

Dear Mayor and Council,

I oppose rezoning application REZ000525 for 1201 Fort Street / 1050 Pentrelew Place. At this critical inflection point in Victoria's growth, I ask you to uphold the OCP and to base your decisions on sound data about housing solutions and not specious, flawed assumptions and unscientific marketing studies that support tactical solutions to this complex topic. I am an advocate of well-informed development strategies and policies that underpin diverse housing and address the needs of all citizens, not simply the aggrandizement of the applicant. I am against this application as unnecessary overdevelopment, which is an expeditious, short-term means to address a far more complex situation and with long-term consequences.

A vote for this rezoning is a vote against the OCP. I have heard no well supported argument for why the applicant cannot develop within the existing zoning stated in the OCP. No viable hardship has been expressed by the developer to even allow council to consider the ten variances requested to bolster the rezoning application, including drastically increasing the FSR. Let's stick to the city's plan.

The massing and height is still inappropriate to the traditional residential designation in the OCP. By selectively addressing council's concerns, the applicant has hamstrung the city, gambling that council will overlook concerns already expressed about the height of building B, massing on the entire site and the Fort Street heritage corridor for fear of the alternative. The applicant has even reduced the setback of the top floor of building B, moving it closer to Pentrelew Place and therefore increasing the visual height. The renderings supplied by the applicant also give an inaccurate and incomplete view of the impact of having a four-storey building immediately behind the wall of townhomes and next to a single-family home on the south side.

The scale of the applicant's rezoning request is not offset by an equitable amenity to the city or the residents in the immediate vicinity. The offer is neither generous nor adequate compared to the financial windfall the applicant receives if this application is approved. Even the terms of the applicant's bonus offer are not favourable to citizens. There is no obligation for them to deliver anything except a payment of \$250,000, which is a pittance if the city were to utilize an up-to-date Community Amenity Contribution calculation. A vote in favour of this application concedes that Victoria does not believe developers need to fund partially the public amenities and infrastructure that should come with this level of density.

The community has made clear their desire for alternate housing forms, e.g. ground-oriented housing, that achieve density while remaining sensitive to the traditional residential designation and respecting the heritage corridor. The applicant has indeed engaged the public but has chosen not to listen and to select only the feedback, which is in the applicant's best interest. It's one thing to engage. It's another thing to listen. The applicant's design maximizes profit by drastically exceeding what is allowable within existing zoning and neglecting feedback from the community. Even the city does not want to acknowledge that since 2012 Victoria has exceeded its own target for building condominiums but failed significantly to meet its target for building ground-oriented housing.

Lastly, I urge you to reject this application based on recent data from failed housing experiments and strategies in other municipalities, where simply building more has proven not to achieve sustainable housing solutions. Please help me, as an engaged citizen, meet this challenge by rejecting this application.

Thank you for your service and consideration,

Anthony Danda
1075 Pentrelew Place