

Recipient: City of Langford, Langford City Hall

Letter: Greetings,
Stop Southglen Drive through traffic proposal

Signatures

Name	Location	Date
David Attwood	Canada	2020-06-16
Rachel Attwood	Victoria, Canada	2020-06-22
Kyleigh Wright	Victoria, Canada	2020-06-22
Alycia Attwood	Victoria, Canada	2020-06-22
Rob Fugle	Victoria, Canada	2020-06-23
Sharon Fugle	Victoria, Canada	2020-06-23
Angela McRae	Victoria, Canada	2020-06-23
Darcy White	Colwood, Canada	2020-06-23
Regina Rose	Victoria, Canada	2020-06-23
colleen guiney	Victoria, Canada	2020-06-25
Ian White	Langford, Canada	2020-06-27
Lyndal Greig	Victoria, Canada	2020-06-27
Katelyn White	Victoria, Canada	2020-06-27
Zoltan Barna	Victoria, Canada	2020-06-27
Pawan Kahlon	Victoria, Canada	2020-06-27
Rob Greig	Langford, Canada	2020-06-27
Julia Smith	Victoria, Canada	2020-06-27
Caitlin Daykin	Victoria, Canada	2020-06-27
Abel Bouchard	Victoria, Canada	2020-06-27
Ranjit Kahlon	Victoria, Canada	2020-06-27

Name	Location	Date
Chris Peterson	Victoria, Canada	2020-06-27
Shaun Kahlon	Victoria, Canada	2020-06-27
Emma Douglas	Vancouver, Canada	2020-06-27
Tara Willett	Victoria, Canada	2020-06-27
Darcy Harder	Victoria, Canada	2020-06-27
Cody Wallace	Victoria, Canada	2020-06-28
Matthew Olsten	Victoria, Canada	2020-06-28
Mark Cawsey	Victoria, Canada	2020-06-28
Darlene Schneider	Victoria, Canada	2020-06-28
ROSEMARY White	Victoria, Canada	2020-06-28
Nicholas Steele	Victoria, Canada	2020-06-28
wayne olsten	Victoria, Canada	2020-06-28
Craig Allan	Victoria, Canada	2020-06-28
Ian Daykin	Victoria, Canada	2020-06-28
Nicola Olsten	Victoria, Canada	2020-06-28
Eric Starling	Victoria, Canada	2020-06-28
Kimberley Starling	Victoria, Canada	2020-06-28
Stephanie Wheaton	Victoria, Canada	2020-06-28
Robyn Smith	Victoria, Canada	2020-06-28
Katherine Dyson	Victoria, Canada	2020-06-28
Ashley Wilson	Victoria, Canada	2020-06-28
Rita Tully	Victoria, Canada	2020-06-28

Name	Location	Date
Jessica Alcock	Macclesfield, England, UK	2020-06-28
Allison Munro	Saanichton, Canada	2020-06-28
cheryl marsh	Victoria, Canada	2020-06-28
Kylie Heron	Victoria, Canada	2020-06-28
Findlay Brook	Victoria, Canada	2020-06-28
Hilary Baldwin	Victoria, Canada	2020-06-28
James Baldwin	Victoria, Canada	2020-06-28
Alexa Baldwin	Langford, Canada	2020-06-28
Jolynn Smith	Victoria, Canada	2020-06-28
Doreen Jensen	Surrey, Canada	2020-06-28
Andrea Jensen	Victoria, Canada	2020-06-28
Bob Wheaton	Victoria, Canada	2020-06-28
Larry Wheaton	Winnipeg, Canada	2020-06-28
Adan Hillis	Victoria, Canada	2020-06-28
Dustin Mcconnell	Saanichton, Canada	2020-06-28
Kath Westwell	Heald Green, England, UK	2020-06-28
Bryan Wilton	Victoria, Canada	2020-06-28
Ayla McDonald	Victoria, Canada	2020-06-28
Cathy Pyett	Victoria, Canada	2020-06-28
Brad Erickson	Victoria, Canada	2020-06-28
Christina Henshaw	Victoria, Canada	2020-06-28
Robert Braaten	Victoria, Canada	2020-06-28

Name	Location	Date
Niki Gollmer	Victoria, Canada	2020-06-28
Jill Reimer	Canada	2020-06-28
Tyler Baldwin	Victoria, Canada	2020-06-28
Ted Truscott	Victoria, Canada	2020-06-28
Ashleigh Enright	victoria, Canada	2020-06-28
Shilo Bagshaw	Victoria, Canada	2020-06-28
Mimi Laf	Victoria, Canada	2020-06-28
Karen Hatch	Victoria, Canada	2020-06-28
Dawn Sheppard	Saanich, Canada	2020-06-28
Barbara Wilson	Victoria, Canada	2020-06-28
Gigi Choy	Victoria, Canada	2020-06-28
Sean Poole	Victoria, Canada	2020-06-28
Elva Poole	Campbell River, Canada	2020-06-28
Stephen Vincent	Victoria, Canada	2020-06-28
Louise Mackay	Victoria, Canada	2020-06-29
Michael Sidhu	Victoria, Canada	2020-06-29
Kristin James	Vancouver, Canada	2020-06-29
Darin Ferrill	Victoria, Canada	2020-06-29
Alan Baldwin	Sidney, Canada	2020-06-29
Lisa Nordin	Victoria, Canada	2020-06-29
John Butler	Victoria, Canada	2020-06-29
Cindy Robertson	Abbotsford, Canada	2020-06-29

