

Trina Cruikshank

From: Barb MacDonald [REDACTED]
Sent: November 14, 2021 4:57 PM
To: Mayor Young; Denise Blackwell; Lanny Seaton; Lillian Szpak; Matt Sahlstrom; Norma Stewart; Roger Wade; Marie Watmough; Darren Kiedyk; langfordvoters@gmail.com; Matthew Baldwin; Langford Planning General Mailbox
Subject: Re: Public Hearing Bylaw 1931 – 1365 Goldstream Avenue

I am writing to question the difference between the public notice and the actual agenda item for the proposed bylaw changes with respect to a development at 1365 Goldstream. The notice specified a single 6-story building:

To amend the zoning designation of the property from the AM (Amenity) Zone to a new Area 5 of the CD1 (Comprehensive Development 1 – Goldstream Meadows) Zone, to allow for a 6-storey multi-family residential building.

However, the agenda package refers to approving two 6-story buildings:

Bylaw No. 1931
File No. Z21-0032
A Bylaw to Rezone 1365 Goldstream Avenue from the Amenity (AM) Zone to Area 5 of the CD1 (Comprehensive Development 1 – Goldstream Meadows) Zone to Allow for the Construction of Two Six-Storey Multi-Family Buildings Containing Approximately 102 Units
Page 157 of 295

As a previous writer about this property, a signatory to the petition against sale and development of this property and a wholehearted endorser of a letter you have recently received from Jacqueline Gintaut, I ask you to reconsider discussion of this item at the very least until the public notice has been remedied to make it clear what is actually being proposed and to allow Langford residents the opportunity to make fully considered submissions to council.

Thank you for your attention.

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

Trina Cruikshank

From: Gregory [REDACTED]
Sent: November 13, 2021 5:38 PM
To: Langford Planning General Mailbox
Subject: FW: re bylaw 1931 1365 Goldstream Av

The public notice says **a building**. The petition is for two with 102 units. Ie 150 to 200 cars. They cannot be dumped onto Goldstream Ave.

I did not get a reply from my previous email. Please see that this gets to council on 15th.

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

From: [Gregory](#)
Sent: November 4, 2021 10:42 AM
To: planning@langford.ca
Subject: re 1365 Goldstream Av

I saw your notice in this weeks Goldstream Gazette. A 6 floor apt or condo will have a great many cars, By the looks of your map, they would all be dumped onto Goldstream Av which cannot handle any more traffic. I would have no problem with this development if the traffic is diverted to West Shore pkwy.

Goldstream Av cannot handle this traffic.

Gregory Gill
1275 Goldstream Av
Langford
[REDACTED]

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

Trina Cruikshank

From: Howard Anderson [REDACTED]
Sent: November 14, 2021 2:26 PM
To: Langford Planning General Mailbox
Subject: 1365 Goldstream Ave

Unbelievable ... Langford has gone from being seen as progressive to the Municipality used as a " not like Langford " slogan for other areas ...in a matter of years ..
a terrible tribute to the council ... what went wrong ... greed . indifference ?
..for God's sake leave some wetlands alone .. not every inch needs to be developed ...

--

Howie Anderson [REDACTED]
2815 Lakeshore Place
V9B 5T5

November 14, 2021

To: Mayor and Council
Cc: dkiedyk@langford.ca; mwatmough@langford.ca; mbaldwin@langford.ca;
aproton@langford.ca; planning@langford.ca; langfordvoters@gmail.com

From: Jacqueline Gintaut
1331 Ravens View Drive
Langford, BC V9B 6B1

Re: Public Hearing Bylaw 1931 – 1365 Goldstream Avenue

As a Langford resident and taxpayer, I am writing to request that Mayor and Council oppose Bylaw 1931 regarding the property at 1365 Goldstream Avenue.

Regardless of when, why or how the land identified as 1365 Goldstream was purchased, this property, combined with the neighbouring land, was the subject of a petition signed by 2600+ individuals, 1700 of which were Langford residents, requesting that the lands be retained / preserved as amenity for residents' use.

The petition was submitted to the City on June 17, 2021, followed by a request to have the issue brought forward to a Council meeting, both of which received no formal response. Three weeks later, over 200 individuals wrote personal letters to Mayor and Council requesting

- that the topic and petition be placed on the July Council agenda to provide a petition representative and residents the opportunity to speak to the matter within a city recognized forum, before a decision was made; and,
- that Mayor / Council recognize the wishes of Langford residents by not selling the land, but rather undertaking a broad-based consultation process with residents to determine how the land could best be utilized by the community as a whole, e.g. preserved as dedicated parkland.

