

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, February 08, 2017 5:54 PM
To: Lisa Helps (Mayor); Marianne Alto (Councillor); Chris Coleman (Councillor); Ben Isitt (Councillor); Jeremy Loveday (Councillor); Margaret Lucas (Councillor); Charlayne Thornton-Joe (Councillor); Geoff Young (Councillor)
Subject: FW: Concerns re: Joint Advisory Design Panel/Heritage Advisory Panel Meeting 11:30 am Wed. Feb.1, 2017; Mount St. Angela Redevelopment Proposal by Keay Cecco Architecture Ltd.

The opposing Advisory Panels factions at the mandated joint meeting exhibited little willingness to listen to the other let alone compromise on elements of their conflicting recommendations. No meaningful consensus was achieved.

The representatives of Keay Cecco Architecture Ltd. clearly repeated their position, as outlined in the January 12, 2017 Committee of the Whole Meeting, that value of the rework of the “heritage designated” elements of structures on the Mount St. Angela property is \$ 4.3 M and further the value of the subsidy in “density lift” being requested from City of Victoria is \$ 3. M.

Quite simply, City of Victoria may not receive \$3. M worth of benefit from rework of some or all of the “heritage designated” structures on this property.

Further, it may be ill advised for anyone to spend \$ 4.3 M to save anything on this site.

City of Victoria professional heritage planners have not to date done and made public thorough analyses of who bears the costs and who reaps the benefits of sundry past heritage reworks required by City of Victoria Council.

Concessions have routinely been granted in the past by City Council to developers to buildings and building elements “designated” as a result of lobbying by the Hallmark Society, sundry heritage activists, and City of Victoria heritage planners. Little investigation has been done to establish the increased costs to the housing or facilities arising from protection of the designated elements, or whether residents of the City of Victoria and neighbouring residents have actually benefitted from absorbing those costs.

Repeated poor decisions by the owner of the Mount St. Angela property, often at the urging of heritage activists on City of Victoria staff and some members of City Council, have resulted in this location becoming economically undevelopable.

Too many buildings have been “designated” as having heritage value. City Council has exacerbated the situation by ratifying the heritage designations without quantifying the value and costs of the proposed preservations.

In order for this property to develop, City Council might now consider either

Removal of all or some of the heritage designations thereby allowing the developer to build to density specified by current municipal zoning and to demolish all structures beyond their economic service life, or

Transfer \$ 3. M in value to the developer in the form of density lift and require the proponent to save the designated structures, or

Accept \$ 4.3 M in cash from the developer and approve development at the increased density without the requirement to preserve anything, or

Purchase the property from the present owner using municipal tax monies should City of Victoria Council deem the designated structures have sufficient heritage value.

Selection of any of the above options requires thorough and detailed cost and benefits analysis by City of Victoria planning staff to a much higher standard than has made public to date. The Director of Planning should be professionally embarrassed to bring forward a proposal on the basis of “liking the shiny glass background wall”. Sloughing off responsibility for cost benefit analysis of this proposal to a committee of unelected advocates, advisors, and volunteers, many of whom by living elsewhere are not impacted by any decision, is simply unforgivable.

As voters and taxpayers we expect better.

George Churcher
999 Burdett Ave.
Victoria, BC
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: February 8, 2017 4:02 PM

To: pmadoff@victoria.ca

Subject: Concerns re: Joint Advisory Design Panel/Heritage Advisory Panel Meeting 11:30 am Wed. Feb.1, 2017; Mount St. Angela Redevelopment Proposal by Keay Cecco Architecture Ltd.

Being both City of Victoria taxpayer and a neighbour impacted by the proposed redevelopment project for the grounds of Mount St. Angela I attended the above meeting in the Songhees Room at City Hall. I was extremely disappointed with your handling of the matter.

As I understand your assigned task as directed by City Council at the Committee of the Whole meeting held January 12, 2017 was to address, resolve, or establish elements of compromise to the unanimous conflicting recommendations to City Council from the above two Advisory Panels regarding the most current Mount St. Angela redevelopment proposal by Keay Cecco Architecture Ltd.

Throughout the meeting, neither the Heritage Conservation panel advocates nor the pro development panel activists appeared willing to hear, understand, or consider the concerns of the other group.

The Heritage advisors demanded conservation, as a perceived entitlement, of various structures and elements presently existing on the site with no explanation or their value or significance, costs of the preservation upon either the project, or impacts upon the community with regard to loss of green space, shading of neighbouring properties, parking, and use of surface and subsurface city owned utilities.

The pro development Advisory Design panel members endorsed the project initiative as proposed with superficial evaluations as “I like the glass wall”, “I like the English garden”, and ‘the courtyard landscaping is interesting’.

If there are technical merits or concerns with the proposal either in whole or in part, each faction appeared too haughty to communicate same to the others.

There were no substantive discussions, no accepted issues of compromise, and no apparent benefits of “free professional advice” to be gleaned by either the public or by City Council from the gathering of these two advisory supposedly professional factions who like children in a sandbox, simply do not play well together.

