

Madison Heiser

From: Ernie Kuemmel [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, July 21, 2020 6:08 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Submission Re: 913-929 Burdett Avenue
Attachments: July 23 submission.docx

Please find attached our submission in respect of the 913-929 Burdett Avenue, Mount St. Angela, public hearing to be held July 23, 2020. We would be please to address any questions which you may have.

Thank you for your consideration.

Ernie Kuemmel and Susan Pickard

601, 999 Burdett Avenue, Victoria

[REDACTED]

Madison Heiser

From: Dan Simmons [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 3:04 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Input regarding the proposed changes to 913-929 Burdett Ave and 914-924 McClure St.

Dear Council,

I appreciate the efforts being made to preserve the heritage homes between Burdett and McClure streets. However, I want to alert you to what could evolve into a glaring, embarrassing contradiction to this good intention. If you destroy the character of the setting of heritage homes by creating chaos in traffic flow, parking, and the ability of people who have already been residents of those streets to enjoy the peaceful atmosphere close to downtown that they have worked hard to preserve, then you are defeating your purpose.

I would like to request that studies be done into traffic flow, parking spots, access to buildings and coordination with planned streets designated for bikes only. May these studies help guide you into making wise decisions for preserving the peaceful, livable character of our streets that has made Victoria famous. May the studies preserve you from disastrous mistakes and demonstrate that you are sensitive to these concerns and that you are not moving just for the cause of collaborating with rich, influential "developers."

My wife and I join the other residents of 923 McClure Street in wanting the city council to work efficiently to limit the number of cars using the McClure Street to park on, to exit from or to use as access in some way to buildings on Burdett Street. It is my hope that all the proposals on the table for developments on McClure Street will be seen together so that the plurality of developments will not overpopulate our street with traffic, parked cars, and obstacles for easy access.

Thank you for your consideration of these concerns,

Daniel F. Simmons and Alice R. Simmons
2-923 McClure Street
Victoria, B.C. V8V 3E8

July 21, 2020

Attention: Mayor and Council

RE: 913-929 Burdett Avenue – Mount Saint Angela: Rezoning Application

Dear Mayor Helps and Council:

My wife and I currently are owners in the adjacent building, located at 999 Burdett Avenue.

Although development of this site has been expected and welcomed since we moved into our suite in 2008, the proposal approved in 2008 was much more sensitive to the neighbourhood context and historic values of the Mount Saint Angela site. We and other original owners purchased our properties under the impression that this was the type of development that would proceed going forward because there was an approval in place. When we purchased our suite it was before the 2008 recession. We paid \$1.5 million in 2008 dollars for our suite and particularly for that reason we did our own due diligence in reviewing what was proposed next door to us and welcomed it as it was then proposed.

Unfortunately, the developer found it financially unviable and has now felt the need to revise the project several times with a hugely expanded plans as being applied for today. As a result we and all owners in our complex are being adversely affected by the most recent proposal due to its height and density, among other things.

As you are aware, our building is 5 stories high off Burdett and our complex has 66 units. The most recently proposed plan for the St. Angela's site is for more than double the suites of our complex which is roughly on the same amount of land. We feel that the density currently being proposed is excessive considering the amount of land being used. It appears that the developer is simply increasing the project size with each successive application to accommodate increases in building costs. That should not be council's concern. The applicant has amalgamated these properties with hopes to develop it and economies of the day are dictating revisions for more density. If the developer waits another 5 years, will they apply for a 10 story building? We feel they should wait until after the pandemic settles to see where things settle before advancing this current application in today's even more uncertain times than were present in 2008.

The approved 2008 proposal was better balanced with building height maximums at 4 stories that were lower than the Mount Saint Angela tower and provided a transition from it to the slightly taller Chelsea building. In the initial application it incorporated a step back at two stories which reduced the apparent mass of the building.

The current application shows continuous high buildings along the Burdett streetscape and they appear far too overpowering for a streetscape that wishes to accentuate the historical Christchurch Cathedral, the Cathedral office building and the Cathedral school, Mt. St. Angela's and the Cartriff residence all in this one-block section of Burdett Avenue.

We feel that the new proposal does not demonstrate that a development of the density now being proposed can be sited on a site of this size without both detracting from the heritage values of Mt. St. Angela and the negative impact on the character of the neighbourhood.

In our opinion, features of the new proposal are very problematic for the following reasons:

- Building additions with the current massing overwhelms the historic buildings due to building additions that are taller than our building if the allowed increase in building heights are approved. An increase of 4 metres or 12 feet (equivalent to one additional floor) is excessive and creates much more impact to the neighbouring properties that are directly affected. We feel council should vote against this proposed increase in height.
- A building design with a courtyard, pushes the new buildings and building massing overly close to the neighbouring property and streets.
- No breaks in the buildings across the whole site, which emphasizes the large building mass and overwhelms the street and heritage character on-site.

The proponents need to further demonstrate how they are significantly advancing the community plan's objectives. They have interpreted the policies as giving them those density and height rights without needing to prove how and why they are appropriate for this application. We do not see their proposal demonstrating how they are significantly advancing the plan objectives beyond the amenities already secured (restoration of the Mount Saint Angela property, senior housing through the rezoning in 2008). While the OCP and Humboldt Valley Precinct both allow for development that is denser than the site is zoned for, the Plans require that it be sensitive to the context, compatibility, innovative and desirable. In our view, that has not been satisfactorily demonstrated.

