



November 18th, 2024

City of Victoria
1 Centennial Square
Victoria, BC V8W 1P6

Attn: Robert Bateman, Planner

Re: 350 & 360 Douglas – Rezoning and Development Permit - Resubmission

Dear Robert Bateman,

For your consideration, please accept this revised application for a rezoning and development permit for the property located at 350 & 360 Douglas Street. Starlight Developments have revised the previous application in response to the comments received from the City of Victoria staff in their August 2024 memo.

Following our initial application 2023, we have had the opportunity to refine the design of our proposed infill development to better respond to the comments provided by local area residents and City of Victoria Staff. proposed townhome development on several occasions. The application proposes a new infill residential building on the northern part of the site, facing Toronto Street. The building will be 6-storeys in height, stepping down to 4-storeys on the west side and appearing as 5-storeys on the east side, where it will integrate with the existing slope of the site. The proposal includes 90 new rental units ranging from one bedroom to three bedrooms and includes two new levels of underground parking and surface parking to serve both the existing tenants on and the future residents of the proposed purpose-built rental infill building.

Comments Checklist/Response

To ensure every comment is addressed or acknowledged, a complete table of comments and responses is below.

| | |
|-------------------------|--|
| Project: | 350 & 360 Douglas Street |
| Department(s): | Housing, Engineering, Parks, Zoning Plan Check & Fire |
| Received: | 2024-08-16 |
| Response Issued: | 2024-11-18 |

| Category: | Housing |
|-----------|---|
| Comment: | – As previously indicated, the proposal is exempt from the Inclusionary Housing and Community Amenity Policy because it is a rental project. But we suggest that you have a |

| | land lift study completed for Council's consideration because we do not typically have applications to add rental while retaining existing rental on site. If you complete this study and there is a lift, we encourage you consider providing a contribution in accordance with the Inclusionary Housing and Community Amenity Policy . | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------|--|---------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|---|---------------------|---|--|--|-----------------|---------------------|-----------------|---------------------|-----------------|---------------------|---------------|---|---|----|----|----|----|--------------------|----|----|----|----|-----|----|--------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|--------------|----|--|-----|--|-----|--|
| Response: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Resolved ✓ – <i>A Land Lift Analysis was prepared by Mulholland Parker Land Economists Ltd and was provided to staff for review on October 25, 2024.</i> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Comment: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – We want to make you aware of the Tax Exemptions for Affordable Rental Housing that Council recently adopted. Let us know if you are interested in adjusting your proposal to pursue this. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Response: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Acknowledged ✓ – <i>Starlight Developments will not be amending our application.</i> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Comment: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Council recently approved the Family Housing Policy which includes targets for family sized bedrooms (effective September 1, 2024). Please provide the information in the table below so that we can include it in the COTW report. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Response: | <p>Number of Units by Type</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th colspan="2">Proposed New Building</th> <th colspan="2">Existing Buildings</th> <th colspan="2">Total (including proposed and existing units)</th> </tr> <tr> <th></th> <th>Number of Units</th> <th>Percentage of Units</th> <th>Number of Units</th> <th>Percentage of Units</th> <th>Number of Units</th> <th>Percentage of Units</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Studio</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>55</td> <td>28</td> <td>55</td> <td>19</td> </tr> <tr> <td>One-bedroom</td> <td>55</td> <td>61</td> <td>81</td> <td>41</td> <td>136</td> <td>47</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Two-bedroom</td> <td>31</td> <td>34</td> <td>61</td> <td>31</td> <td>92</td> <td>32</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Three-bedroom</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>4</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TOTAL</td> <td>90</td> <td></td> <td>197</td> <td></td> <td>287</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | Proposed New Building | | Existing Buildings | | Total (including proposed and existing units) | | | Number of Units | Percentage of Units | Number of Units | Percentage of Units | Number of Units | Percentage of Units | Studio | 0 | 0 | 55 | 28 | 55 | 19 | One-bedroom | 55 | 61 | 81 | 41 | 136 | 47 | Two-bedroom | 31 | 34 | 61 | 31 | 92 | 32 | Three-bedroom | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | TOTAL | 90 | | 197 | | 287 | |
| | Proposed New Building | | Existing Buildings | | Total (including proposed and existing units) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Number of Units | Percentage of Units | Number of Units | Percentage of Units | Number of Units | Percentage of Units | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Studio | 0 | 0 | 55 | 28 | 55 | 19 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| One-bedroom | 55 | 61 | 81 | 41 | 136 | 47 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Two-bedroom | 31 | 34 | 61 | 31 | 92 | 32 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Three-bedroom | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | 90 | | 197 | | 287 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Category: | Parks |
|-----------|---|
| Comment: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Coordinate site, landscape, civil and arborist tree management plans, as follows: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> show metric bar scales on all drawings, including "Existing Site Plan". retain tree #001, 002, 903, 906, 907 and 969, per direction of Parks management team, in coordination with Transportation requirements. |

