

Metro 78 (LDA20-0066)
(September 13 Public Hearing)
Agenda items 3.21, 3.22, 3.23 and 3.24

Community/Neighbourhood Speaker:

Spencer Proctor PhD

Address 7825-115 street, Belgravia

Home Owner (15 years) and family of five in Belgravia

(sharing laneway adjacent to the Metro78 proposal)

2- Slides to present

Validity of Developer's Justification for >4 storey proposal.

- During the community consultation process the developer cited 'profitability' as primary justification for violation(s) of ARP for increased height (>4 storeys)
- The developer has reported that due to the size of building (142 units, approximately 150-200 residents) it requires a watermain upgrade (Cost to developer ~\$1million) (we assume that this data is in Developer's Pro Forma, but was not shared with the neighbourhood group.)
- Developer claims that in order to make this investment 'profitable' an extra 3 storeys are required (Community requested that the developer make the pro forma available, but they did not)
- Community/Neighbourhood group generated their own CPA- solicited pro-forma which disputes the developers claim.
- **We submit that the developer should provide adequate details to support this claim and that it is not the responsibility of the community to defend the ARP and financial implications per se.**
- **Therefore, the primary justification for the need >4 storeys is in dispute, lacks relevance and is invalid.**

Primary justification of developer for >4 storey proposal cannot be adequately determined.

- In order for the current proposal to be upheld, current issues should be presented in the context of a *Land Use Discussion* only.
- The primary justification described above is not a *Land Use* Issue, but rather based on 'profitability' (or a *financial issue*).
- Based on the current process, the City and its Councillors are not equipped to hear financial arguments (either for or against or both).
- The community has generated their own CPA- solicited pro-forma that disputes the developers claim, reinforcing that sufficient detail has not been provided.
- **The primary justification is not a *Land Use* Issue, nor sufficiently founded and therefore the premise to request for ARP violation(s) is invalid.**