

Karen Sidhu

From: Public Hearings
Subject: FW: proposed changes to 224 Superior Street

From: LENORE HARLTON
Sent: July 7, 2018 10:39 AM
To: Public Hearings <PublicHearings@victoria.ca>
Subject: proposed changes to 224 Superior Street

I would like my phone number and email address kept confidential please.

I object to the proposed changes to 224 Superior Street on a number of grounds.

1) Heritage designation: As an owner of 215 Superior street for the past 30 years, I am very well aware of the attraction the home holds for all those walking by this block of Superior. Pedestrians of all sorts are constantly crossing the street and stopping in front of the home to take pictures. It is an important tourist attraction and I object to any proposal that includes change to the exterior of the building. This lot is a remarkable addition to the neighbourhood and has been for some years. Presumably it was designated heritage when it was purchased by the present Owners so why would they be allowed to change this attraction just to maximize profit.

2) Parking: Despite the arguments presented by the Owners, it seems just common sense that making additional driveway areas and taking away the existing parking will be detrimental to the current parking situation. Never mind the detriment to the looks of the property. As it is, the persons who stay at the bed and breakfast often make no attempt to stay parked in the lot and are constantly encroaching on the already limited street parking. As it is we cannot at times get parking ourselves because of church attendees and patrons of the restaurant at the end of Superior street.

3) Setbacks and site coverage: Surely the Owners can profit adequately without completely destroying the property with a small additional house and altered setbacks.

2 questions please: 1) I understand a stop work order has been placed on the property. I would like to know specifically what steps are now being taken to enforce the current bylaws. Heritage and otherwise. I am upset that the Owners advertised the property last May and seem to consider themselves outside the bylaws.

2) I am also concerned that the young people clearing out the bricks from the home were apparently not protecting themselves from any possible asbestos contamination. Is it true the City simply depends on the Owner/developer to state there is no asbestos in a property, even one of this age?? It seems to me arguable the City might bear some responsibility there in future if that is true.

All of which is respectfully submitted. Thank you for your time.

Lenore B. Harlton
215 Superior Street
Victoria BC V8V 1T4

Proposed Changes to 224 Superior Street

To City of Victoria,

I am opposed to the changes put forward in your request for input document. I do not believe the changes are in the best interest of our neighbourhood.

It appears a design proposal has been brought forward that requires many of our zoning bylaws to be changed in order to implement. This is on a heritage property, one of the oldest and most prominent heritage properties in James Bay.

Some of my concerns are;

Parking; the existing driveway and parking area is suitable for multiple parking stalls while still maintaining the heritage integrity. The proposed plan would require 3 driveways and parking in the front of the buildings which is not conducive to maintaining the heritage integrity. As well the 3 driveways would remove many road side parking spots.

The present lot size provides proper site coverage which maintains the heritage integrity. Building a house on a small rezoned lot will reduce the heritage integrity not to mention harmful to the use and enjoyment of the property adjoining on the west border.

Setbacks are created in bylaws to protect the properties surrounding a building site and future owners within the site. The proposal is suggesting to reduce setbacks in three areas, and once again, on a heritage site.

Thank you for your consideration,

Regards

Hewitt (Hew) Bowman
215 Superior St.