| | |
|-----------|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> c. redesign building and notch parkade at tree #001, 002, 903, 906, 907 and 969, utilizing vertical excavation + shoring, L-shaped footings, as well as other low-impact demo, construction and landscaping methodologies to reduce impacts to protected root zones. d. clearly show parkade outline, as well as any overhangs by using dashed lines and notations on all drawings. e. show 1.5m SRW on Toronto St. frontage, with 1.8m inbound sidewalk and 1.5m boulevard with street tree planting. Show 2.75m SRW on Huntington Pl. frontage, with a 1.5m inbound sidewalk located at inner SRW and a minimum offset of 1m from existing trees (to be retained), plus additional street tree planting. f. show street tree planting in 1.5m boulevard along Douglas St. frontage, per Subdivision and Development Servicing Bylaw No. 12-042, Schedule C. It is preferred that streetlight/hydro poles are retained within the sidewalk on Douglas St. frontage, to allow for street tree planting. Refer to Transportation comments for frontage design. g. show new street trees within SRW on Huntington Pl., per SDS bylaw, Schedule C. Refer to Transportation comments for frontage design. h. show two new street trees within new boulevard on Avalon Rd. per the SDS bylaw, Schedule C. Refer to Transportation comments for frontage design. i. Label all new street trees as "New boulevard tree – Species to be determined by Parks. Street tree locations, species selection, and number of trees is subject to approval by the City of Victoria Parks Division. j. Show existing and proposed service locations, as well as preliminary third-party utilities (including hydro, phone/internet and gas). |
| Response: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Resolved ✓ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. <i>Site Plan, Landscape, Civil drawings have been revised and to include bar scale.</i> b. <i>The application has been revised to accommodate the retention of Trees 001, 002, 903, 906, 907 and 969. Please refer to the revised Landscape Drawings and Arborist report.</i> c. <i>The parkade design has been amended to minimize impacts of the critical root zone of Trees 001, 002, 903, 906, 907 and 969.</i> d. <i>The parkade outline has been shown on plans. A dashed fuchsia line is shown on the architectural plans to indicate the parkade foundation wall.</i> e. <i>The requested layout has been provided, except for locations where the alignment of the sidewalk is adjusted to avoid impacts on the retained trees.</i> f. <i>Three street trees have been proposed along Douglas Street where feasible given utility placements. Please refer to the updated Landscape Plan for details.</i> g. <i>Street trees have been shown within the SRW on Huntington Place. Please refer to revised Landscape and Civil Drawings for reference.</i> h. <i>Two street trees have been added along the Avalon Road frontage as requested. Please refer to revised Landscape and Civil Drawings for reference.</i> |

| | |
|-----------|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. <i>New Street trees have been labelled as 'New Boulevard Trees'. Please refer to revised Landscape and Civil Drawings for reference.</i> j. <i>Existing overhead utilities and underground services have been identified. Please refer to revised Civils drawings for reference.</i> |
| Comment: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Please ensure the lot will achieve at least the Tree Minimum once all replacement trees are planted. If not, then the owner must plant additional replacement trees to achieve at least the tree minimum on the lot. The tree minimum for each lot is specified in the Tree Protection Bylaw 21-035, Schedule E and is based on lot size. The subject property is approximately 8912m² and requires forty-five (45) bylaw-protected trees on site following development, meeting siting, soil volume, and species requirements outlined in Schedule E. Part 3 trees will not be considered for this application. Cash-in-lieu will only be accepted if it is clear that Tree Minimum cannot be met. |
| Response: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – <i>The Landscape Plan aims to maximize replacement trees where open landscape space is available.</i> – <i>Additional soil cells have been proposed in the updated set which increased the replacement tree number from 5 to 8. It is anticipated that cash-in-lieu will be required to satisfy the tree compensation total.</i> |
| Comment: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Arborist to conduct exploratory digging and submit separate arborist addendum outlining the findings (with photos), for the following locations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. at edge of existing retaining wall (which has been proposed as "remove"), within PRZ of tree #969. |
| Response: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Resolved ✓ – <i>Exploratory digging was completed and summarized in a memo (dated November 06, 2024).</i> – <i>Per the Arborist Memo, "No impacts are anticipated by the proposed retaining wall re-alignment along the Toronto Street SRW".</i> – <i>Please refer to attached Arborist Memo prepared by Talmack Urban Forestry.</i> |
| Comment: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Update arborist report, including tree inventory, Executive Summary key findings, tree impact summary and mitigation recommendations, per all requirements outlined above (under General comments). Refer to the tree bylaw, Schedule C |
| Response: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Resolved ✓ – <i>Arborist Report has been revised.</i> – <i>Please refer to updated Arborist Report prepared by Talmack Urban Forestry.</i> |
| Comment: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Update arborist tree management plan utilizing the most recent site plan and revised parkade plan, in accordance with the tree bylaw, Schedule B. Including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. locate tree protection barriers at edge of proposed building (or 6.5m), for tree retained trees, and show phased tree barriers at edge of landscape elements for landscaping phase only. Construction access into PRZs of retained trees is not supported. |