After two hours of posturing, the discussions had degenerated to preservation of a rock outcrop on McClure Street, planting of a heritage orchard from fruit tree cuttings, and details of restoration of an herb garden which may not have existed.

Some panel members holding either viewpoints, frustrated by having wasted their time in a sham meeting, simply departed without participating in the “straw vote” orchestrated by the meeting chairman in a rushed matter at the end of the allotted time. The gathering appears to have been orchestrated to fail in order to report that a meeting had taken place.

City Council members would be irresponsible in the extreme in moving this project to a public hearing based upon recommendations claimed to be from the above meeting.

There is considerably more work to be done by City of Victoria Planning professional staff in evaluation of who bears the costs and who reaps the benefits of this initiative before a considered and competent decision can be taken by City Council.

George Churcher
999 Burdett Ave
Victoria BC

[REDACTED]

Pamela Martin

From: Bridget Frewer
Sent: Tuesday, January 31, 2017 3:40 PM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council
Subject: FW: Mt. St. Angela proposed redevelopment/rezoning application
Attachments: MMA's draft letter.pdf

From: Margaret Arthur [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, January 30, 2017 2:23 PM
To: Lisa Helps (Mayor) <mayor@victoria.ca>; Pam Madoff (Councillor) <pmadoff@victoria.ca>; Chris Coleman (Councillor) <ccoleman@victoria.ca>; Charlayne Thornton-Joe (Councillor) <cth Thornton-joe@victoria.ca>; Geoff Young (Councillor) <gyoung@victoria.ca>; Ben Isitt (Councillor) <BIsitt@victoria.ca>; Jeremy Loveday (Councillor) <jloveday@victoria.ca>; Marianne Alto (Councillor) <MAalto@victoria.ca>; Margaret Lucas (Councillor) <mlucas@victoria.ca>
Cc: Charlotte Wain <CWain@victoria.ca>
Subject: Mt. St. Angela proposed redevelopment/rezoning application

Dear Mayor, Councillors and Planning Staff,

In August 2015 I wrote a letter of objection to the proposed redevelopment application for Mt. St. Angela (attached).

I am still opposed to this application and would add the following comments:

1. Increased density - as a neighbour directly impacted by this application I am opposed to the density requested and the rezoning necessary to grant such density.
2. The increased density requested to justify the upgrade to the heritage buildings **does not benefit** the heritage restoration.

The heritage building will not be available for the public to enjoy - is that worth the increased density?

3. Green Space - While there is green space now on the Maclure Street side it will become private space and again not available for the enjoyment of neighbours and passing pedestrians.

Regards,

Margaret Arthur
303-999 Burdett Ave.
Victoria V8V 3G7

Margaret Arthur
#303 - 999 Burdett Ave.
Victoria, BC V8V 3G7

August 18, 2015

Mayor & City Council
City of Victoria
#1 Centennial Square
Victoria, BC V8W 1P6
Via Email

Re: Rezoning Application for CD-10: Mt. St. Angela District
913,917,923,929 Burdett Ave. & 924 McClure St.

I am an owner & taxpayer at 999 Burdett Ave. and writing to express my opposition to the current proposal for redevelopment of the Mt. St. Angela District. While I expect a development of some sort this particular proposal is not in keeping with the unique & historic character of this entire 900 block Burdett Avenue.

I have reviewed the Official Community Plan and the Humboldt Valley Precinct Plan. This proposal does not honour the policies, objectives or values of either plan. Until further consultations with the neighbourhood are taken by the City, the Humboldt Valley Precinct Plan should prevail as the the detailed policies and directions in that plan were gathered through extensive consultations at the time. This area is NOT the downtown core and this commercial, for profit/institutional proposal will put a continuous wall of 6 story buildings along Burdett (7 stories on McClure St.) with no visual breaks. There is no green space on either street side to break up the proposed building structure. This will drastically change the nature of this neighbourhood. The glass wall will be detrimental to songbirds.

Further the scale, mass, density and height will overwhelm the street views on Burdett and McClure Streets. Rather than complementing the other buildings on the street, they will overshadow them. As well, the heritage building, Mt. St. Angela & the Cardeff residence will not be the primary focus of the sight thus changing the unique nature of this neighbourhood. The view corridors, sight lines and skyline landmarks to the Cathedral will be impeded by the proposed height of the building. I propose that the City ask the developer to put up balloons on the sight to show the proposed height of the buildings so that the

entire surrounding neighbourhood can see what we will be looking at if this development is built. Further, I think that the developer should be obliged to submit his entire proposal, not just the request for the rezoning.

Due to the proposed land use change & commercial use of this site (133 units and 26 assisted living units) this is effectively an accommodation suitable for a medium sized hospital or a downtown hotel.

The pollution, noise, and traffic arising from operation of a health care facility on this site is inappropriate to the commitments made to neighbours by City of Victoria in published planning and zoning documentation. The provision of a loading dock on Burdett Avenue cutting through the mature trees and significant boulevard will offend both the ears and the eyes via noise and offensive smells of exhaust from large delivery trucks, garbage and recycling trucks, cooking exhausts and garbage fumes, and vehicle back up alarms.

