



City of Langford Official Community Plan

Bylaw No. 1200

Version 4.0
Adopted: 16 June 08
Updated: 8 June 20

City of Langford Planning Department
2nd Floor, 877 Goldstream Avenue, Victoria, BC V9B 2X8
Phone: 250.478.7882 Fax: 250.391.3436
www.cityoflangford.ca

From:

Ref: Rezoning of 2885 West Shore Parkway

The following extracts from the OCP were used to frame subsequent questions and issues of concern:

1. Despite the tangible benefits of development, climate protection and sustainability are at the forefront of our minds.
2. An OCP vision reflects the ideas and input of our residents,..... preserving open spaces are top priorities for many.....societies need to create prosperous economies and communities, but not irreversibly damage the planet in the process.
3. Protect large areas of high-value green space;
4. Consider view impacts from the valley or from water bodies and from hillside development sites. Policy 3.20.1 Set targets for view preservation from the valley and creation from hillsides or shorelines when considering development applications that addresses the community's desire to maintain views of key landscape features such as ridgelines, peaks, rocky outcrops, shorelines and environmentally sensitive areas with the strong demand for hillside development sites with views
5. Preserve the character of Langford's lakes. Policy 3.23.1 Create lakefront-specific subdivision regulations, which may include: i. Encourage park dedication to be taken adjacent to lakes, and encourage creation of trail access, boat launches, and viewing platforms, to provide public access to and for the enjoyment of the lakes. ii. Exclude streamside protection and enhancement area (SPEA) from minimum lot size calculation
6. Pedestrian facilities will be improved by such means as reducing unnecessary pedestrian barriers, increasing opportunities for crossing busy roads in safety, providing direct routes where practicable, and providing incentives for walking throughout the city and especially within residential neighbourhoods.
7. Livability refers to the environmental and social quality of an area as perceived by residents, employees, customers and visitors. This includes safety and health (traffic safety, personal security, and public health), local environmental conditions (cleanliness, noise, dust, air quality, and water quality),

Traffic and Safety

We were told several years ago by the Mayor (on public record) that :

- Safe pedestrian access around the lake on Goldstream was in the pipeline. - **No action taken.**
- Large vehicles parked on Goldstream outside private residences,impeding traffic and forcing vehicles pedestrians into the middle of the road were known about and would be addressed. - **No action taken.**

Instead, the amount of traffic, particularly heavy industrial trucks and vehicles have steadily increased.

Q1 - Will the council take action to safeguard pedestrians on Goldstream before someone else is killed or injured due to increased traffic and huge increase in heavy industrial vehicles ?.

R1 - There is no safe pedestrian access along Goldstream at all and the situation is getting worse. No future development must be allowed which uses Goldstream for heavy industrial vehicles until this is rectified.

Livability - Noise, dust, air, water quality

For over 5 years, developers have used industrial equipment to drill, blast and crush rock from 7 am to 7pm almost year round. The work starts at 0700, however, vehicles and their reversing warning devices can be heard up to 2 hours earlier on a regular basis.

This does not include the work on the highway which took place overnight for many months without any consideration for residents. That area is now used regularly by trucks to test their air brakes before they head up the Malahat. The noise is shocking, sudden and greatly reduces quality of life.

Q2 - How many more years of noise, dust and inconsiderate building practices are acceptable?

R2 - No more development should be allowed until sensible hours of operation, time limits for construction (i.e heavy industrial work not during mornings and evenings/weekends), have been implemented.

Sympathetic Developments

Plans for developments are approved at public hearings, then amended privately allowing developments near areas of outstanding natural beauty to be done in a way that is totally unsympathetic with the environment.

Large, monolithic concrete structures now border walking trails and overshadow lakeside areas.

No ridgelines or views from the lake have been considered and in fact, every possible area that can feasibly overlook the water is being developed at an alarming rate, which only seems to be increasing.

Q3 - Can the council state which “*ridgelines, peaks, rocky outcrops, shorelines and environmentally sensitive areas*” have been earmarked for preservation and where this is documented ?

R3 - No further development should be allowed that can easily be seen, or heard from walking paths or the lakeside.

Sensitive Areas

An extensive survey of the wetlands around the north and west sides of the lake was undertaken. If these areas have been designated as requiring protection and/or preservation then these areas need to be rezoned and this reflected in CRD Atlas.

R4 - Before any further development (or associated rezoning) can be considered, these areas must be formally documented and removed from any potential future development. (They currently are included in the proposed area to be re-zoned.)

Lack of Transparency Regarding Building Developments and Spending of Public Monies

There is a perception that deals are being made and public money is being spent based not on the needs of the residents and community, but the financial interests of developers.

