

Growth Area. Residents can walk to stores for groceries<sup>8</sup>, and there are nearby restaurants.<sup>9</sup>

- Parking concerns. Three streets<sup>10</sup> meet near the path to the proposed community garden site. Far from off-street parking, community gardeners will park on streets. Who knows how many?
- Traffic concerns. Roads meet near the path. Outside traffic (some linked to large residences on the west side of Jacklin Road) uses Sunridge Valley Drive to Brittany Drive. There are nearby large residential buildings in Langford,<sup>11</sup> Belmont Market generates more traffic than Belmont Secondary School did, and eastbound vehicular traffic on Kelly Road has risen markedly. There's no turn signal, so it's hard to turn left off Kelly Road onto Brittany Drive. Adding perhaps 120 community garden plots will make it worse.
- Lack of sidewalks. Homes were built in the late 80s, there are nearly no sidewalks, and no more are planned.
- Concentration of impacts on nearby residents. These residents will not benefit if a project is imposed on the neighbourhood yet will bear a disproportionate share of the burdens.

### ***Outstanding Questions***

- Lighting & Power. In the April 13, 2026 Council meeting, there was confusion about lights near the proposed Community Garden Hub. There are none: the nearest lights are over the foot bridge, in the Macan Place turnaround, and along streets that meet near the pathway. With no lights, there may be no power, which calls into question the site's suitability for many of its expected usages from a safety and security perspective.
- Alternative site evaluation. Colwood has 51 other parks<sup>12</sup>, and its various plans list innumerable places that community food growing activities could take place. With so many options, it is unclear why — notwithstanding policies that community gardens should be within walking distance — no alternative sites are known to have been evaluated. Concentrating garden plots at one site does not respect the Official Community Plan.
- Capacity planning. Six senior staff members approved the Manager of Parks' Report. What traffic and parking studies were completed, and what were the conclusions? Some Intensification is addressed in Annex G.

### ***Conclusion***

The issue is not whether community gardening is beneficial. The issue is whether this proposal is right for this location and whether Council should proceed before issues are fully explored and resolved.

Council should pause the proposal pending further review and consultation.

8 Nearby are Thriftys Belmont Market, Shoppers Drug Mart, Bulk Barn, Superstore, Wal-Mart, Quality Foods, and a grocery store will open in the former Fairway Market space

9 In Langford's Belmont Market and Westshore Town Centre

10 Antrobus Crescent, Brittany Drive, and Sunridge Valley Drive

11 On Reunion Avenue, Sooke Road, Jenkins Avenue, and near Happy Valley Road

12 <https://www.colwood.ca/media/file/20210408-prmp-final>, p. iii

Thank you for committing the time to thoroughly examine the Community Garden Hub proposal, its impacts on the Colwood Creek neighbourhood, and whether it is the best option to meet Colwood’s needs.

Lawrence C. Surges, B.Mus, CD

cc: Colwood Creek Ratepayers Association ([info@colwoodcreekratepayers.ca](mailto:info@colwoodcreekratepayers.ca))

**Annex A**  
**Additional Guiding Principles**

<p>Traffic and Highways Bylaw No. 1134, 2010 (With amendments to January 12, 2026) - <a href="https://colwood.civicweb.net/document/6576/">https://colwood.civicweb.net/document/6576/</a></p>	<p>Excerpts of particular relevance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● the Bylaw exempts residents from the limit of 72 hours of on-street parking, but Council directed staff to draft an amendment, so it’s assumed to apply to everyone, and no more than 2 vehicles associated with a household may park on a street;</li> <li>● parking is to be within 30 cm (12 in) of the curb;</li> <li>● no blocking sidewalks or footpaths; and</li> <li>● parking is prohibited within 6 m from intersections, 6 m before stop signs, 5 m from hydrants, 1.5 m from driveways, and within 1 m of another vehicle.</li> </ul>
<p>Parks Management Bylaw No 1171</p>	<p>(2) No person shall do any of the following in or on any park or on any beach:          (b) foul or pollute with decayed vegetables, carrion, or other organic waste, dung, noxious substances or filth of any kind, any lake, stream, pool, fountain, river or pond</p>

Invasive species must be controlled, but it is noted that fruit and seed-bearing species that OCP Policy 14.2.1.1(f) promotes are often targetted when volunteer groups work in Colwood parks. Removal reduces sources of food for people and wildlife.

**Annex B  
Community Gardens in the CRD**

Information gathering is ongoing; to date, we visited community gardens in Esquimalt and Langford. Searches led to [Esquimalt’s Community Gardens Policy](#), parts of which would be worthwhile additions for any City of Colwood community gardens partnership with any operator.

*The Esquimalt Community Gardens Society evaluates and selects members according to the following criteria:*

1. *Esquimalt resident.*
2. *Reside in an apartment building or renter in a house and does not have access to a yard.*
3. *Living radius to the garden.*
4. *Willingness to volunteer....*
5. *Year round use of the plot....*

**Annex C  
Shortage or Surplus**

Proponents and supporters indicate a capacity of 70 plots fully allocated and a waitlist of 25, for a shortage of 25 plots. They cite this to justify additional garden capacity a factor of 6 times larger, and propose locating it near a Colwood boundary with Langford. Clearly, such a location would be very attractive to Langford residents and less so to most residents of Colwood. On that basis, it cannot be recommended.

A breakdown of Colwood Garden Society membership is unknown; a model with 50% Colwood membership (35 having plots, and 13 waiting) shows a significant surplus.