Name	Location	Date
Trevor Wheaton	Okotoks, Canada	2020-06-29
Pamela Truscott-White	Victoria, Canada	2020-06-29
Marcus Swift	Victoria, Canada	2020-06-29
Dan Gross	Victoria, Canada	2020-06-29
Madeline McCarthy	Edmonton, Canada	2020-06-29
Mouli paul	Calgary, Canada	2020-06-29
Holly Ritchie	Winnipeg, Canada	2020-06-29
Andrea Clark	Victoria, Canada	2020-06-29
Cindy Parrish	Victoria, Canada	2020-06-29
michelle Edgington	Victoria, Canada	2020-06-29
Jason Lehman	Victoria, Canada	2020-06-29
Jim Nygaard	Surrey, Canada	2020-06-29
Julie Thompson	Victoria, Canada	2020-06-29

[REDACTED]
Alderglen Pl
Langford BC [REDACTED]

Re: Rezoning Bylaw Amendment for 2627 Sooke Rd (Z19-0023)

Concerns regarding this application

- Why does the proposed new building need to exit onto Southglen at all? There are many buildings that have right-turn only rules all over this province. Residents/visitors simply must take a slightly different route. For example, coming up Glen Lake Road to Sooke Road.
- A parking exit on to Southglen will destroy this family centered area. This is a family neighbourhood with children often playing & cycling in the streets of Alderglen, Southglen and both Ernhills. This is also the route children walk to get to Happy Valley Elementary and Belmont Secondary or to catch the school bus to John Stubbs, Spencer, Dunsmuir, or Royal Bay schools.
 - Currently there is little infrastructure, including: few streetlights, no sidewalks, soft shoulders, no parking/parking controls.
 - In poor winter weather, the switchback hill of Ernhill Drive is not well maintained, and vehicles often have difficulty with it (including those with snow tires). There will be increased risks with more traffic on this hill.
- Currently there are approximately 58 residences on the streets (with an additional 5 or so being built at the end of Ernhill Dr). That is already 58 households, soon to be 63, using Ernhill Dr as an exit. Most households here have 2 cars (some even more). That means approximately 138 cars/day use Ernhill. This development will DOUBLE the amount of traffic at ANY given time on these streets, not just peak hours.
- Any visitors for Ernhill Place already must park on Ernhill Dr & Southglen. Most likely this will be the same for the 5 new homes being built. There is already frequent parking congestion along the sides of the roads.
- The requested bylaw amendment would be to take the parking down from 2.25 parking stalls/unit to 1.25 parking stalls/unit. This will equal 112.5 cars for 90 units. Let's be honest, if there are 2 adults living in a 1-bed unit, there is a good chance there will be 2 cars/unit and not just 1 which would mean the potential addition of another 67 vehicles on top of the 112. If we split the difference and take just 30 of those vehicles, that is

adding an extra car for every other house on Alderglen, Southglen, and both Ernhill Dr & Pl. Where will they park? That's not even including any visitors or commercial parking.

- This bylaw change will negatively affect the value of homes on these streets with the increased traffic and parking congestion.

Why would the City of Langford be willing to zone this address as C9 when the current infrastructure of the existing neighborhood cannot cope with the added traffic?

Next, looking at the document entitled Design Guidelines and Development Permit Areas developed by the City of Langford, Appendix O, I would like to discuss a few items. Appendix O is specifically about the Jacklin/Sooke Road Comprehensive Development Area Design.

Firstly, under the section entitled Justification we find the following statement:

The justification of this designation is to ensure that Council has the ability to secure the necessary information and establish conditions on developments such that the form and character of new commercial and multi-family residential development are of a high quality, and best suited to both the surrounding properties and the vision of Langford as expressed in the Langford Plan. (Appendix O, pg O1)

I can see how the frontage of this building suits the vision of Langford, however, I fail to see how increasing the traffic and parking congestion through the Alderglen/Southglen/Ernhill neighbourhood is best suited to the surrounding properties.

Secondly, under section O1 Site Organization, subsection Guidelines we find the following:

The siting and massing of new commercial buildings on this site should be massed in a manner that is sympathetic to the local context. Buildings over four stories are not considered appropriate; (Appendix O, pg o2)

If buildings over four stories are not considered appropriate, why is council considering a building proposal that is six stories in height?

Thank you for your consideration,

[REDACTED]



Alderglen Pl

June 29, 2020

████████████████████
████████ Alderglen Place
Victoria, BC ██████████

To whom it may concern,

RE: Proposed Bylaw No. 1883 for 26278 Sooke Road (Z19-0023)

In response to the Notice of Public Hearing, for the above property and bylaw amendments, as residents of the Alderglen Place and surrounding community for three years, we are writing to express our concerns with this application and proposed bylaw changes.

Our main concerns are related to the parking exit from the proposed apartments onto Southglen Drive. Currently, the 'no exit' road from Ernhill Drive onto Southglen Drive and ending at Alderglen Place has no infrastructure in place to support this change. There are many families with young children who live in this area. These families are often seen riding bikes or scooters, playing basketball or football, and playing in the cul-de-sac and the nearby park. Opening up Southglen Drive for access to the proposed C9 complex will substantially increase the flow of traffic through the already poorly lit and unsafe roads. In poor winter conditions, like we have seen the past few years, the Ernhill Drive hill is difficult to drive up or down and would be considerably unsafe with increased use.

Approval of an access point to this proposed development from Southglen Drive will not only lead to increased traffic flow, but also an increase to parking congestion. Most families in this community own more than one vehicle and one or two recreational vehicles. There is already limited street parking spaces available. The requested bylaw amendment, to decrease the number of parking stalls per unit from 2.25 to 1.25, is an unrealistic option that will leave apartment residents parking on surrounding streets and contributing further to congested streets in the surrounding area.