| | |
|-----------|---|
| | <p>ii. indicate low-impact construction methodology and updated arborist supervision requirements through arborist notes.</p> |
| Response: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Resolved ✓ – <i>Arborist Report has been revised.</i> – <i>Please refer to updated Arborist Report prepared by Talmack Urban Forestry.</i> |
| Comment: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Update Landscape Plan & Replacement Tree Plan to clearly identify which trees are proposed as replacement trees and clearly identify planting areas for soil volume calculations (show on plans), including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. replace all removed trees at a ratio of 1:1, or Tree Minimum must be met, whichever is greater. Note: Tree Minimum for the lot is 45 trees. Cash-in-lieu will only be accepted if it is clear that Tree Minimum cannot be met. i. confirm selected trees are from Part 1 of Schedule E replacement tree list first (reaching at least 10m at maturity). If soil volumes or spacing does not allow for Part 1 trees, consideration will be given to Part 2 of Schedule E replacement trees at 2:1 replacement. ii. confirm tree planting meets spacing and siting requirements per the Tree Protection Bylaw No. 21-035, Schedule E, Section 4 (siting, soil volume, timing of planting, and size of stock requirements). iii. Soil volume table must contain separate planting areas for each individual location of replacement tree, calculated in accordance with Schedule E. Appropriate soil volumes shall be provided for any replacement tree, per Schedule E, Part 4, or as approved by the Director. Refer to the soil volume table example in Schedule E, Section A, Part 2(g). iv. Street tree planting details should be shown on replacement tree plan or landscape drawings. Parks trees planted 1.0m or less from curbs or sidewalks are to have root barriers to protect civil infrastructure. Refer to Schedule B to the Subdivision and Development Servicing Bylaw No. 12-042 for City of Victoria Tree planting detail SD P4. v. Clarify proposed landscape elements within PRZs through improved labelling and notations, including privacy fencing. |
| Response: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Resolved ✓ – <i>Please refer to updated Landscape Plan and Replacement Tree Plan for reference.</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. <i>Please refer to the revised landscape plans. The revised application proposes 56 trees, 43 on site and 13 within the right-of way.</i> ii. <i>Confirmed.</i> iii. <i>Confirmed.</i> iv. <i>An updated soil volume chart has been included in the tree management plan.</i> v. <i>The street tree planting detail has been included in the tree management plan.</i> vi. <i>Additional notes have been added to the landscape plan which specify landscape elements and site plan elements that are proposed within the PRZ.</i> |

| | |
|-----------|---|
| Comment: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submit a grading plan which provides existing and proposed grades for easy reference and review is required, including confirmation that no grade changes shall occur within tree protection zones. |
| Response: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resolved ✓ <i>Please refer to updated Civil Grading Plan for reference.</i> |
| Comment: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site plan shall show all trees, ID #'s, critical root zones and canopy spread for trees to be retained (trunk – scaled circle to represent the trunk where it meets the ground, PRZ – scaled solid bold circle, and canopy – scaled fine dotted-line circle). Trees proposed for removal shall be identified with a red 'X'. |
| Response: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resolved ✓ <i>Please refer to Civil Servicing Plan for reference.</i> |
| Comment: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submit a coordinated Civil plan, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Show all site and municipal trees to be retained with ID# and show all proposed municipal trees. Identify municipal trees to be removed with an ID# and a red X. Show a separate water service and sleeving under hard surfaces on the site servicing plan for irrigation of the trees and turf in the boulevard, in accordance with the Subdivision and Development Servicing Bylaw. Include the following notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All irrigation work, including required inspections, shall follow the Supplementary Specifications for Street Trees and Irrigation, Schedule C to the Victoria Subdivision and Development Servicing Bylaw 12-042, and comply with the Irrigation Industry Association of BC standards. Irrigation design shall be submitted for review and approval to City of Victoria Parks no less than 30 days prior to scheduled installation. Contact Parks at 250-361-0600 with at least 48 hours notice to arrange for irrigation inspections. Required Parks inspections for irrigation: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Irrigation sleeving prior to backfilling. Open trench mainline and lateral lines. Pressure test. Irrigation system, controller, coverage test, backflow preventer assembly test report required, backflow assembly (incl. inspection tag and testing report). Note: installation of the water service to be at the expense of the applicant. |
| Response: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resolved ✓ <i>Please refer to updated Civil Servicing Plan.</i> |

