROPERTY

I FAIL TO UNDERSTAND WHY THIS WOULDN'T BE AN INITIATIVE THAT MAYOR & COUNCIL WOULD SUPPORT.

MY REQUEST:

- THAT WE WORK TOGETHER TO CREATE A UNIFIED [REDACTED] ENCOMPASSING ALL 3 SITES THAT BENEFITS MORE THAN ANY SINGLE DEVELOPER, ONE THAT MEETS THE OBJECTIVES TO CREATE AFFORDABLE HOUSING IN OUR COMMUNITY, AN OBJECTIVE CLEARLY SET FORTH BY THE MAYOR.

I FORMALLY ASK YOU TO GIVE MY PROPOSAL FAIR CONSIDERATION FOR THE BENEFIT OF ALL.

I WOULD APPRECIATE AN OPPORTUNITY TO MEET WITH EACH AND/OR ALL OF YOU TO REVIEW IT MORE THOROUGHLY AND OBTAIN YOUR INPUT.

THANK YOU,

Joanne Kent
2715 SOOKE RD.
T: [REDACTED]

THE FOLLOWING IS MY DETAILED RESPONSE to Matthew's email of October 29th:

Thank you for taking the time to document your response to my letter of October 27, 2021 and our subsequent telephone conversation on October 29th.

Firstly, you state in the first paragraph of your response below that I "should have received an opinion from the City's Approving Officer in this regard". I have received no such thing, nor have I had any contact with anyone in this position.

Secondly, I would like to state for the record that the City, yourself included, had reiterated to me and my agent, [REDACTED], on more than one occasion that a development permit would not be issued for 3216 Happy Valley Road without road access being provided to my property. In fact, the City proposed this as a solution for the diminished access from Sooke Road. In our conversation on Friday, you said

the City had made “a bad assumption” in this regard. Based on that “bad assumption” I withdrew my [REDACTED] having any involvement whatsoever.

This “bad assumption” on the part of the City has [REDACTED]

Furthermore, the City’s own “Staff Report to the PZAH Committee” included in the agenda for the Sept. 13, 2021 meeting regarding the rezoning application put forward by [REDACTED] states the following (this is an excerpt from page 5 of said report):

"ACCESS TO LANDS BEYOND

As illustrated in Appendix A, the applicant is proposing a private strata road in the centre of the property for access to the individual townhomes. However, through the referral process, the Ministry of Transportation and the Engineering Department have both stated that half a municipal road along the north side of the property should be dedicated and built (the other half to be dedicated and built by 3212 Happy Valley) in order to provide a safe access route to 2715 Sooke Road, for which the only access is on Sooke Road near the bend in the road. If Council wishes to provide an alternative access for 2715 Sooke Road, they may wish to request the applicant to dedicate half a municipal road along the north side of the property."

Thirdly, you state in the second para. of your response below that after meeting with [REDACTED]...”staff concluded that the requested half road could not be provided for access to [my] property without [REDACTED] to [REDACTED] townhouse proposal. Staff will, therefore, be sending [REDACTED] application back to the PZAH Committee with this information. We do not expect that the Committee will recommend to Council that this road be provided to you as a condition of [REDACTED] rezoning, nor would we expect Council to impose such a burden on [REDACTED] (or [REDACTED]) rezoning application.”

There is a critical piece of information in my letter you have missed or overlooked. I refer to the scale drawing attached to my letter, which I have also attached here for your reference.

This drawing shows a third option where no one loses, and everyone wins. Neither [REDACTED] or [REDACTED] suffer any [REDACTED] or burden, each is able to proceed with the number of units proposed, AND a road can be provided that connects and provides safe access to all 3 properties. Of significant benefit to the City and community of Langford is [REDACTED]

There is a further benefit that is not shown on the drawing: if as you say, the Ministry of Transportation will permit the existing Sooke Road access to my property to remain open but with right hand turn access only, then the roadway showing on the diagram could be extended to provide right hand turn access onto Sooke Rd. through my property for both [REDACTED] & [REDACTED] developments and thus eliminate the need for left hand turns onto Happy Valley Road.

This solution addresses everyone’s concerns – there are no economic repercussions for anyone - and not only does it provide safe access to & from each property with a unified roadway, the City and community of Langford gain [REDACTED]

I look forward to your response.