At the July 19, 2021 Council meeting, Acting Mayor, Norma Stewart read a prepared statement acknowledging receipt of the petition / subsequent correspondence and stated that "[resident comments] will be considered as part of any decision that Council makes. We want to be clear that there will be an opportunity to speak on this matter at another upcoming meeting."

Now – without the opportunity for Langford residents to weigh in on how the land could best be utilized to the benefit of the community as a whole, the property is before Council for consideration to be rezoned from Amenity to Comprehensive Development in order to allow for the construction of two 6-storey buildings.

I can think of no measure by which one could perceive this as good process, practice or policy. Further, why is the above noted petition and 200+ letters not included as part of the agenda package for this Public Hearing?

Langford residents need to be advised of the 'steps that must be taken' that will cause our current elected officials to:

- appropriately acknowledge and recognize community input;
- truly 'hear' what is being conveyed by community residents; and,
- appropriately respond to and address community input or issues through action.

In addition to the above, approving this bylaw and allowing for the building of two 6-storey buildings comprised of 102 units would compound the now common-place issues related to hard / soft infrastructures, such as traffic, parking, health-care resources, community services, and so on.

Traffic: Adding 100 to 200 vehicles to the area will create significant traffic impacts:

- within the immediate area given the existing narrow roadways and current road condition;
- with respect to entering / exiting the community via Leigh Road to the TransCanada Hwy; and
- with regard to the ever-building cross-community traffic congestion.

Parking: Goldstream has very little street parking space, with the exception of the public parking provided to access the trail system. Given that the city only requires 1.25 parking stalls per unit to accommodate both residents' and visitors' needs combined with the fact that most households own two vehicles, a situation will be created wherein anywhere between 50 – 100 vehicles would be required to park on-street. This scenario will impact both residents within the immediate area with respect to day-to-day living and residents within the broader community with respect to the parking required to access the community trail system.

Available Housing: Mayor and Council may argue that that all of the above is of no consequence and / or worth the sacrifice of community needs, issues and desires because their focus is on creating housing. What type of housing is being created: Available, Attainable or Affordable? While these developments would create available units within the broader housing market – from a community perspective – the question needs to be asked, 'Who would these available units be built for, given that they will not be affordable or even attainable for a large segment of the existing Langford population?'

Further, the flaws in the new Attainable Housing Program – found by news outlets – significantly limits the number of individuals who could benefit from the program, given that the news reporting indicates that:

- To qualify for the required \$450K mortgage, the buyers would need an annual income in the neighbourhood of \$110,000.

- To secure the pre-sale of the new condo, the buyers would have to come up with a deposit of 5% to 20% (\$22,500 to \$90,000) prior to accessing the program; yet a separate eligibility criteria indicates that the current value of all assets held by the buyers (family) does not exceed \$50K.
- The available units will likely be the least desirable. Within the Capital Daily article, a local realtor referenced this proposed development at 1365 Goldstream.
 - [Marko] Juras referenced a building currently proposed near the highway at the end of Goldstream Avenue. Thirty-one of the 102 units are proposed to be part of the program.
 - But the “attainable” units “are right on the highway,” Juras said. “They’re facing the highway at eye level. These are going to be **extremely undesirable units**. You could literally spit onto the highway from those units.”
 - Juras suspects that's not an oversight.
 - This program could end up to the benefit of the developer, helping them offload undesirable units. I think it's a political ploy to make Mayor Stew Young look good.”

Given all of the above, can Mayor and Council say that this proposed development is to the overall benefit of Langford residents?

Please vote NO.

Trina Cruikshank

From: Jeff Magee [REDACTED]
Sent: November 15, 2021 10:11 AM
To: Mayor Young; Denise Blackwell; Lillian Szpak; Lanny Seaton; Matt Sahlstrom; Norma Stewart; Roger Wade
Subject: November 15, 2021 Council Agenda

I would like to express my opposition to the adoption of bylaws 2008, 2009 and 1931, and the removal of the covenant on 2684 Selwyn Road. Adoption of these bylaws and the removal of the covenant goes against the wishes of the residents of Langford.

Council would best be prudent in these decisions as residents are looking to the next election and making decisions based on your actions and your support for resident's views. Support for developers and sleight of hand actions in support of them are not missed and will be remembered.

The decisions you are making on this Agenda will define you.