We purchased our home in this area because we were attracted to the quiet and peaceful community. Passing this bylaw change will negatively affect the value of our home and others in our community due to the associated increased traffic and parking congestion.

Although we fully support the growth of the city of Langford and understand the need for affordable housing, we are strongly against the proposed, new building having an access through Southglen Drive. We request that the city of Langford and the developer of the proposed C9 zone work toward another option that would leave Ernhill Drive, Southglen Drive and Alderglen Place with the same, safe and peaceful community-vibe that we fell in love with ██████████ years ago.

Thank you for your consideration,

████████████████████



[REDACTED] Southglen Drive
Victoria, B.C. [REDACTED]

June 29 2020

To Whom It May Concern Re Rezoning Bylaw Amendment for 2627 Sooke Road (Z19-0023)

I have lived at [REDACTED] Southglen Drive for [REDACTED] years. This is a nice residential area with a mixture of families including some seniors with walkers and at least 2 families with children with special needs.

Over the years I have seen many changes in my neighbourhood. Mostly in increased housing therefore causing increased traffic. First was the 5 plex, then the townhouses, and the not yet completed 9 houses being built by Dave Horner with access to all coming off Ernhil Drive.

With further construction of a 90 suite apartment block with access from Ernhil to Southglen Drive the increased traffic will double or more. This neighbourhood was not built for this amount of traffic. Furthermore at 2627 Sooke Road there is only 115 parking spaces available. That inadequate parking will ensure tenants and their visitors will be parking on Alderglen, Southglen, and Ernhil Road which could result in us taxpayers not having room for our family and friends to park. These streets can at times already be congested and people have to navigate large ditches.

I do not understand why there cannot be access to this building elsewhere. I am strongly opposed to this and am asking city council to deny this proposal and anticipate your cooperation addressing these concerns.

[REDACTED]

Emily Garry

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, June 29, 2020 6:57 AM
To: Robert Dykstra
Cc: Langford Planning General Mailbox; [REDACTED]
Subject: Proposed Bylaw No. 1883 - 2627 Sooke Road

Dear Mr. Robert Dykstra,

I would like to state on record that I am opposed to the rezoning of the property at 2627 Sooke Road. I am further opposed to the amendment of Bylaw no. 300 by means of proposed Bylaw no. 1883 which would allow the developer of this property to build a 90 unit condominium with access from Southglen Drive.

For reference I have lived in Langford since I was 2 years old starting in [REDACTED]. The only absence from living in my hometown was a [REDACTED] years stint in Europe. I now have a family of my own, [REDACTED], at [REDACTED] Alderglen Place which will be substantially affected by the proposed access that council is debating. Having grown up in Langford through the 1980's and 1990's I experienced the days when Langford was family focused and having games of hockey on the street or riding your bike down the street was a daily occurrence, as it should be for children. If the proposed Bylaw 1883 moves forward where this large condo block has access to Southglen Drive that kind of experience growing up will no longer be something that is possible for my [REDACTED].

Langford pushes the image of being family friendly and yet these mature neighbourhoods where young families have enjoyed the type of freedom and safety we are requesting here are at risk. It would be preferable if this condo complex was accessed from Sooke Road only. Allowing the neighbourhood behind this new development to remain a place people will want to stay and raise families.

I fully understand the Langford municipality has a continuous goal of creating more options for people to live but why does that have to be at the expense of the tax paying residents that have lived in these mature neighbourhoods for decades?

I request that council reviews this matter from the point of view of the people who have lived in Langford for years, have supported the local economy for years, and have touted the benefits of living in these neighbourhoods to other greater Victoria residents. I mentioned in the paragraph about myself that I lived in Europe. I chose to come back to Langford because I wanted to escape the cramped, over populated life that is a hallmark of European cities and suburban areas so I could raise a family with the experiences such as I had. I chose to purchase a house in an isolated cul de sac for this specifically to encourage the kind of freedom growing up in this city once offered. It feels like the goal of Langford city council is the march of progress and expansion without considering the people that helped make this happen over the past 15 to 20 years.

I graduated from Belmont in [REDACTED] and with many options to live around the world chose to come back to what Langford has to offer. Please review this proposed new development thinking of what is important over the long term to this city. This is likely just one neighbourhood with no pulling power to make you consider this request seriously and most likely decision has already been made. However I am still one of the people who has tried to make this city a better place and not being able to have safety on the roads outside of my home, solely for the benefit of another condo block, is a travesty.

Back in January when [REDACTED] attended the pre-hearing on this proposed zoning change and their attempts to state Southglen was always planned to continue into the remaining lots; that city plan was likely from 30-40 years ago when it was expected to be large lot family dwellings occupying that land. Turning this development now into condominiums ruins this well established neighbourhood. The building will be too high and the amount of traffic will be much more than the "survey" they paid for suggests. Many units will have more than one car. I know your argument being transit and jobs are close BUT many people in this neighbourhood do end up owning multiple cars and traveling for work because not everyone wants to work for the businesses in Belmont Park (fast food or grocery stores)

The city of Langford I know does have a vision for Sooke road and understand this would mean you are one step closer to achieving this vision but again the residents of Ernhill, Southglen and Alderglen will be severely effected giving them access to Southglen. The infrastructure is already weighed with all the development in this area. With insufficient sidewalks and street lighting. There

are so many condos being built within a five minute walk and the roads in and out of Langford aren't changing enough to cope. Not only does this burden on the local area resources (like Happy Valley School) but our kids won't be able to play on Southglen or Alderglen streets any longer due to extreme increase in cars using the road and other non residents of these streets using this new route as a short cut. We will loose the community we cherish and our house values will evidently suffer from these changes.

