

8 January 2008

To Mayor and Council  
City of Victoria

Re: 923 Burdett Street

**On 8 January 2008**, a meeting was held at the Fairfield Community Center hosted by the Planning and Zoning Committee. The purpose of the meeting was to provide an opportunity for neighbours to **view and comment on the recent changes** to the Mt. St. Angela proposal prior to the Public Hearing. It is important to note that issues and concerns raised at previous meetings may still exist, which may not be reflected in this letter.

An indeterminate number of neighbours may not have received their notice of the meeting due to the Planning Department using a significantly out-dated list of the current owners and area residences in their mail-out. This situation may have occurred on two previous notifications as well. This letter will not reflect the opinions of the committee members.

### **Community Comments**

The majority of the people who spoke expressed concerns about blasting. In fact, some called for an independent assessment and wanted to know by what means will the effects of the blasting be monitored. Leaving it up to the blasting company, their insurance companies, and the province **is not** acceptable. The lack of a detailed city policy on this subject should not automatically relieve the city of its responsibilities in this matter.

The owner of a neighbouring condo building claimed her building has suffered numerous cracks in its foundation and interior walls, and that the blasting noticeably shocked their building. The best way to repair any possible damage to Mt. St. Angela and other properties is to take every step possible to prevent it from happening in the first place. The blasting which took place on the Chelsea property, and the damage it caused, is proof that additional precautions and preventions are necessary.

A resident of Burdett Street, in response to the concerns about blasting, stated that their home suffered no major damage resulting from all the blasting in the area.

There were several comments and inquires into what was wrong with leaving the heritage house on McClure Street and staggering the design of the proposal as it was previously proposed. Why must we uproot this beautiful heritage house on McClure Street and give it away to another street?

Neighbours, the city, and council designed and approved of the Humboldt Valley Plan, which included the Mt. St. Angels property. Why are people compelled to ignore the plan or dismiss it?

Concerns were expressed over the future of the house located 929 Burdett Street, as well as similar houses, that are being discarded as a result of new development.

Not convinced condos are correct for this property. If it has to be re-developed in this manner is there a less intrusive development proposal?

What guarantees are there that the Mt. St. Angela building will be maintained and the proposed use will not be changed at some future date? What would happen to the building if at some future date circumstances prevent the owners from honouring their agreement?

**Note:** The proponent stated that it did not make a difference which building on McClure Street the entrance to the underground parking went; the recent change was just in response to a request by parks.

The recent changes have reduced the height and number of stories as well as changed it from a concrete-frame to a wooden-frame construction. The form, massing, and location of the new buildings remain the same.

- Is there a formula to measure the maximum number residential vehicles permitted on a street such as McClure?
- If yes, what is it, and with the addition of all the newly proposed units, including the Chelsea, how close are we from reaching that number?
- Will this prevent other developers from adding to the traffic problem on McClure Street with their new multi-unit condo proposal in the future? If so what assurances do we have or is this going to be an ongoing battle?
- What large vehicles will have to come onto McClure Street on a regular bases ie: garbage truck?
- What prevents visitors for taking up all the existing street parking?

Just because the numbers may work on paper does not mean it works in reality; there are still too many vehicles on a small, and narrow, street.

**We would like to thank the proponent for providing an opportunity for the public to view and comment on the proposal prior to the Public Hearing.**

Wayne Hollohan  
Chair, Fairfield Planning and Zoning Committee