

From: Lenore Harlton

Sent: May 7, 2019 4:13 PM

To: Public Hearings <PublicHearings@victoria.ca>

Subject: Proposed alterations to 224 Superior Street; Your file # HAV00007 Meeting Thursday, May 9, 2019

Hello. I am including the email I sent to you last July with respect to this proposal and adopt the comments therein so will not repeat them.

Since then I remain opposed to the proposal, particularly the construction of the small house on the lot, and have additional concerns. Opponents to the project breathed easy last fall as we understood the project could not proceed until the original chimneys were restored. We knew this could not happen as two neighbours saw many bricks being hauled away in the dumpsters that were being used, despite the Owners assertion to you that he had kept all the bricks. Yet now workers are replacing the external portion of the chimneys with wood chimneys that apparently are to be covered with cut bricks so they hopefully look like the original chimneys. I am unsure what is happening inside the home and haven't found where the Owner got permission to do this, but obviously they must have.

Which leads to something that confused me: the Owner was told by Council at the meeting on July 12, 2018 that the project was not approved.

We were relieved. You had before you an Owner that advertised the condos for sale some time before he even started the approval process and who intends to gross a few million on this project. Then the City was required to expend resources to put a Stop Work Order on the project because the Owner had "accidentally" removed the chimneys from the heritage home without the necessary permit. A neighbour told you that the Owner had told him that "he owns the property and he can do what he likes" and you had an Owner that only made any concessions to his neighbours when they were forced on him by Council. Yet rather than invoking any form of censure for someone who blatantly ignored the rules and bylaws, Council made the decision to give him special consideration by placing the matter on the next Council agenda without any notice to the opponents of the project. This seemed to me an interesting application on which to decide to make a Mayor's exception to help the applicant. But there it was.

As to the matter of all the neighbours who approve this project: my recollection is it was presented to me by the Owners as "We can do this under the current rules/bylaws if we want to and the beauty of the property and the yard will be very much destroyed. But if we do it this other way with allowed variances we will do it so it will be much better." Was this how it was presented to the other neighbours I wonder.

It is my understanding the interior of the house is a real mess. Has a building inspector been inside recently to see what has been going on? Is

Council taking steps to keep tabs on this project to ensure whatever Council decides is respected?

All of which comes down to my real concern. This weekend as always many strollers stopped when they reached this property. That is all going to be lost. The beautiful yard will be gone. The Owners will have made a great deal of money but a neighbourhood icon will have been lost.

(P.S. I love the current paint job but think prior Owners such as the Ryans and their predecessors did a lot of work on the house and the property and the current owner should perhaps not be trying to take full credit for it.)

My initial letter: (Please continue reading - thank you)

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 B.C.
V8V 1T4