If not, then why would the council recommend another 30 townhomes on the site of a single residence if it were not to make money for that individual. To help clarify the community need, the following questions need to be answered (without the need to request the information from an Freedom Of Information inquiry as demanded by the head of Langford's Planning department).

- **Q4** - How many homes are currently under construction in Langford ?
- **Q5** - How many more have been approved ?
- **Q6** - How many more have been proposed and are under consideration ?
- **Q7** - How many of those homes are low cost apartments ***which can be purchased*** rather than being investments for large corporations who rent them whilst the housing market climbs?

Q8 - If we cannot afford safe pedestrian walkways or sidewalks along Goldstream then can the council confirm if and why almost \$500,000 was spent rehousing residents from a privately owned development in Langford (just off Goldstream) last year ?

Q9 - What is the requirement for a 4 acre hotel (no details of plans released) next to a water meadow and who stands to benefit financially ?

Summary

There are 9 specific questions to the council, the answers to which are in the interests of the community and helping them evaluate this re-zoning. Can the council please respond to each, giving their perspectives or simply providing the information requested.

- **Q1** - Will the council take action to safeguard pedestrians on Goldstream before someone else is killed or injured due to increased traffic and huge increase in heavy industrial vehicles ?.
- **Q2** - How many more years of noise, dust and inconsiderate building practices are acceptable?
- **Q3** - Can the council state which “ ***ridgelines, peaks, rocky outcrops, shorelines and environmentally sensitive areas***” have been earmarked for preservation and where this is documented ?
- **Q4** - How many homes are currently under construction in Langford ?
- **Q5** - How many more have been approved ?
- **Q6** - How many more have been proposed and are under consideration ?
- **Q7** - How many of those homes are low cost apartments ***which can be purchased*** rather than being investments for large corporations who rent them whilst the housing market climbs?
- **Q8** - If we cannot afford safe pedestrian walkways or sidewalks along Goldstream then can the council confirm if and why almost \$500,000 was spent rehousing residents from a privately owned development in Langford (just off Goldstream) last year ?
- **Q9** - What is the requirement for a 4 acre hotel (no details of plans released) next to a water meadow and who stands to benefit financially ?

There are also 4 recommendations for both the council and the public's consideration. Can the council respond to each :

- **R1** - There is no safe pedestrian access along Goldstream at all and the situation is getting worse. No future development must be allowed which uses Goldstream for heavy industrial vehicles until this is rectified.
- **R2** - No more development should be allowed until sensible hours of operation, time limits for construction (i.e heavy industrial work not during mornings and evenings/weekends), have been implemented.

- **R3** - No further development should be allowed that can easily be seen, or heard (i.e. from walking paths or the lakeside.(in compliance with the OCP aims to.. ***maintain views of key landscape features such as ridgelines, peaks, rocky outcrops, shorelines and environmentally sensitive areas.***)
- **R4** - Before any further development (or associated rezoning) can be considered, these areas must be formally documented and removed from any potential future development. (They currently are included in the proposed area to be re-zoned.)

Emily Garry

From: Matthew Baldwin
Sent: Monday, November 2, 2020 10:52 AM
To: Trina Cruikshank
Subject: FW: 2885west shore and 1365 Goldstream

Matthew Baldwin, MCIP, RPP

Director of Planning and Subdivision
250.391.3404

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, October 26, 2020 10:50 AM
To: Matthew Baldwin <mbaldwin@langford.ca>
Subject: 2885west shore and 1365 Goldstream

good morning Matthew;

I am just writing to confirm that the proposal for Hotel / townhouses only involves the areas marked 1365 and 2885?

My concern is that the other Shaded Grey areas (along Lake End rd) aren't being considered for any development? These areas are one of

the last large bogs that filter the run off to the lake.

thank you for your attention and time.

take care and stay safe

[REDACTED]

Emily Garry

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, October 31, 2020 10:26 AM
To: Langford Planning General Mailbox
Subject: West Shore Parkway and Goldstream Avenue Rezoning

My name is [REDACTED]. I am a home owner on [REDACTED] and have lived here for [REDACTED] years. Being a tax paying resident I hope my Council will hear my voice and represent my views.

I am extremely concerned about the rezoning of and proposed hotel restaurant, hotel and townhouse development at 2885 West Shore Parkway and 1365 Goldstream Avenue.

I truly feel the ecosystem of our little lake and surrounding greenspace cannot support this much development, added traffic and use.

The over-development going in in this corner of Langford and its negative effects are already becoming very apparent.