I am open to further questions or inquiries to this message in protest of the proposed Bylaw no. 1883 and the access to this property from Southglen Drive.

Thank you for your time.

[REDACTED]

Robert Dykstra

Planning Department

City of Langford

Sent by E-mail: rdykstra@langford.ca

Copy to Suzette Chapman, Planning Assistant

Sent by e-mail: planning@langford.ca

Request for submission during the Public Hearing, Monday, 29 June 2020 at 5:30pm.

RE: Proposal to amend Langford Zoning Bylaw 300 by means of proposed Bylaw No. 1883. File Z19-0023

The purpose of the bylaw is to rezone 2627 Sooke Road from R2(one and two- family residential) Zone to the C9 (Community Town Centre Pedestrian 9) Zone that includes a request for increased density on this site to permit a 90-unit apartment building with one commercial unit along Sooke Road.

In the materials provided to date, there is no traffic study / report regarding the impact to Southglen Drive, Ernhill Drive and Jacklin Road should this development be approved to proceed.

As a resident on Ernhill Drive for the past ■■■ years, I can provide first-hand knowledge of the increase of traffic flow over the past several years as a result of the completion of the multi-unit housing development at the end of Ernhill Drive. We have seen a fair increase in vehicle traffic as a result from these residents. Ernhill Drive was never designed for potential as a through-street but rather a dead-end street to service a small residential neighbourhood. There are no sidewalks for pedestrians – we all use the road for walking, biking, kids on their skateboards. The Southglen/Ernhill neighbourhood has only one way in and out to Jacklin Road. In addition, Ernhill Drive has a steep grade at the top off Jacklin Road with two sharp bends in the road. The last bend in the road creates a blind spot for vehicles travelling down the street. Regardless of the posted speed limit, drivers tend to approach this bend at an excess speed requiring quick action to brake for residents pulling out their driveway – creating a safety hazard.

The developer is requesting approval to build a 90-unit apartment building with a grade level commercial unit that only allows the access and egress directly off Southglen /Ernhill Drive and Jacklin Road except for minor right hand turns on and off onto Sooke Road.

Even with the reduced parking variance being requested, it would result in approximately 150 parking stalls on site. That would equate to approximately 150 vehicles requiring access to this site on a daily basis to go to work and back and to go shopping, etc. In addition, there would be service vehicles, delivery vans, recycling and garbage pick ups that would be required. Also visitors to the residents and the commercial business. This back and forth traffic will result in approximately 300 vehicles needing to use Ernhill Drive / Southglen Drive on a daily basis. The additional traffic allowing this new access for this 90-unit development would change the very nature of the street and raise safety concerns for the current residents.

This Bylaw change would severely impact our neighbourhood by bringing an unacceptable level of traffic on our only street. This would contribute to decreasing the value of each of the residents' properties.

Although the report mentions the re-development of other multi-family and mixed-use buildings similar to this proposal in nearby surroundings, such as the Happy Valley/Sooke Road development; it is important to note that the difference is that the access for that development for traffic on and off the site does not go through a one-way residential crescent like this proposal.

This has always been a neighbourhood of well established and maintained homes and not a neighbourhood in transition.

We are opposed to the application to rezone 2627 Sooke Road from One-and-Two Family Residential (R2) to Community Town Centre Pedestrian 9 (C9) that would allow a 90-unit Apartment Building with one Commercial Unit along Sooke Road.

Respectfully submitted by,

[REDACTED]

Homeowners of [REDACTED] Ernhill Drive

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
Alderglen Pl
Langford BC [REDACTED]

Re: Rezoning Bylaw Amendment for 2627 Sooke Rd (Z19-0023)

Concerns regarding this application

- Why does the proposed new building need to exit onto Southglen at all? There are many buildings that have right-turn only rules all over this province. Residents/visitors simply must take a slightly different route. For example, coming up Glen Lake Road to Sooke Road.
- A parking exit on to Southglen will destroy this family centered area. This is a family neighbourhood with children often playing & cycling in the streets of Alderglen, Southglen and both Ernhills. This is also the route children walk to get to Happy Valley Elementary and Belmont Secondary or to catch the school bus to John Stubbs, Spencer, Dunsmuir, or Royal Bay schools.
 - Currently there is little infrastructure, including: few streetlights, no sidewalks, soft shoulders, no parking/parking controls.
 - In poor winter weather, the switchback hill of Ernhill Drive is not well maintained, and vehicles often have difficulty with it (including those with snow tires). There will be increased risks with more traffic on this hill.
- Currently there are approximately 58 residences on the streets (with an additional 5 or so being built at the end of Ernhill Dr). That is already 58 households, soon to be 63, using Ernhill Dr as an exit. Most households here have 2 cars (some even more). That means approximately 138 cars/day use Ernhill. This development will DOUBLE the amount of traffic at ANY given time on these streets, not just peak hours.
- Any visitors for Ernhill Place already must park on Ernhill Dr & Southglen. Most likely this will be the same for the 5 new homes being built. There is already frequent parking congestion along the sides of the roads.
- The requested bylaw amendment would be to take the parking down from 2.25 parking stalls/unit to 1.25 parking stalls/unit. This will equal 112.5 cars for 90 units. Let's be honest, if there are 2 adults living in a 1-bed unit, there is a good chance there will be 2 cars/unit and not just 1 which would mean the potential addition of another 67 vehicles on top of the 112. If we split the difference and take just 30 of those vehicles, that is

adding an extra car for every other house on Alderglen, Southglen, and both Ernhill Dr & Pl. Where will they park? That's not even including any visitors or commercial parking.