Sincerely,

Joanne Kent

On Oct 29, 2021, at 4:00 PM, Matthew Baldwin <mbaldwin@langford.ca> wrote:

Good afternoon, Joanne,

Yes. To reiterate what we discussed this morning, the proponents wishing to develop the lots fronting on to Happy Valley Road are not obligated to provide access to your property as a condition of subdivision. You should have already received an opinion from the City's Approving Officer in this regard. The Planning Zoning and Affordable Housing Committee asked [REDACTED] (one of the proponents seeking rezoning for lands fronting Happy Valley Road and backing onto your property) to explore the option of providing half a road (with the other half to be provided by [REDACTED]) as a condition of rezoning.

After meeting with [REDACTED] to review what [REDACTED] had done in regard to the road, and to revisit [REDACTED] proposal in light of the dimensions of [REDACTED] lot, setbacks etc., staff concluded that the requested half road could not be provided for access to your property without [REDACTED] to [REDACTED] townhouse proposal. Staff will, therefore, be sending [REDACTED] application back to the Planning Zoning and Affordable Housing Committee with this information. We do not expect that the Committee will recommend to Council that this road be provided to you as a condition of [REDACTED] rezoning, nor would we expect Council to impose such a burden on [REDACTED] (or [REDACTED]) rezoning application.

[REDACTED] If you wish to know how much development can be achieved [REDACTED] (through rezoning) with this access, I recommend speaking with the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure or a traffic engineer with experience in this sort of thing. Our Director of Engineering, Michelle Mahovlich can assist you in this regard. The Ministry will have the final say on any rezoning [REDACTED], as any bylaw resulting from a rezoning application must be signed by the Minister prior to adoption. Further to this, it was and is [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Again, we do not believe that Council will make this a requirement of either of their rezoning applications, due to the cost burden that it represents.

I trust that this information is satisfactory.

Sincerely,

Matthew Baldwin, MCIP, RPP

Director of Planning and Subdivision

250.474.6919

From: Joanne Kent [REDACTED]

Sent: Friday, October 29, 2021 10:39 AM

To: Matthew Baldwin <mbaldwin@langford.ca>
Cc: Mayor Young <mayor@langford.ca>; Denise Blackwell <dblackwell@langford.ca>;
Matt Sahlstrom <msahlstrom@langford.ca>; Lanny Seaton <lseaton@langford.ca>;
Norma Stewart <nstewart@langford.ca>; Lillian Szpak <lszpak@langford.ca>; Roger
Wade <rwade@langford.ca>; Michelle Mahovich <mmahovich@langford.ca>; Darren
Kiedyk <dkiedyk@langford.ca>; Robert Dykstra <rdykstra@langford.ca>; Leah
Stohmann <lstohmann@langford.ca>
Subject: Re: Time sensitive re 2715 Sooke Rd.

Hello, Matthew.

I am writing to acknowledge your telephone call and our conversation earlier this morning.

Please provide your response in writing outlining the information you shared with me, including the details of the go forward plan, so I can take the appropriate action. I would appreciate receiving this by end of day.

Thank you,

Joanne

On Oct 28, 2021, at 4:10 PM, Matthew Baldwin
<mbaldwin@langford.ca> wrote:

Good afternoon, Ms. Kent,

We have received your letters and will provide a response to you shortly.

If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me here.

Sincerely,

Matthew Baldwin, MCIP, RPP
Director of Planning and Subdivision
250.474.6919

From: Joanne Kent [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, October 28, 2021 3:12 PM
To: Mayor Young <mayor@langford.ca>; Denise Blackwell
<dblackwell@langford.ca>; Matt Sahlstrom
<msahlstrom@langford.ca>; Lanny Seaton <lseaton@langford.ca>;
Norma Stewart <nstewart@langford.ca>; Lillian Szpak
<lszpak@langford.ca>; Roger Wade <rwade@langford.ca>; Michelle
Mahovich <mmahovich@langford.ca>; Matthew Baldwin
<mbaldwin@langford.ca>; Darren Kiedyk <dkiedyk@langford.ca>

Cc: John Horgan <John.Horgan.MLA@leg.bc.ca>

Subject: Time sensitive re 2715 Sooke Rd.

To the City of Langford Mayor, Councillors and key staff;

I hand delivered a letter with supporting documentation for each of you today at Langford City Hall, but was told that physical mail was being scanned and emailed to the addressee. Given the time sensitive nature of this matter and the upcoming PZAH committee meeting affecting my property, I need to ensure this critical information is in your hands beforehand, so am attaching it here for your review.

Thank you for giving it your prompt attention.

Sincerely,
Joanne

Joanne Kent
Director
Sea-Isle Rehabilitation Services Ltd.
2715 Sooke Road
Victoria, BC. V9B 1Y8
Tel: 250.474.1916
Cell: [REDACTED]
Email: [REDACTED]

