

- Hi. My name is Anthony Danda,
- I live at 1075 Pentrelew Place and am not connected to the applicant.
- I want to spend my time addressing the lack of an equitable compromise in this application.
- First let me state clearly that I believe this site should be developed.
- And as much as I believe that the city needs to find a solution quickly to the inefficiency and divisiveness of site-specific zoning allowed by an OCP that has more interpretations than the Bible, even I can buy into a site-specific zoning for this site in the spirit of compromise.
- I am not afraid of change, a characteristic often levied against Victorians by people who have a lot to gain from that change.
- But change does not mean a blank cheque.
- Everyone needs to benefit.
- I can't support this application because it still contains such a high degree of inequity in stakeholder benefits.
- I attended the official and unofficial public engagements over the past two years.
- I met with the applicant one-on-one to discuss my vision for the property.
- What I heard in those meetings expressed overwhelmingly by the public as well as my direct feedback never materialized in any of the applications.
- This application represents only those elements of public feedback that maximize profit.
- I have provided to the applicant and to mayor and council on a number of occasions my vision of what would represent a reasonable transition between the density on Fort and the traditional residential character of Pentrelew Place.
- I would like to see 2 and 3 storey houseplexes or courtyard housing on the R1-B lot.
- Everyone wins with this proposition.
- The applicant gets more density than the current zoning allows.
- The neighbours get a more reasonable transition to the existing neighbourhood.
- Even a document prepared by the city mentions the benefit of these housing types as providing family-friendly housing and maintaining the character of a single-detached streetscape.
- The OCP even calls out these housing types as appropriate for traditional residential zones by arterial and secondary arterial roads.
- How could this alternative not have been explored, endorsed or contemplated? How was this missed?
- So where have we ended up?

- The application calls for 60% more density than is currently allowed for this lot.
- I'm not a land value expert, but regardless of whatever analysis was done two years ago, no reasonable person could hand on heart say that this application is not going to derive substantially more profit than the outright allowance.
- And what do the citizens of Victoria get?
- A right of way between a six storey and a four storey building that connects nothing.
- Let's be very clear.
- This is not a public park.
- This land will be owned by the strata and there is absolutely no obligation for them to maintain it to a particular standard.
- This proposed contribution to a vaguely defined Pemberton trail, if the trail even exists, is not commensurate with the multi-million dollar uplift that is envisioned
- The city is even putting up way-finder signs to extend the Rockland Greenway from Vancouver, up Rockland, past the heritage homes to the major tourist sites in Rockland.
- People will not be directed up Fort Street from downtown. They will be directed up Rockland.
- So any talk of this right-of-way being part of the Pemberton Trail is a red herring to justify allowing half of Building A to encroach upon the traditional residential neighbourhood.
- The density and height isn't just on Fort. It's actually in the neighbourhood, which is where 6 storeys do not belong.
- And then there is the contribution to affordable housing.
- Built on another site. Maybe.
- In two years. Maybe.
- There are no guarantees other than the applicant can pay \$250,000 after they've already pre-sold the units.
- To characterize this miniscule contribution, relative to what the applicant receives in a density bonus, as largesse on the part of the applicant is both specious and disingenuous.
- Regardless of that land lift analysis that uses the most inane baseline that grossly favours the applicant, it is a drop in the bucket given the 60% density bonus and the impact to the neighbourhood, which has clearly voiced their concern through their correspondence.
- The way this contribution is being marketed is complete subterfuge.

- Responses from many in favour of the application think the applicant is going to build 10 affordable units, not subsidize them. They don't connect that the applicant is only required to pay \$250,000.
- Overall, this is a horrible deal for me, my neighbours and the citizens of Victoria.
- Despite everything I remain hopeful that that we can do better.
- We can find an equitable compromise and overcome this unfortunate impasse and move past the acrimony.
- I also hope that the decision-making on this application is not driven by threats or uncertainty of what might be.
- This application should be declined because it doesn't provide an equitable, sustainable compromise between the majority of Victorians who have to live with the outcome and the very few who profit materially in the short-term.