- This bylaw change will negatively affect the value of homes on these streets with the increased traffic and parking congestion.

Why would the City of Langford be willing to zone this address as C9 when the current infrastructure of the existing neighborhood cannot cope with the added traffic?

Next, looking at the document entitled Design Guidelines and Development Permit Areas developed by the City of Langford, Appendix O, I would like to discuss a few items. Appendix O is specifically about the Jacklin/Sooke Road Comprehensive Development Area Design.

Firstly, under the section entitled Justification we find the following statement:

The justification of this designation is to ensure that Council has the ability to secure the necessary information and establish conditions on developments such that the form and character of new commercial and multi-family residential development are of a high quality, and best suited to both the surrounding properties and the vision of Langford as expressed in the Langford Plan. (Appendix O, pg O1)

I can see how the frontage of this building suits the vision of Langford, however, I fail to see how increasing the traffic and parking congestion through the Alderglen/Southglen/Ernhill neighbourhood is best suited to the surrounding properties.

Secondly, under section O1 Site Organization, subsection Guidelines we find the following:

The siting and massing of new commercial buildings on this site should be massed in a manner that is sympathetic to the local context. Buildings over four stories are not considered appropriate; (Appendix O, pg o2)

If buildings over four stories are not considered appropriate, why is council considering a building proposal that is six stories in height?

Thank you for your consideration,

[REDACTED]

 Alderglen Pl

From: Robert Dykstra
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Department Directory - Building - Commercial development beside residence
Date: Tuesday, January 7, 2020 10:18:00 AM

Hi Robert,

I've been forwarded your email and can assist as best possible. We don't have materials to review that discusses rights, but there will be public meetings in which you're invited to speak to the project, voicing any concerns that you have. You may also write to us well. When a public meeting is scheduled to be held, you'll receive notification in the mail that outlines where and when it will take place. Your best options are to speak at the meetings and/or write to us so that both the Planning Committee and City Council can be made aware of your concerns.

If I can help in any other way, please let me know.

Thanks,
Robert

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: January 6, 2020 10:35 AM
To: Langford Administration General Mailbox <administration@cityoflangford.ca>
Subject: Department Directory - Building - Commercial development beside residence

You have received an email from [REDACTED] via the Langford website:

Department: Building

Name: [REDACTED]

Phone: [REDACTED]

Address: [REDACTED]

Topic: Commercial development beside residence

Message:

Good morning. A 90 unit building (2627 Sooke Road) is to be built [REDACTED]. I have some concerns for both my home and my street. Is there any reference material that I can review that discusses what my rights are as an affected resident. I'm mostly concerned with property value, safety, and privacy. Thank you.

June 29, 2020

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] Alderglen Place
Victoria, BC [REDACTED]

To whom it may concern,

RE: Proposed Bylaw No. 1883 for 26278 Sooke Road (Z19-0023)

In response to the Notice of Public Hearing, for the above property and bylaw amendments, as residents of the Alderglen Place and surrounding community for three years, we are writing to express our concerns with this application and proposed bylaw changes.

Our main concerns are related to the parking exit from the proposed apartments onto Southglen Drive. Currently, the 'no exit' road from Ernhill Drive onto Southglen Drive and ending at Alderglen Place has no infrastructure in place to support this change. There are many families with young children who live in this area. These families are often seen riding bikes or scooters, playing basketball or football, and playing in the cul-de-sac and the nearby park. Opening up Southglen Drive for access to the proposed C9 complex will substantially increase the flow of traffic through the already poorly lit and unsafe roads. In poor winter conditions, like we have seen the past few years, the Ernhill Drive hill is difficult to drive up or down and would be considerably unsafe with increased use.

Approval of an access point to this proposed development from Southglen Drive will not only lead to increased traffic flow, but also an increase to parking congestion. Most families in this community own more than one vehicle and one or two recreational vehicles. There is already limited street parking spaces available. The requested bylaw amendment, to decrease the number of parking stalls per unit from 2.25 to 1.25, is an unrealistic option that will leave apartment residents parking on surrounding streets and contributing further to congested streets in the surrounding area.

We purchased our home in this area because we were attracted to the quiet and peaceful community. Passing this bylaw change will negatively affect the value of our home and others in our community due to the associated increased traffic and parking congestion.

Although we fully support the growth of the city of Langford and understand the need for affordable housing, we are strongly against the proposed, new building having an access through Southglen Drive. We request that the city of Langford and the developer of the proposed C9 zone work toward another option that would leave Ernhill Drive, Southglen Drive and Alderglen Place with the same, safe and peaceful community-vibe that we fell in love with [REDACTED] years ago.

Thank you for your consideration,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Robert Dykstra](#)
Subject: 2627 Sooke Road Application for rezoning
Date: Sunday, June 28, 2020 9:54:23 AM

Mr. Dykstra,

I live on Ernhill Drive with my husband and 2 small children. We are unable to attend the electronic town hall tomorrow, but we are strongly opposed to the rezoning application of the development at 2627 Sooke Road. There is simply not enough room for street parking, which will overflow onto Southglen and Alderglen. It is not unreasonable to assume that the vast majority of residents in the proposed condominium will have at least 1 vehicle, and an average of 1.5 is also not unreasonable to expect.

