

- almost my worst nightmare
- wrong in so many ways - where to begin - not enough time
- lengthy letter - ^{Feb.} staff managed to turn everything in favour
of developer - PLN 27 - conservation
strategy, no views seen

Meeting initiates process to rezone.

- rezone back to residential
 - 1928
 - commercial - we were non conforming
 - late 1970's ^{commercial sprawl outside village core} _{arbitrarily} changed to residential. - Do Duck Inn
 - preference for 5th Ave style that fits the neighborhood
 - this one's a bad fit

- doesn't "transition" from village commercial to residential when it's bigger than everything around it
- doesn't "anchor" the corner. it overwhelms the corner overshadowing adjacent residences, on N & W.

① Massive size is our biggest concern.

- over allowable height - add tower. 15 m. 10x10

PLN 44 - monstrosity makes our house look like a cottage ^{vacation}

② Design - reflection of small buildings on small lots

- 1 & Moncton / Mutual bldg
- 3rd & Bayview

③ Cladding - ^{Des. Permit Guidelines on industrial buildings} corrugated metal - we're going to be looking at a whole wall of it. - backdrop for our yard.
^{staff accepts}
PLN 30

- last summer - owner moved panel to next side → Jan plan - now they've been moved to rear

- placement of bench in lane to allow people to admire panel
 - pull patrons - after hours water hole
 - garbage / glass / cigarettes
 - pruned over trees - perfect screening
 - camp site.
- I could go on - haven't even broached the
 - rooftop garden issue
 - privacy concerns from 3rd floor balconies overlooking our back yard

The guidelines (Section 9.3.2.1; page 53) further suggest in part that "...new development of greater scale should ensure that larger structures do not unnecessarily block views from or impact the privacy of smaller ones."

New growth should not "disrupt the character and existing fabric of the community which is so valued" (Steveston Area Plan Overview 1.0). Unfortunately, this proposal is intrusive and disruptive and we would appreciate it if the City would abide by its own regulations and reject this proposal as currently presented.

contravenes accepted urban policy of the city for building in Steveston