<i>City Hall</i>		65%	<b>50%</b>	35%	<b>100%</b>
Total plots	70	70	70	70	70
Less: Used	70	46	35	25	70
Available	0	25	35	46	0
Waiting list	25	16	13	9	25
Surplus (Deficit)	<b>-25</b>	8	<b>23</b>	37	<b>-25</b>

Observations:  
 Membership must be 100% Colwood residents to have a shortage of 25 plots  
 Breakeven is at roughly 73% Colwood residents  
 Even if there is a shortage of 25 plots, there is not an urgent need to build as many as 152

## **Annex D**

### **Meeting a Shortfall of 25 Plots**

On April 13, 2026, Brian Beastell asked if other sites were considered. [Minutes of the Colwood Garden Society's 2025 AGM](#) on September 28, 2026 (in City of Colwood Liaison Report), indicate that the City:

- said there's no room in Royal Bay for a community garden although there's apparently demand (number of gardeners not specified), and
- gave permission for a community garden of 20-30 plots opposite the off-street parking along Sunridge Valley Drive.

That many plots could clear the Colwood Garden Society's report waiting list backlog, but because Royal Beach/Waterfront Village is an Intended Area of Growth where build-out is ongoing, it is evident that:

- in accordance with OCP Policy 14.2.1.1(c), the City should facilitate the establishment of a community garden in that vicinity, and
- if buildout of Royal Bay is expected to continue for about 10 years and buildout of Royal Beach (Beachlands) is expected to continue for 15 years, it's too early to conclude there's no space.

The highest density in Colwood will be in our other identified city centre, Colwood Corners/Allandale, and the third highest density will be in the adjacent Hatley Park/Sooke Road Corridor. Those, too, should be priorities.

## **Annex E**

### **Access to Parking Lots (City Hall vs Proposed Colwood Creek Site)**

On May 28, 2026, we walked to gather data. We travelled lightly, were not accompanied by children, and had no need of multiple trips. It was easier for us than it would be for community gardeners. Having no idea where gates will go, we used the junction of paths (where the removed dog waste receptacle used to be) as a point of reference.

Proponents and City staff mention parking lots on Sunridge Valley Drive and Cecil Blogg, which are (with limited street parking on Cecil Blogg) identified in the [Colwood Creek Park Management Plan](#) (page 20, Feature 12) as available parking areas for Park users. They minimize an increased demand for street parking that a large community garden will impose on the neighbourhood.

From a parking lot perspective, there's literally no comparison between City Hall and the proposed site, even if every dog owner stays away. Gardeners *will* park on nearby streets.

The Park Management Plan indicates that the off-street parking on Sunridge Valley Drive accommodates 20 cars, and when additional amenities for families are added, there will be higher demand for parking on that side of the park. We are told that community gardeners will also park there.

**City Hall**

**Proposed Colwood Creek Site**

5 m (gate to front lot)  
11 m (2nd gate to front lot)  
43 m (2<sup>nd</sup> gate and along compound to Wishart Elementary lot)  
54 m (2<sup>nd</sup> gate along path to back lot)  
83 m (2<sup>nd</sup> gate to E staff lot)  
181 m (gate to Wishart Elementary staff lot on Wishart)

414 m (Junction, across bridge, keeping L to Cecil Blogg loop) 4:45  
519 m (Junction of paths to middle of Sunridge Valley offstreet parking lot) 6:10  
4–5 acres (Derek de Canole, Colwood Garden Society Board minutes of March 14, 2026, item #6)

21 m X 31 m = 651 m<sup>2</sup> = .0651 ha, 0.16 acres, or 7,007 sq ft

Sunridge Valley Drive off-street parking: 20 spaces for all park users, with highest overall demand at peak community gardening times

Combined (3 Colwood City Hall parking lots): 75 spaces, with many free during peak community gardening times

**Annex F  
Questions to Consider**

A Co-Chair and a member of the Parks and Environment Committee attended the Colwood Garden Society Information and Planning Meeting on May 14, 2026: Thus, the Parks and Environment Committee and a member of Council are aware that residents are very concerned about the very last two questions on the list. The Colwood Creek Park Management Plan was prescient, so concerns could and should have been anticipated. Even if they seemed muted on April 13<sup>th</sup>, the possibility that residents simply hadn't been told should have been apparent. This handout is from the May 14<sup>th</sup> event.

**Handout not visible during redacting**

Legitimate concerns should be heard and considered by Council,

which should have professional input and advice from staff through the Chief Administrative Officer.

## **Annex G Intensification**

Having no written estimates from the proponent or staff, estimates were generated by Microsoft Copilot based on observational data at other community gardens in BC.

### Discussion

The subdivision is not very densely populated, so the intensity of traffic attributable to residents of the immediate area is low. Compared to other areas, Colwood Creek streets are calm, so Sunridge Valley Drive and Antrobus Crescent are used for driver training, and large running groups often go around the loop three or four times.

A community garden of this scope is not a passive use; it behaves like a small community centre in terms of traffic and daily activity. Based on comparable gardens in BC, which average 1.5 to 2.0 visits per plot per day in peak season, there will be a substantial number of daily visits, most in peak after-work hours from 4-7 pm or on weekends. That baseline is before an allowance for workshops or work parties that a community garden needs to be successful.

### Summary

This project would increase activity density by 5–10x compared to the background level attributable to residents of the immediate area. With no on-site parking, all daily visits will spill onto residential streets. Especially in peak hours, seniors, kids, and pets will face increased conflict with vehicles. The project would increase destination use without appropriate infrastructure.