Furthermore, we would like to see a left turn from Sooke road into the condominiums and no through access from our quiet streets. Ernhill has no sidewalks, barely a shoulder and many turns. The speed limit is 50km/hr and cars fly down the road. Without an improvement to infrastructure, the increase in traffic will make our quiet road feel unsafe for pedestrians, cyclists and children.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [Agendas](#)
To: [Suzette Chapman](#)
Subject: FW: Bylaws, Council/Committee Meetings and Agendas
Date: Tuesday, June 23, 2020 8:41:58 AM

Over to you for action.

Christina Bell

Confidential Corporate Services Coordinator

From: langford@atomic-crayon.com <langford@atomic-crayon.com> **On Behalf Of**
[REDACTED]

Sent: June 22, 2020 10:46 AM

To: Agendas <agendas@langford.ca>

Subject: Bylaws, Council/Committee Meetings and Agendas

You have received an email from [REDACTED] via the Langford website contact us form

Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone: [REDACTED]

Address: [REDACTED]

Message:

Dear Mr. Robert Dykstra,

I want it on record that I am opposed to the rezoning the property at 2627 Sooke Road.

Furthermore, I am opposed to the amendment of Bylaw no. 300 by means of proposed Bylaw No. 1883 which would allow the developer of said property to build in less that 1.5 parking stalls per unit with the additional .25 parking stalls set aside for visitor parking.

After my wife passed, my daughters and I moved to [REDACTED] because it was a quiet residential street. It was our dream home and I had every intention to make this residence my forever home and something that I might be able to pass on down to my daughters. This quiet street was perfect for our family home.

In this quiet little valley are m any other young families and a park that the local residence enjoy taking their young children too.

The property at 2627 Sooke road is going to introduce 90 units to our quiet area. These means 90 families with a potential of 90 more vehicles. This is if each unit only has one vehicle. many couples have two vehicles so it is within reason to believe that this building can bring a potential 180 more vehicles to the area. Also understand that this potential number does not include visitors to the

above mentioned property.

As 2627 Sooke Road is asking for only 115 parking spots for the 90 units, there will be inadequate parking available to the future residence. With inadequate parking, the residence of the proposed 2627 Sooke road will be forced to park on side streets and will clog the narrow streets of Southglen Drive and Alderglen Place with more cars.

With Sooke road not having a left turning lane into the property, and the proposed property only having a Right In Right Out entrance, the traffic for the proposed development will be turning left on Jacklin Road, Right on Ernhill Road and right on Southglen Drive where the proposed entrance to the property will be. This means that this quiet street will see a potential of 180 plus vehicles travelling down this road daily. Also this means congestion at the intersection of Jacklin and Sooke road as well as the traffic increasing 800% down quiet streets where young children play road hockey and basket ball and ride their bikes.

This drastic change in the landscape for the residence of Sooke Road, Ernhill Road, Southglen Drive and Alderglen place will be immediate. This change will have a tremendous impact on our right to enjoyment of our properties. As part of the selling feature of this neighbourhood is the lack of access and the low vehicle traffic, this development will have effect the markability and therefore the value of our collective properties.

I would like to see no access to the property at 2627 Sooke Road from Southglen, vehicle or pedestrian, in order to reduce traffic and parking on our quiet and safe streets.

I implore the city council to deny this application as it stands.

Sincerely,

A black rectangular redaction box covering the signature of the sender.

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, November 2, 2020 3:14 PM
To: Langford Planning General Mailbox <planning@langford.ca>
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Proposed Bylaw no. 1883

Dear Langford City Council,

I would like to state on record that I am still opposed to the rezoning of the property at 2627 Sooke Road. I am further opposed to the amendment of Bylaw no. 300 by means of proposed Bylaw no. 1883 which would allow the developer of this property to build a 90-unit condominium with access from Southglen Drive.

For reference I have lived in Langford since I was 2 years old starting in [REDACTED]. The only absence from living in my hometown was a [REDACTED] years stint in Europe. I now have a family of my own, [REDACTED] which will be substantially affected by the proposed access that council is debating. Having grown up in Langford through the 1980's and 1990's I experienced the days when Langford was family focused and having games of hockey on the street or riding your bike down the street was a daily occurrence, as it should be for children. If the proposed Bylaw 1883 moves forward where this large condo block has access to Southglen Drive that kind of experience growing up will no longer be something that is possible for my [REDACTED].

Langford pushes the image of being family friendly and yet these mature neighbourhoods where young families have enjoyed the type of freedom and safety we are requesting here are at risk. It would be preferable if this condo complex was only accessed from Sooke Road. Allowing the neighbourhood behind this new development to remain a place people will want to stay and raise families. If any access is granted off Southglen, visitors and residents will drastically increase traffic along with parking on our streets which hinders our family's ability to play in the neighbourhood.

I fully understand that Langford municipality has a continuous goal of creating more options for people to live but why does that have to be at the expense of the tax paying residents that have lived in these mature neighbourhoods for decades?

I request that council reviews this matter from the point of view of the people who have lived in Langford for years, have supported the local economy for years, and have touted the benefits of living in these neighbourhoods to other greater Victoria residents. I mentioned in the paragraph about myself that I lived in Europe. I chose to come back to Langford because I wanted to escape the cramped, over populated life that is a hallmark of European cities and suburban areas so I could raise a family with the experiences such as I had. I chose to purchase a house in an isolated cul de sac specifically to encourage the kind of freedom and enjoyment growing up in this city once offered. It feels like the goal of Langford city council is the march of progress and expansion without considering the people that helped make this happen over the past 15 to 20 years.

I graduated from Belmont in [REDACTED] and with many options to live around the world chose to come back to what Langford has to offer. Please review this proposed new development thinking of what is important over the long term to this city. This is likely just one neighbourhood with no pulling power to make you consider this request seriously and most likely the decision has already been made. However, I am still one of the people who has tried to make this city a better place and not being able to have safety on the roads outside of my home, solely for the benefit of another condo block, is a travesty.