Burdett Avenue is not designated as an Arterial Route, a Secondary Arterial Route, or a Collector Route in the Parks Green Space and Transportation Plan. Burdett Avenue is simply an old neighbourhood residential street. Additionally, a private, for profit seniors' home will bring many service deliverers to the complex regularly in addition to the industrial services and this will create parking and transportation issues. Again, we are NOT in the downtown core.

My unit is on the west side of 999 Burdett and therefore my privacy and light will be hugely affected. City of Victoria City Councillor Pamela Madoff, who was council liaison to this neighbourhood for a number of years, has recently decreed that "all properties should have reasonable access to fresh air and sunlight". This proposed development does not address this.

I have concerns with the mid block walkway as shown on the development proponent's drawing A 2.0 titled Burdett Avenue Elevation. A walkway nearer to the heritage buildings would give pedestrians a greater appreciation of the Mt. St. Angela heritage designated building.

I request that the City of Victoria reject the current development proposal.

Yours truly,

Margaret Arthur

**MOUNT ST. ANGELA
THE SISTERS OF ST ANN
CHRONOLOGY 1957-2017
Sister Marie Zarowny, SSA President**

- 1957** In response to the need to provide suitable care and accommodation for our senior Sisters, a proposal to build an additional wing to Mount St. Mary for this purpose was explored.
- 1958** Angela Hotel is for sale and consideration was given to its purchase, to be used as an infirmary for the Sisters; this idea was rejected because we did not have the means to maintain it as a separate establishment.
- Consideration is given to purchase property (House and 2 lots at 930 McClure) to provide space for the expansion of Mount St. Mary.
- 1959** It has become urgent to provide accommodation for senior Sisters: there is an increasing number of Sisters on missions outside of Victoria who need infirmary care; the current sleeping quarters of our senior Sisters at St. Ann's Academy have been declared unsafe by the fire marshal. The most expedient remedy to this situation is to purchase Angela Hotel and the adjoining house (facing McClure) and to do the necessary renovations. Angela Hotel was purchased from the Isherwood family in November.
- 1960** Mount St. Angela is opened as retirement home for our senior sisters; those needing nursing care would be admitted to Mount St. Mary.
- 1962** 913 Burdett is bought *as land* for the future expansion of Mount St. Angela; this was *15 years prior* to it being designated as a heritage building.
- 1965** New regulations from the Department of Health mean that Sisters needing nursing care are no longer able to readily access Mount St. Mary.
- 1965-1977** As stated, our intention in purchasing 913 Burdett was to have land on which to expand Mount St. Angela, to be able to provide nursing care for our Sisters. As 3 self-contained suites, it was not a suitable house to renovate for the use of Sisters. As well, heating, plumbing and electrical wiring needed to be brought up to code. We received three distinct offers from local citizens who were interested in purchasing the house and moving it to another site; all offers were with the assurance that the house would be preserved. All three were refused by City Council. Permission to demolish the house was finally contracted and signed. At this point a freeze was put on the house and the demolition

had to be discontinued for a period of five months. *At that time the Declaration of Heritage House was imposed. (June, 1977)*

Subsequently, we had no choice but to make the necessary changes and use it as accommodations for some Sisters.

- 1978 New proposal: A building be built on the site of 929 Burdett and land immediately behind it, on McClure.
- 1979 Permission was received from City Council to demolish these two buildings.
- 1980 Proposed Building not feasible because of restricted land available; city zoning laws; cost of required renovations; etc. Decision made to explore feasibility of building a new facility, suitable to our needs, on the property we now own on Arbutus Road.
- 1982 St. Ann's Residence at 2474 Arbutus Road completed and the Sisters from Mount St. Angela move to their new home. Our intention is to sell Mount St. Angela. *However, because of poor real estate market and high interest rates at the time, it remains empty for five months.*
- 1983 Decision is made to do some renovations to the interior of Mount St. Angela and to re-open it as a home for our semi-retired sisters who do not need nursing care.
- 1992 *Mount St. Angela is designated Heritage.*
- 2002 As a result of a Congregation-Wide Actuarial Study, we are advised to sell Mount St. Angela at the first opportunity. The number of Sisters in the Province has significantly decreased; we have empty rooms in two major facilities, Mount St. Angela and St. Ann's Residence. Cost of maintaining both facilities is prohibitive. At the time we are planning for the sale of 999 Burdett (site of former Mount St. Mary). The sale of Mount St. Angela will be our next priority. *Although the Humboldt Valley Land Use study is underway, we are not consulted regarding our intentions for the properties we own on Burdett and McClure.*
- 2004 Change of SSA Leadership; completion of sale of 999 Burdett
- 2005 Offer to purchase Mount St. Angela and adjoining properties, with exception of 911-917 Burdett.
- 2006 In anticipation of the sale, most of the Sisters living at Mount St. Angela move to St. Ann's Residence.
- 2007 City delays approval of re-zoning until after the economic downturn which prevents the developer from proceeding with his plans
- 2008-present: Subsequent proposals, in spite of conscientious efforts to meet all requirements likewise do not materialize. The objections of the heritage advisory committee continue to be surprising when every attempt has been made to preserve and enhance the heritage elements.