

D. Harrison  
22 (1) – 201 Street  
Langley, BC V3A 6K1

08 January, 2024

Paula Kusack  
Deputy Corporate Officer  
City of Langley

Re: Bylaw No. 3260 (Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 198)

Dear Ms. Kusack:

Please find below my comments regarding the above-described Zoning Amendment.

To start, I am a resident / homeowner within the City of Langley, but I have no direct connection to this rezoning application. Nor will I be directly impacted by the rezoning of the 200<sup>th</sup> Street Corridor as I live outside that zone.

My comments are therefore, based solely on this application as I have seen described by the City of Langley notices in the *Langley Advance* and online.

I am against this rezoning as it stands for the purpose of this 14-unit townhome. Not because I am against the densification, *per se*, but because of the following reasons.

1. I find that this application is disjointed and stands alone and in isolation from the surrounding properties.
  - a. The traffic infrastructure is already insufficient for the 2 existing properties.
    - i. There currently is no left-turn lane into these properties for northbound traffic, nor is there a segregated right-turn lane for southbound traffic. Further, given the confines of 200<sup>th</sup> Street itself, will there be any future opportunity to create and install one.
    - ii. Given that there will be 7 times the households (from 2 to 14 properties), such an increase will only magnify the existing problem.
    - iii. This is only setting the situation up for magnified traffic hazards at rush-hour. For example, if residents are attempting a left-hand (northbound)

turn out of the property they will have to make a hazardous left-hand turn across 200<sup>th</sup> Street traffic which has just crested the hill. Traffic throughout the day is already thick and uncontrolled left-hand turns across 200<sup>th</sup> Street is already hit-and-miss with safety.

- b. Approval of the application will only result in a piecemeal / hodgepodge of future development along the corridor.
  - i. Both the two northern bordering properties (Parcels 279 and 280) and the two southern bordering properties (Parcels 403 and 402) will at some point, in the future, be seeking a similar rezoning.
  - ii. Both such future reapplications will suffer from the same structural deficiencies.
  - iii. Given that this assembly is in the middle of the block, there will be no opportunity for cohesion of design or planning for the 3 assemblies.
- 2. This application, as it stands in isolation, seems to contradict the City of Langley's own District Policies / Best Practices Guide.
  - a. There is no lane access (8.2.1) nor does there seem to be provision for any future such development.
  - b. There does not appear to be plans for the development of a temporary lane access (8.2.2)
- 3. To me, it seems that the better alternative would be to wait until all the aforementioned properties (Parcels 279, 280, 403, 402) as well as the two current lots are assembled into one large parcel of land. This would permit :
  - a. one larger development, cohesive in design and nature.
  - b. the construction of dedicated turn lanes, both northbound and southbound, that are not possible when developing in isolation.
  - c. the development of a lane access off 45A Avenue, servicing the entire property.
  - d. the development of a controlled light at 45 A Avenue to mitigate and lessen traffic hazards created by the need to turn north across traffic onto 200<sup>th</sup> Street.

4. The City of Langley has spent considerable time and effort to create its new OCP. It has only this one chance to get it right. The opportunity lies to create one, large cohesive neighbourhood within this corridor. To approve small pieces, one at a time, seems to contradict all this time and effort.

Thank you for your time and attention into my feedback.

Sincerely,

Mr. D. Harrison