Back in January my [REDACTED] attended the pre-hearing on this proposed zoning change and their attempts to state Southglen was always planned to continue into the remaining lots. That city plan 30-40 years ago was expected to be large lot family dwellings occupying that land. Turning this development into condominiums specifically to max out the land ruins this well-established neighbourhood. The building will be too high and the amount of traffic will be much more than the "survey" they paid for suggests. Many units will have more than one car. I know your argument being transit and jobs are close BUT many people in this neighbourhood do end up owning multiple cars and traveling for work because not everyone wants to work for the businesses in Belmont Park (fast food or grocery stores) which is really the only place within walking distance.

The city of Langford has a vision for Sooke Road and I understand this would mean you are one step closer to achieving this vision but again the residents of Ernhill, Southglen and Alderglen will be severely affected giving them access to Southglen. The infrastructure is already buckling under the increase of people within the area with all the development, simply having to go pick up [REDACTED] from school or day care and navigating Sooke Road in the afternoon clearly shows this. There are so many condos being built on Sooke Road specifically that the roads in and out of Langford aren't changing enough to cope. Not only does this burden the local area resources (like Happy Valley School) but our kids won't be able to play on Southglen or Alderglen streets any longer due to an extreme increase in cars using the road and other non residents of these streets using this new route as a short cut. We will lose the community we cherish and our house values will evidently suffer from these changes.

In summary I believe the number of units in this proposed condo complex should be reduced from 90 down to a more reasonable and sustainable number as well as access from South Glen Drive should be removed to preserve our neighbourhood. The amount of proposed parking spots is not enough and having any access off Southglen will change our community and would no longer support our neighbourhood culture. Our kids will not be as safe playing in my neighborhood and it pushes us to look for another municipality that can offer what we will lose if this development goes ahead.

I am open to further questions or inquiries to this message in protest of the proposed Bylaw no. 1883 and the access to this property from Southglen Drive.

Thank you for your time and consideration of these concerns.

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Robert Dykstra](#)
Subject: 2627 Sooke Road
Date: Monday, June 29, 2020 5:43:17 PM

Dear Robert,

I am writing to signal my concern and objection regarding the proposal to open Southglen Dr for vehicle access to 2627 Sooke Rd.

Southglen Drive and Earnhill lack sidewalks, and limited visibility characterize the areas' driveways. I am concerned about the impact on parking, on pedestrians, on general safety as well as our local property values. I am writing on behalf of [REDACTED] to ask that this amendment not be passed.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]



[REDACTED] Southglen Drive
Victoria, B.C. [REDACTED]

June 29 2020

To Whom It May Concern Re Rezoning Bylaw Amendment for 2627 Sooke Road (Z19-0023)

I have lived at [REDACTED] Southglen Drive for [REDACTED] years. This is a nice residential area with a mixture of families including some seniors with walkers and at least 2 families with children with special needs.

Over the years I have seen many changes in my neighbourhood. Mostly in increased housing therefore causing increased traffic. First was the 5 plex, then the townhouses, and the not yet completed 9 houses being built by Dave Horner with access to all coming off Ernhil Drive.

With further construction of a 90 suite apartment block with access from Ernhil to Southglen Drive the increased traffic will double or more. This neighbourhood was not built for this amount of traffic. Furthermore at 2627 Sooke Road there is only 115 parking spaces available. That inadequate parking will ensure tenants and their visitors will be parking on Alderglen, Southglen, and Ernhil Road which could result in us taxpayers not having room for our family and friends to park. These streets can at times already be congested and people have to navigate large ditches.

I do not understand why there cannot be access to this building elsewhere. I am strongly opposed to this and am asking city council to deny this proposal and anticipate your cooperation addressing these concerns.

[REDACTED]

Emily Garry

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, June 29, 2020 6:57 AM
To: Robert Dykstra
Cc: Langford Planning General Mailbox; [REDACTED]
Subject: Proposed Bylaw No. 1883 - 2627 Sooke Road

Dear Mr. Robert Dykstra,

I would like to state on record that I am opposed to the rezoning of the property at 2627 Sooke Road. I am further opposed to the amendment of Bylaw no. 300 by means of proposed Bylaw no. 1883 which would allow the developer of this property to build a 90 unit condominium with access from Southglen Drive.

For reference I have lived in Langford since I was 2 years old starting in [REDACTED]. The only absence from living in my hometown was a [REDACTED] years stint in Europe. I now have a family of my own, [REDACTED], at [REDACTED] Alderglen Place which will be substantially affected by the proposed access that council is debating. Having grown up in Langford through the 1980's and 1990's I experienced the days when Langford was family focused and having games of hockey on the street or riding your bike down the street was a daily occurrence, as it should be for children. If the proposed Bylaw 1883 moves forward where this large condo block has access to Southglen Drive that kind of experience growing up will no longer be something that is possible for my [REDACTED].

Langford pushes the image of being family friendly and yet these mature neighbourhoods where young families have enjoyed the type of freedom and safety we are requesting here are at risk. It would be preferable if this condo complex was accessed from Sooke Road only. Allowing the neighbourhood behind this new development to remain a place people will want to stay and raise families.

I fully understand the Langford municipality has a continuous goal of creating more options for people to live but why does that have to be at the expense of the tax paying residents that have lived in these mature neighbourhoods for decades?

