

Kelsey Hutt

From: Heidi Bada <[REDACTED]>
Sent: April 18, 2022 11:06 PM
To: Langford Planning General Mailbox
Subject: Comment for April 19, 2022 Public Hearing from Robert Bada, 740 Willing Dr

My name is Robert Bada. I live at 740 Willing Drive. [REDACTED] We bought this property to give us the privacy and tranquility we valued then and still value today but the proposed development will change all that. We need clarification: will there be a buffer zone [REDACTED] [REDACTED]? Also, how near to [REDACTED] property line will any buildings be built?

Respectfully,
Robert Bada

--
[REDACTED]

Kelsey Hutt

From: Mary Wagner <[REDACTED]>
Sent: April 19, 2022 1:15 PM
To: Langford Planning General Mailbox
Subject: Regarding Agenda Item 4.2. BYLAW NO. 2034 for April 19, 2022 Council Meeting

Regarding Agenda Item 4.2. BYLAW NO. 2034 (Olympic View Lands), the increase in the total number of allowable units from 461 units to 1000 units is alarming. Why would it double? The agenda states, "As the development will be a phased one, community and market demands will inevitably shift as the morphology of the area unfolds." Having so much allowed leeway for the developer does not allow the public to have meaningful input. Langford is rapidly removing forest and transforming undeveloped land into housing. We should be focusing on increasing density in the core and avoid urban sprawl.

The 40% open space can be comprised of land dedicated to the City as park, private covenanted open space, or golf course. Private space or for-profit space should not be included in the 40% open space. Green space should be kept green and open to the public - the golf course or private space is not enough of a benefit to the community for the large increase in density. The Council should carefully balance yet another increase in housing in Langford that is already building at a staggering rate above estimated need for this area with the small amount of natural landscape we have left.

Sincerely,

Mary Wagner

104-2669 Deville Rd.

Langford, BC

V9B 0C1

Kelsey Hutt

From: Mike Turner <[REDACTED]>
Sent: April 19, 2022 11:54 AM
To: Langford Planning General Mailbox
Cc: Norma Stewart; Lillian Szpak; Mayor Young; Roger Wade; Matt Sahlstrom; Lanny Seaton
Subject: Olympic View rezoning

Hello,

Please see feedback for the application for rezoning the olympic view properties.

1. I suggest the density being considered is much too high for the area. In the spirit of considering the overall development as a package, which it appears the city is doing by including the specifics like the golf course as part of the 'open space for the whole property, then Langford should consider the site in conjunction with the Colwood portion and match the density. Yes Colwood is a different municipality, and yes Langford is accountable only to its citizens, but coordination and consistency across municipal borders is essential. Keep the density reasonable given the rural nature of this area, and aligned with Colwood.
2. The zoning and density is not in alignment with the south langford neighbourhood plan, which the planning department consistently flip flops between abiding by when it suits a decision they make, or saying it's 'outdated' when it conflicts with an approach. Secondly, in the spirit of being good neighbours as part of the capital regional district (which no matter how much Stew hates, still is a factor), density should be significantly reduced adjacent to rural municipalities like Metchosin who has chosen a nature and rural-first approach to development.
3. As I mentioned recently on the rezoning proposed on Klahanie, the road of Klahanie itself and Dicker are unsuitable for the type of development density being proposed. The city seems to only believe that vehicle traffic on Klahanie exits via Klahanie and Latoria where the new lit traffic intersection will be going in. However, anyone from Gwendolyn Dr west exits Klahanie via Dicker at the 90 degree bend, and the non-conforming tee of Dicker into Happy Valley. There is a constant flow of traffic from the new developments up Frederic Dr and Willing that exit via Dicker to HV. Adding on a through road to OV via Gwendolyn is going to exacerbate this. Dicker at Happy Valley should be closed entirely to discourage people using Klahanie and dicker, via the rural ALR properties to enter Happy Valley. This road is consistently overused and is a dangerous non-conforming setup.
4. Any consideration of the 40% open space should be required to remain as natural, unmodified space. To do otherwise does not align with retaining any ecological values on the property, of which there are many. These properties are likely the last intact swaths of natural landscape that exists in south Langford. Ecological values should be considered equal to the socioeconomic ones that Langford seems to constantly prioritize.
5. Under Langford's design guidelines, it is up to the Director of Planning to prohibit salvage of native plants on a greenbelt property before it is developed. In other words, the act of salvaging native plants is fully permissible until the director says otherwise. I would ask that the public has an opportunity to salvage native plants. So far there has been no opportunity made public by the city or Burrard dev in this nature, despite the significant clearing at the end of Gwendolyn Dr. It's a wasted opportunity and just compounds the ecological effects of razing the earth.
6. In summary, at some point Langford needs to remember it is serving its existing constituent base, not those who might be moving here in the future. Keep the density of these properties the same as what is on the Colwood side. So far the colwood side is looking great, lots of trees, nice landscaping, relatively large yards, and the Langford side is shaping up to be yet another concrete and asphalt jungle where they claim they've offset it by using a golf course that's been there for decades.

Mike Turner
801 Stanehill Place

