

05-27-21

Claire Cassell

Owner of: 230 10th Street, SE. 20003

To The Planning and Zoning Committee

I want to inform you that my position on this large scale project at: 232 10th Street, SE. Case #20467 has changed. Last December 20th, 2020 I had signed off on a form letter but, made notes dated: to the plan date of: 12-03-20 that I approved the work. However now that I see more plan detail with markings showing size and height I withdraw my support for the size of this project. Also I did not understand or were told of the historic preservation regulations that this project would be asking for with so many exceptions as well as if passed would set a new precedent for the neighbourhood.

We certainly want our neighbours to renovate and expand their home so they can enjoy their lifestyle within the home. But, have value to its surroundings and blend-in by not overpowering. Respect the historic value of all around. After all isn't that why they bought this house in this neighbourhood in the first place ???



Claire S. Cassell



John C. Cassell <johnccassell@gmail.com>

Renovations on the 10th/11th Street Alley

John C. Cassell <johnccassell@gmail.com>
To: Jim Sherry <jim.sherry@gmail.com>

Wed, Jun 30, 2021 at 6:56 PM

Today June 30th I dropped by the neighbourhood to review the existing conditions. I viewed both the front but, mainly the back.

My approach was to see what the existing homes in our row have done and value that to what 232 wants to do.

- We do not like the third story addition at all. Looks an an abortion to the existing historical conditions, that no one has attempted to do this. As draw it looks like a stacked box that only a multi-rental unit might do to get 1 more tenant.
- I believe the best example is 240 as it has a very nice clean addition that steps back at the 2nd floor as not to over power the lot "yard" to reduce the exterior impact to both its own yard and surrounding areas. The architects did a very nice clean design. In order to get this addition to work the owners had to remove their garage but, the lot coverage looks to be under or at 60%.
- We would like to see the the owners at 232 attempt to do the same size and/or design as we think it accomplishes both interior space and exterior set-back/lot coverage rules with the garage removed.
- If the owners at 232 follow through with the addition that requires the garage to be removed it should be dully NOTED on the plat that NO garage can ever be added even with special exemptions for needs.

We want to express that we do not want to be the one that causes an owner not to do what they wish to do to their home. We and the City should value all notes/conditions and work with owners and their neighbours to get what we all want. After all that is why owners choose to stay rather than move away.

Claire and John Cassell

On Tue, Jun 29, 2021 at 11:03 PM Jim Sherry <jim.sherry@gmail.com> wrote:

[Quoted text hidden]