The project design with a large interior courtyard means that the impacts of the proposed development are more strongly felt by the neighbours and the neighbourhood generally. To accommodate their courtyard, the higher elevations in the proposed application seriously impacts our complex's interior courtyard and also negatively affects all suites that face the applicant's property totaling approximately two thirds of our building's occupants.

Other designs could strike a better balance between the needs of the project proponents and the community desires for heritage conservation and livable neighbourhoods.

Adding steps down to the tall building portions would foster better transitions to the street and to the neighbouring properties. The Chelsea property drops a full floor for the segment that runs along Vancouver Street to McClure Street mirroring the slope to the south.

While the project seems to meet parking requirements of the City, we do not see that the proponent has demonstrated that they have, in fact, provided enough vehicle parking for their target market, let alone reducing the current requirement. Proposing 133 units and less than half allotted a parking stall is, in our opinion, grossly deficient. Although seniors will appreciate the location of the development, most that are able would still use a vehicle even if only once or twice in a week. We have been previously told that the target market would be 79 years and over. Is it really realistic to think the majority of these seniors will be using bicycles extensively for their errands? It appears the applicant has organized for almost every resident to have a bicycle with appropriate storage in the parking level (109 bicycle stalls) rather than having more vehicle parking and visitor parking.

Having a complex of this size will also dramatically increase the traffic on McClure Street, which is a dead-end street, because the parkade entrance is from McClure. The additional traffic caused on McClure by the proposed project plus the addition of the 11 townhouses proposed across the street from the proposed project will cause severe traffic issues on McClure because it is not a through street. You must also consider the Abigail's business at the end of the street on McClure. All of these complexes need safe and reasonable access to their properties and this is all only from Vancouver Street and a dead end McClure Street. The applicant should have made the access to their project off of Burdett as it currently is in three locations on the property to gain entry to the Mount St. Angela's buildings.

The applicant previously emphasized the "community" aspect of their development, yet they disregard the effects of the development on the immediate neighbour to the east by not adequately considering the building design and the overlook from these new buildings with unit design and window placement that will create direct views into our building living spaces and outdoor areas. The east building will directly block more than half of the west-facing Chelsea residents from sunlight at various times of year and have severe negative consequences in respect of privacy with the currently proposed building height requests to increase by 4 meters or 12 feet (one floor) which make the applicant's building higher than the Chelsea building. The applicant would have been better to allocate some of the suites to the massive open areas over two floors for the Atrium/Galleria area to lodging rather than adding another floor to their building.

The three-storey glass walls on each side of the historic Mount St. Angela building is also of concern as these glass walls are likely to be a major cause of songbird mortality. Our community enjoys a vast number of songbirds, and to lose any for a design feature that would be incorporated would be a very sad loss for all in the community. Why the applicant has chosen such an ultra modern design for the sections other than the heritage buildings is puzzling. Wouldn't it have been more attractive to have buildings similar to the era of the heritage building to create a small heritage building community?

Locating the loading bay immediately adjacent to the Chelsea residential property with truck reversing signals and delivery traffic is very disruptive and is disrespectful of their neighbours. They should locate the delivery bay somewhere within their own development so the general outside community is less affected.

If an approval is given, which we strongly oppose, we would also renew our request that the developer acknowledge that the kitchen facility would NEVER be used as a commercial kitchen to out-source food service to other facilities. We request that the City put a restrictive covenant on title specifying the restriction that no commercial kitchen facility will ever be allowed on this property. As a direct neighbor we also have serious concerns about odours being emitted by the commercial portion of the proposed facility, that being their in-house laundry and the commercial kitchen. If allowed, these items must be insured to be vented so as not to be a nuisance to the surrounding community.

In closing, we respectfully submit our objections to the currently proposed plan for the Mount St. Angela area and as stated in our initial opening, development of this site is expected and welcomed, but we feel the developer has not proposed a development that would be appropriate for this site or the surrounding community.

Respectfully Submitted,
Ernie Kuemmel and Susan Pickard

Mt St Angela Rezoning Application

July 21 2020

To Mayor Helps and Council

City of Victoria

The addition to our neighborhood of a senior's residents is welcome. Also the fact that the current residents will be housed in a purpose built accommodation .My main concerns regarding this development application are the increase in height, density, lack of open green space, traffic /noise concerns, and loss of heritage aspects.

The loss of the Porte Cochere and the 1912 portion is an example of "development through neglect". The preservation of 2 of the existing houses, and the front portion of Mt St Angela is a benefit. These development proposals started before 2008, so much time to maintain existing structures.

The increase in height and density overwhelm the heritage portion, the street views, and neighbouring properties. The requested increase in height is an additional 13 feet, plus a basement that is not counted. Adding on the roof, the elevator runs , HVAC, and other equipment, seems to be more than 7 storeys. The increased shadowing will have a detrimental effect on nearby gardens. The increase in density is 15% of land size. With the open courtyard for residents use, the open green space is very minimal. The OCP and previous zoning should be followed. The density lift should not apply, the applicant has owned the property since 2006. I see no mention of amenities our neighbourhood would receive.

The building parking is accessed from McClure. However garbage pickup, commercial deliveries, and moving trucks will use Burdett Ave . Along with visitors dropping off/picking up residents. This does not follow city guidelines for access.

Catherine Brankston

Owner/resident

314 999 Burdett Ave

Victoria BC

V8V 3G7