Jeff Magee
750 Walfred Rd.
Langford
[REDACTED]

Trina Cruikshank

From: Mary Wagner [REDACTED]
Sent: November 11, 2021 1:31 PM
To: Langford Planning General Mailbox
Subject: To be included for the public hearing on 1365 Goldstream on Nov 15

Categories: Sammy's In Progress

Regarding Area Adjacent to Goldstream Meadows Park and Ed Nixon Trail

There a Public Hearing about 1365 Goldstream which is adjacent to the Ed Nixon Trail. Development here is of great concern to the value of the Ed Nixon Trail as a nature trail and as a green space. This area near Langford Lake has value for everyone. As more and more of Langford is developed into higher density housing, business parks, roads etc., the need for significant areas of green space is more important than ever, and this area is a great place to expand a natural area, rather than develop right up to the edge of the Ed Nixon and Henson trails.

As shown in Figure 4 from the city's agenda package for Oct 18th, you can see that there is already a trail known as Henson Trail connecting to the Ed Nixon Trail that would be adversely affected by construction noise and subsequent buildings in view of the trail. In fact, if you walk on the Ed Nixon trail towards the highway, instead of green space, you would see buildings at 1365 Goldstream. This whole area should be a green space in my opinion, but if it is too late to save 1365 Goldstream from development, I urge council to save the adjacent area shown as lot 2885 and make it a dedicated park space.



Sincerely, Mary Wagner, 104-2669 Deville Rd., Langford, BC V9B 0C1

Trina Cruikshank

From: Susan Jacobs [REDACTED]
Sent: November 15, 2021 12:50 PM
To: Langford Planning General Mailbox
Subject: FW: Public Hearing submission for proposed bylaw #1931 re: 1365 Goldstream Avenue

I realized that I forgot to include my address in my submission. It is 2817 Lake End Road, Langford.

-----Original Message-----

From: Susan Jacobs
Sent: Monday, November 15, 2021 12:04 PM
To: planning@langford.ca
Subject: Public Hearing submission for proposed bylaw #1931 re: 1365 Goldstream Avenue

Dear Mayor and Council,

I am writing to express my concerns regarding proposed bylaw #1931 to rezone 1365 Goldstream Avenue to allow a 6-storey multi-family residential building.

My concerns are as follows:

1. This property was part of the subject of a petition submitted to the city last spring signed by several thousand people including many residents of Langford asking that the city consult with its residents regarding its future use. To the best of my knowledge, the city has not responded to this petition. I find it very distasteful that this rezoning and sale proposal would be considered without first addressing the petition.
2. It was reported in the media this past summer that this property was not to be sold pending the outcome of the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure's "further and more detailed review of both access to this property and other potential infrastructure needs in this general area". The public has not been informed as to the outcome of this review.
3. I am very concerned about the cumulative impact on the health of Langford Lake that the many developments you are allowing close to the lake are having.
4. A six storey building would be out of scale to the other buildings in the area and would be highly visible from Langford Lake creating a blight in the viewscape.
5. A building of this size would dramatically increase the traffic on the west end of Goldstream Avenue. This is a narrow road without sidewalks and with houses and human activity very close to the road. Without upgrades to the road, this extra traffic would create a safety concern. As you are aware, prior to the closure of access from the Trans Canada Highway several years ago, there was a pedestrian hit and killed by a car on this stretch of road.
6. Adding this number of residences to this end of Goldstream would inevitably create an increase in emergency response calls to this end of the road which would also be problematic due to the condition of the road, not to mention the increase in noise pollution in the area that the sirens would create.

For these reasons, I urge you to deny this proposal.

Regards,

Susan Jacobs

I acknowledge that I live on the unceded traditional territories of the LEKWUNGEN (Esquimalt and Songhees), and W̱SÁNEĆ (Malahat, Pauquachin, Tsartlip, Tsawout, and Tseycum) peoples. I give thanks to the Coast Salish peoples for allowing me to live, work and play on their traditional lands.

November 15, 2021

Re: Public Hearing Bylaw 1931 - 1365 Goldstream Ave

I am writing to express my strong disapproval for the sale and development of this parcel. Given we are seeing today in real time the effects of extreme weather conditions, which are only projected to worsen in the coming years, it would be prudent to retain as much natural flood control and runoff filtration as is left around Langford Lake. We have already destroyed so much of the floodplain. The paltry monetary return in exchange for the land will soon be eaten up by lower property values around a dead lake, hence lower tax revenues, increased compensation to flood victims, and general lower quality of life for the greater community.

1700 fellow Langford residents agree with this viewpoint, as evidenced by the petition submitted earlier this year. I hope you will see the broader responsibility you hold for the community, and reject this proposal in favour of retaining and enhancing the property to its natural state.

Teresa Ackroyd
325 Renart Place