It is great to see the lake being enjoyed and I have watched its use steadily increase over the years. But with this increased use comes added garbage and damages around its shores. The amount of trash floating in the water and washing up on shore was the highest its ever been this summer. Not to mention the garbage (beer cans, wrappers, toilet paper) on the island and in the park areas. The loss of forested areas around Ed Nixon Trail is disheartening.

The ongoing destruction of the surrounding natural spaces has directly caused flooding of the lake in the last 2 years.

The noise pollution (including the incessant rock crushing) of the existing developments going in on the west side lake of the is an extreme disturbance and already interferes with the quiet enjoyment of all residents on and around the lake.

Enough is enough. Our beautiful greenspace is being compromised and our ecosystem destroyed. This lake and surrounding trails are bursting at the seams with the amount of use it gets from the residents of Langford. Adding an indefinite amount of hotel guests will kill them.

Please oppose the rezoning and save Langford Lake

Thank you,

[REDACTED]

Emily Garry

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, October 31, 2020 1:47 PM
To: Langford Planning General Mailbox
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Westshore Parkway and Goldstream Avenue Rezoning

To whom it may concern,

Our family owns the house at [REDACTED] (near the end of Goldstream). We are very concerned by the application to rezone multiple parcels of lands to the northeast of Langford Lake for the purpose of putting in a hotel and townhouses. We would like to officially state our objection to this and ask that it not proceed. This is for multiple reasons.

First, the area is a key environmental section of the larger lake and sustains important ecosystems.

Second, the north end of the lake with its very small beach and trails is already at capacity. To try and add hundreds of more people through hotels guests and residents is simply impossible with the small size of this end of the lake. This past summer the upgrades to the beach were excellent but most days could not handle any more people at it.

Third, we would like to ask that if this proceeds, there be NO access via Goldstream. North of Goldstream and Leigh Rd is a residential area that already has many cars and with no sidewalks or bike lanes is very dangerous for children and people walking along Goldstream.

Thank you for considering our thoughts. Again, we ask that this area be retained as marsh land and part of the care of the larger area of Langford Lake, which is such a gem!

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to reply to us.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]
Homeowners at [REDACTED]

Emily Garry

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, October 31, 2020 2:45 PM
To: Langford Planning General Mailbox
Subject: West Shore Parkway and Goldstream Ave Rezoning

To whom it may concern,

We are writing to you today to express our concern over the rezoning of the West Shore Parkway and Goldstream Ave. area. This property is extremely close to Langford Lake and any further development in the area could erode the environment. We live close to this area and walk the lake trail frequently. I am afraid any further development will disturb the ecosystem of the area. We have many varieties of birds and other wildlife in the area now and wouldn't want to see any of them in danger of losing their habitat.

There is already a development in the works for the area of Goldstream Ave and Leigh Road. We don't know how this will impact traffic and infrastructure at this time. Increased traffic on Goldstream could be very dangerous as there are many pedestrians on this road and no sidewalks! The proposed development would increase traffic and be a danger to pedestrian traffic.

There is no need for a hotel, restaurant or more condos in this area. We don't support this development application.

Thank you

[REDACTED]

Langford

Emily Garry

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, October 31, 2020 4:15 PM
To: Langford Planning General Mailbox
Subject: West Shore Parkway and Goldstream Avenue Rezoning

To Langford Council,

I am sickened at the thought of yet another development, especially one of this magnitude, being built so close to Langford Lake.

I believe it is clear to all of us who live here that we are witnessing the destruction of the Langford Lake ecosystem. The amount of development taking place is obviously having far reaching consequences and an irreversible negative impact. It's just good common sense that if you strip the surrounding area of its natural vegetation system, the lake will struggle to survive.

Langford Lake is a vital resource. We have a responsibility to practice stewardship in our lakes and to keep them healthy for all. It is beyond irresponsible for our elected officials to put the lake at risk for the sake of a select few and some short term financial gain.

The consequences of this development will be irreversible. Please carefully consider the impact of your actions and the legacy you wish to leave.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Emily Garry

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, November 1, 2020 7:17 PM
To: Langford Planning General Mailbox
Subject: Proposed development for hotel, restaurant and 30 townhomes

Good Day,

We are long time residents of Langford, and just found out today that there is a proposed development to built a hotel, restaurant and 30 townhomes bordering Goldstream Ave. and West Shore Parkway. We are not in favour of this development, as it would cause the destruction of trees, greenspace and ecosystems surrounding the Ed Nixon Trail and the wetlands along the lake. Furthermore, this would increase the traffic and noise in an already overwhelmed infrastructure. Please make note of our views for the public record.

We also note that our house hold has never received any advance notice of this development through the normal channels: direct mail from the City of Langford to inform the neighbouring homes of the proposed rezoning and plans for development.

