

I am the current owner in #2-118 Michigan street that is next to a proposed redevelopment of 301/303 St Lawrence St. I purchased the unit after the initial design application was submitted and was unaware that it was rejected by certain individuals on the Planning Committee when it was acceptable to JBNA and the owners most directly affected by any development on that site. The second design was enforced onto the developer by the Planning Committee but it has been categorically rejected by JBNA and the owners of #118 Michigan St, again the persons most affected by any development on that site.

I take considerable objections to the unilateral decision making by this committee in regards to proposals put forth for 301/202 St. Lawrence St. It is shameful behaviour of this committee to unilaterally negated the input and considerations put forth by JBNA and the residents of 118 Michigan Street, this development's most immediate neighbor. The duties of a committee of any municipality are not to be executed in a vacuum without understanding of the persons your decisions affect. City of Victoria is supposed to be a democratic society based on principles of fair, judicious and informed decision making that considers all individuals as equal and valued members of society. To completely ignore the JBNA and the immediate neighbors' opinions are actions just short of a dictatorship by a small group of biased and self-serving individuals. To base your objections on 'not a traditional design' versus by-laws, site lines, easements, safety issues, land value issues is mind boggling. City of Victoria do not need a band of "nilly willies" telling us what style of architecture we are to have or not. Victoria and James Bay have a wide variety of architectural eras evident in all established neighborhoods.

I placed considerable cost into purchasing a home in an area where I found the designs to be compatible with my creative and artistic appeals. If I wanted to live in a "traditional" neighborhood- James Bay would not be a choice- Ever. I have worked as a Community Health Nurse in CRD for decades and have been in every (all 13 municipalities) providing home care to the citizens of CRD. I have done extensive work in James Bay and over the decades have found its charm growing in its' eclectic style and warmth and feeling of a community not just a block of houses. The style of homes is not 'traditional' which adds to its overall appeal. The homes have generally been improved upon with home maintenance and care to street presentation as well as introducing modern architecture that can be sleek but often is a balanced mix of stone, wood siding and large inviting door steps, decks and casements around large windows.

The issue: should the tax paying residences of 118 Michigan St. have their privacy violated and their access to well established sunlight be negated by the development design that imposes the balconies and outdoor living spaces directly into these private residences and has an excessive height that negates any natural sunlight that has been present for decades?

Privacy to Neighboring established homes:

James Bay properties generally have close and tight easements which challenges designers to respect privacy when attaching outdoor space either with a balcony or yard. I as a purchaser ensured I had outdoor space that did not look into others personal homes and others could not look into my inner home. I do not believe I am "unique" in that desire for privacy. No one should be subjected to having their life completely exposed by a new development that carelessly places balconies and outdoor living space that have clear sight lines into their private residential areas or onto their own outdoor living space. By allowing a new development to be built with such imposing sight lines into other persons'

private living spaces is excessively disrespectful. These long standing residents and tax payers have lived and established their lives in this area do not deserve to be negated and ignored by any city employee or committee member.

Sight Lines and Height Allowances:

As a purchaser, I preferred the outdoor space that has a clear east, west or south exposure for lightness, warmth and brightness throughout the year. The land in question overlooks a public park with trees in front. The current home has most of its outdoor space in the front. Many duplexes, multi-family dwellings in James Bay have the same arrangements. The front yard is a south to west exposure and the back is an north to east exposure. The back yard faces majority of all the windows, pathways and yards of 118 Michigan- private residences not a Public Park. If the second design (the one the Committee demands) is built the well-established residences of 118 Michigan Street will lose a significant amount of natural lighting into their homes and their outdoor spaces. This will result in a considerable decline in property value for these residents as well as decline in life style enjoyment and pleasure in your own home. The height of any new development on 301/303 St. Lawrence St. needs to consider the shadowing effect onto all surrounding private residents. No new building duplex or four-plex should be allowed to create a large unrelenting shadow over the pre-existing residents on 118 Michigan. The residents of 118 Michigan have paid years of taxes based upon their BC Assessment value to the City of Victoria and should not have to endure an significant loss in property value as well as personal enjoyment of one's own home because a developer wants to increase density on the adjoining property or because of Committee wants to impose their architectural biases.

Why are the privacy needs of the well-established tax paying residents of 118 Michigan St. being negated and ignored by city officials in favour of their architectural personal biases on the development of 301-303 St. Lawrence St.?

Why are the established sight lines and sunlight of long established residents being adversely affected in favour of a developer's desire to make money by increasing the occupancy density of #301-303 St. Lawrence St. and a Planning Committee wanting to impose their architectural biases.

I object to negating the input of JBNA and of the residents of 118 Michigan Street. I object to imposing 'design' preferences on a new development that is in a neighborhood that has no one style of designs evident anywhere. I want a fair, transparent process that focuses on what that piece of property can hold in terms of density, and the least amount of interference upon the adjacent well established properties in terms of preserving privacy and considering the development's height and restriction of sunlight onto 118 Michigan St. Please exercise sound principles of fair governance and due diligence not personal biases on this proposed development.

I do expect a written response to the contents and questions posed in this letter and to be made aware of any future hearings, comments or proposals.

Respectfully,
Alison Hitesman B. Ed RN
#2-118 Michigan St.
Victoria BC V8V 1R1