I request that council reviews this matter from the point of view of the people who have lived in Langford for years, have supported the local economy for years, and have touted the benefits of living in these neighbourhoods to other greater Victoria residents. I mentioned in the paragraph about myself that I lived in Europe. I chose to come back to Langford because I wanted to escape the cramped, over populated life that is a hallmark of European cities and suburban areas so I could raise a family with the experiences such as I had. I chose to purchase a house in an isolated cul de sac for this specifically to encourage the kind of freedom growing up in this city once offered. It feels like the goal of Langford city council is the march of progress and expansion without considering the people that helped make this happen over the past 15 to 20 years.

I graduated from Belmont in [REDACTED] and with many options to live around the world chose to come back to what Langford has to offer. Please review this proposed new development thinking of what is important over the long term to this city. This is likely just one neighbourhood with no pulling power to make you consider this request seriously and most likely decision has already been made. However I am still one of the people who has tried to make this city a better place and not being able to have safety on the roads outside of my home, solely for the benefit of another condo block, is a travesty.

Back in January when [REDACTED] attended the pre-hearing on this proposed zoning change and their attempts to state Southglen was always planned to continue into the remaining lots; that city plan was likely from 30-40 years ago when it was expected to be large lot family dwellings occupying that land. Turning this development now into condominiums ruins this well established neighbourhood. The building will be too high and the amount of traffic will be much more than the "survey" they paid for suggests. Many units will have more than one car. I know your argument being transit and jobs are close BUT many people in this neighbourhood do end up owning multiple cars and traveling for work because not everyone wants to work for the businesses in Belmont Park (fast food or grocery stores)

The city of Langford I know does have a vision for Sooke road and understand this would mean you are one step closer to achieving this vision but again the residents of Ernhill, Southglen and Alderglen will be severely effected giving them access to Southglen. The infrastructure is already weighed with all the development in this area. With insufficient sidewalks and street lighting. There

are so many condos being built within a five minute walk and the roads in and out of Langford aren't changing enough to cope. Not only does this burden on the local area resources (like Happy Valley School) but our kids won't be able to play on Southglen or Alderglen streets any longer due to extreme increase in cars using the road and other non residents of these streets using this new route as a short cut. We will loose the community we cherish and our house values will evidently suffer from these changes.

I am open to further questions or inquiries to this message in protest of the proposed Bylaw no. 1883 and the access to this property from Southglen Drive.

Thank you for your time.

[REDACTED]

Robert Dykstra

Planning Department

City of Langford

Sent by E-mail: rdykstra@langford.ca

Copy to Suzette Chapman, Planning Assistant

Sent by e-mail: planning@langford.ca

Request for submission during the Public Hearing, Monday, 29 June 2020 at 5:30pm.

RE: Proposal to amend Langford Zoning Bylaw 300 by means of proposed Bylaw No. 1883. File Z19-0023

The purpose of the bylaw is to rezone 2627 Sooke Road from R2(one and two- family residential) Zone to the C9 (Community Town Centre Pedestrian 9) Zone that includes a request for increased density on this site to permit a 90-unit apartment building with one commercial unit along Sooke Road.

In the materials provided to date, there is no traffic study / report regarding the impact to Southglen Drive, Ernhill Drive and Jacklin Road should this development be approved to proceed.

As a resident on Ernhill Drive for the past ■■■ years, I can provide first-hand knowledge of the increase of traffic flow over the past several years as a result of the completion of the multi-unit housing development at the end of Ernhill Drive. We have seen a fair increase in vehicle traffic as a result from these residents. Ernhill Drive was never designed for potential as a through-street but rather a dead-end street to service a small residential neighbourhood. There are no sidewalks for pedestrians – we all use the road for walking, biking, kids on their skateboards. The Southglen/Ernhill neighbourhood has only one way in and out to Jacklin Road. In addition, Ernhill Drive has a steep grade at the top off Jacklin Road with two sharp bends in the road. The last bend in the road creates a blind spot for vehicles travelling down the street. Regardless of the posted speed limit, drivers tend to approach this bend at an excess speed requiring quick action to brake for residents pulling out their driveway – creating a safety hazard.

The developer is requesting approval to build a 90-unit apartment building with a grade level commercial unit that only allows the access and egress directly off Southglen /Ernhill Drive and Jacklin Road except for minor right hand turns on and off onto Sooke Road.

Even with the reduced parking variance being requested, it would result in approximately 150 parking stalls on site. That would equate to approximately 150 vehicles requiring access to this site on a daily basis to go to work and back and to go shopping, etc. In addition, there would be service vehicles, delivery vans, recycling and garbage pick ups that would be required. Also visitors to the residents and the commercial business. This back and forth traffic will result in approximately 300 vehicles needing to use Ernhill Drive / Southglen Drive on a daily basis. The additional traffic allowing this new access for this 90-unit development would change the very nature of the street and raise safety concerns for the current residents.

This Bylaw change would severely impact our neighbourhood by bringing an unacceptable level of traffic on our only street. This would contribute to decreasing the value of each of the residents' properties.

Although the report mentions the re-development of other multi-family and mixed-use buildings similar to this proposal in nearby surroundings, such as the Happy Valley/Sooke Road development; it is important to note that the difference is that the access for that development for traffic on and off the site does not go through a one-way residential crescent like this proposal.

This has always been a neighbourhood of well established and maintained homes and not a neighbourhood in transition.

We are opposed to the application to rezone 2627 Sooke Road from One-and-Two Family Residential (R2) to Community Town Centre Pedestrian 9 (C9) that would allow a 90-unit Apartment Building with one Commercial Unit along Sooke Road.

Respectfully submitted by,

[REDACTED]

Homeowners of [REDACTED] Ernhill Drive

[REDACTED]