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]

Emily Garry

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, November 2, 2020 10:24 AM
To: Langford Planning General Mailbox
Subject: West Shore Parkway and Goldstream Avenue Rezoning

My name is [REDACTED] and I live at [REDACTED] on Langford Lake. I've just been made aware of the meeting on this evening and downloaded the information. I have some questions regarding the documentation.

I can't get my head around which is the correct representation of the "subject properties".

In the document titled "City of Langford Bylaw No. 1931 A Bylaw to amend Bylaw no 300 "Langford Zoning Bylaw, 1999"", the attached schedule shows the properties at 2775 West Shore Parkway and 1365 Goldstream Avenue as the Subject properties.

The notices published in the Goldstream Gazette show the same shaded area.

In the document titled "Notice of Public Hearing" on the second Page "Rezoning Bylaw Amendment (Z20-0016) 2885 West Short Pkwy & 1365 Goldstream Ave", there are additional areas highlighted – which encompass some lakefront plus property and property on the non-lake side of Lake End Road across to the back of houses on Lakeshore Place. These also are identified as "Subject Properties".

On the staff report and the notice sent to residents, the extra areas are highlighted also.

Which of these correctly identify the "subject properties"?

If the extra highlighted area is correct then I'm concerned with the wording in the Staff Report to Council under the paragraph titled "Purpose" which reads "As part of this agreement, a portion of the subject property could be rezoned from the AM Zone to the CT1 zone, and a portion could be rezoned to the RT2 zone with various amendments to both zones". If this bylaw is passed it concerns me that this area so close to an already failing lake could be rezoned without any further public input.

I'd like to add that as long-term residents on the lake, we watch it deteriorate on a yearly basis. We see algae blooms, flooding, excessive weed growth and forbidden use due to unsafe conditions. These are more and more frequent. We are concerned with the reduction in size of the settling ponds in Westhills, which I understood were for the health of the lake and continued development resulting in the loss of natural habitat that filters the lake, the "jewel of Langford" will become so polluted as to be unsuitable for any kind of recreation.

I'm hoping these concerns will be addressed/clarified at the meeting or, if not, the Public meeting rescheduled so residents have some time to educate themselves on the proposal.

A response regarding the discrepancy in the highlighted area would be greatly appreciated prior to the meeting tonight.

Thank you for your time.

[REDACTED]

From [REDACTED]

Sent: Monday, November 2, 2020 2:48 PM

To: Langford Planning General Mailbox <planning@langford.ca>

Subject: Zoning change and development plans for 1365 Goldstream and 2885 Westshore Parkway

To; Mr. Matthew Baldwin, Director of Planning and Subdivision and Langford City Council

Dear Mr. Baldwin and Councillors,

I am writing to express my concern about the proposed zoning change and development plans for 1365 Goldstream and 2885 Westshore Parkway.

I have just become aware of the plan and I have visited the property to try to get a sense of what will be done. The information available about the proposal is inconsistent. The posted signs at the location show lots numbered 1365 Goldstream and 2885 Westshore parkway subject to the rezoning. The rezoning bylaw amendment Z20-00016 last revised Aug. 25 shows a large area to the east of those numbered lots, all the way to 2807 Lake End Rd., indicating a development twice as large as indicted on the sign. Which is correct? This is another example of the poor communications from Langford Council to citizens. No information is available from either source to indicate where the townhomes will be, where the hotel will be, or how they will be accessed. Even a best case will have substantial negative ecological and traffic impacts.

The area slated for development is part of the last remaining wetland associated with Langford Lake. It is critical habitat for many species of plants and animals, an important part of the Langford Lake hydrologic system and ecosystem, and part of the Goldstream watershed. The owls, hawks and eagles hunt there and many of the amphibians and reptiles need that area. The lake is already severely stressed and this development will further damage its resilience. Langford features the lake in its publicity, as do the the many real estate developments. It is a key amenity that contributes a great deal to property values. Even from a purely financial point of view, it does not make sense to risk further damaging the lake and devaluing this wonderful asset the city has built around.

A hotel and 30 additional townhouses will also add to the traffic density, Does the plan use Goldstream for access? Is it intended to create a connection from Goldstream to Westshore Parkway? Either would create high pressure on Goldstream, a small road with narrow shoulders and poor visibility due to the hills and bends in the road.

Finally, I would like to make you aware that there is a strong prevailing attitude among Langford citizens that Langford Council does not care about the environment and will not listen to voices of opposition to the relentless development. People are upset about this and other developments that continue to destroy ecosystems and watersheds and they feel powerless to do anything about it.

For the record, I am strongly opposed to this planned rezoning and development.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]