

- My name is Matena Morfidis and I live at "s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"
  - My parents and sisters live beside the proposed development site at "s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"
  - Our family has lived in this house for 38 years, I myself lived in this house for 32 years.
  - I am opposed to the proposed development.
- 
- The church we know will be demolished and replaced with another structure of some kind.
    - The Church has a sloped roof with pitched dormers and a bank of windows running along each side. It is about 3.5 storeys high.
    - I believe it is wood frame construction;
    - There is a brown shingle roof;
    - It has a sloped entrance way with two beautiful doors.
    - There are trees on the north side
  - If you look around the neighbourhood on the west side of Larch you quickly see how well the church fits in with the houses and streetscape around it despite the yellow fence around it now and the garbage that hasn't been cleaned up by the developer. It is compatible with the dwellings on West 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> and my father's house. It has a neighbourly feel.
  - The building that is suppose to replace it is a box of 6 storeys with an add-on upperstorey – a 7<sup>th</sup> level.

- It does not look anything like the houses or streetscape around it so it does not make sense to build this building on that site
- I don't understand how anyone could say this is attractive because it isn't
- It will be much higher at 67.1 ft. than the church and all of the houses around it;
- I don't accept that we cannot build something better
  
- I understand that architects from our community have designed townhouses and row housing that are a better blend. They provide the opportunity of retaining the playground and daycare. The designs offer examples of a lower height, sloped roofs, green construction and a livable aspect. They would satisfy the design of a neighbourly feel
  
- I realize that the proposal for 1805 is a particular application of a City Program that is designed to increase density – and that is mainly for high-income earners who can afford upper level rents.
  
- But the objective of greater density has to be looked at in context.
  - Every site is different.
  - Every site and every Plan has to be looked at in its own particular setting.
  - This is why you have to look around to see what you are fitting into.

- The proposed design has little sensitivity to its surrounding environment.
- A lay person can easily see that it is a wrong concept: it is disproportionate in scale and size.

- The other architectural designs have found ways of embracing neighbourhood feel and values.

- And I suppose this is at the root of the differences between the approaches – values. We are a values-based neighbourhood.

My father spends a lot of his time fixing the landscape and the outside of his house to look beautiful just like many of the neighbours do as well. This proposed building will take this beauty away as it is just a square like box.

- The developer comes from the outside motivated principally by financial return and seeks to impose an alien concept and design on our street because he does not share our values.

- We understand that he says he needs 7 levels because it will make the project economical but this is not the way to do it.

- There has to be a better way.

- The proposal is not the result of neighbourhood-based planning. The people who live here should have been partners in the conception and planning for the building and character of the building. We weren't.

- The community does not support this structure
- It would not have supported this structure if involved at the outset;

- As I have said, the community's concerns are not reflected in the design which should have been especially with this type of proposed building

- The Urban Design Panel recognized that this proposal “needed further development of proportions and character.”

- That is to state the obvious – the building is too massive and out of step with the streetscape around it.

- The Panel acknowledged that this development is a precedent and it needs “to be given a lot of attention.”

Little attention has been given to its fitness in our neighbourhood.

- The people in this community support more rentals, more affordable accommodation, reasonable rent levels, greater diversity, environmentally sensitive housing.

- These objectives could be achieved by adopting any one of the approaches that local architects have come up with.

- I urge you to consider alternatives to this proposal. Rely on local know-how. Send this proposal back to your Staff with a direction to work with the community to come up with a better design as it is only fair for the people who have lived in this neighborhood for many years and their opinions and views should be considered.

Matena Morfidis

## Choi, Rowena

---

**From:** Kurt T. Aydin "s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2019 9:09 PM  
**To:** Bligh, Rebecca; Boyle, Christine; Carr, Adriane; De Genova, Melissa; Dominato, Lisa; Fry, Pete; Hardwick, Colleen; Kirby-Yung, Sarah; Stewart, Kennedy; Swanson, Jean; Wiebe, Michael; Public Hearing  
**Subject:** I am against 1805 Larch Street Rezoning

Reasons I oppose this proposal (as if spot-zoning/non-planning weren't reason enough):

- It is grossly out of scale, delivering unprecedented density, and providing no benefit to the people now living around it.
- It looms over the houses that adjoin it and will black out the homes north and east of it with winter shadow.
- Its density is more than double its neighbours to the east, in the higher-density-zoned area.
- It requires 56 more vehicles to negotiate the narrow lane just feet from the windows, gardens and decks of the people who live in the 2500 block of 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup>. (Compare this to our L-shaped, no-exit lane which is home to about 18 cars; every car going in and out passes our house and we are conscious of vehicle noise all year round; triple that number would be a nightmare.)
- Nothing in the proposal can compensate neighbors for their loss of privacy, light and quiet.

"s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"



Kurt T. Aydin

"s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"