| Category: | Engineering and Public Works |
|-----------|---|
| Comment: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Letters of Engagement (Client-Engineer agreements): Please provide to the City letters of engagement (or Client-Engineer) agreement for all disciplines involved in works within the right-of-way. This should include (at minimum) the Civil Engineering |

| | |
|-----------|---|
| | <p>consultant, Landscape consultant, Electrical consultant and others as necessary. The consultants engaged should provide a letter (agreement) which fully outlines their scope of engagement and may also include items for which they are not engaged. The developer is responsible to ensuring that the consultants provide this concurrent with the resubmission.</p> |
| Response: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Resolved ✓ – <i>Please refer to Letters of Engagement.</i> |
| Comment: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Preliminary civil plan not included in the latest submission. Please ensure it is submitted with the next package. |
| Response: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Resolved ✓ – <i>Please refer to updated Civil Servicing and Grading Plans.</i> |
| Comment: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – On the preliminary civil servicing plan, the proposed services for the new building are not shown. Please provide these on the next submission. |
| Response: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Resolved ✓ – <i>Please refer to updated Civil Servicing Plan.</i> |
| Comment: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Please show the preliminary BC Hydro PMT/private substation location and where the proposed connection is to the new building. |
| Response: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Resolved ✓ – <i>Please refer to updated Civil Servicing Plan.</i> |
| Comment: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – On the preliminary civil servicing plan, please show only new proposed services & mains in bold. |
| Response: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Resolved ✓ – <i>Please refer to updated Civil Servicing Plan.</i> |
| Comment: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – It is recommended that, as a condition of rezoning, and secured in a legal agreement which is registered prior to bylaw approval: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. All SRW's are requested by the transportation department: ii. Driveway style street crossing & pedestrian lighting as per transportation comments iii. All TDM measures as requested by the Transportation Department to the satisfaction of the Director of Engineering iv. The Requirements of the Sanitary Attenuation Report be secured (if necessary) and be registered in a legal agreement. |
| Response: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Resolved ✓ – <i>Starlight is willing to enter into all SRWs as requested by the Transportation Department.</i> |
| Comment: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The applicant is financially responsible for frontage works to the centreline of the road to current City of Victoria standards (i.e., at the time of Building Permit), as per the Victoria Subdivision and Development Servicing Bylaw, and to the satisfaction of the Director of Engineering and Public Works. |

| | |
|-----------|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The Civil designer must show all existing survey monuments on all plan submissions (including 3rd party design / utility submissions) and is to note those monuments that will be impacted by the development and associated works. Any monument located within 0.5m of an area of works is to be considered destroyed. As per Bylaw 22-028; the City will charge the developer \$2,000 per impacted monument as a fee at the time of Building Permit (non-refundable). Please ensure that the Civil submission drawings include existing monument locations. – If anchor pinning is required into the road right of way in order to facilitate the excavation, the developer will be required to enter into an encroachment agreement with the city for the anchor pins. |
| Response: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Acknowledged – <i>Prior to BP Issuance, if underpinning is required into the road right of way, Starlight will enter into an encroachment agreement with the City of Victoria.</i> |

| Category: | Transportation |
|-----------|---|
| Comment: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Updated Civil plan set required, this should include dimensions of the proposed SRW's, and dimensions of the proposed boulevards and sidewalks, including where curbs have been realigned at the intersections. Please include revisions on Huntington to retain a number of trees (as per the Parks comments convey), the proposed driveway style crossing of Avalon at its intersection with Douglas St, details of any proposed planting in the new Douglas St boulevard and details of the proposed pedestrian lighting at the corners of Douglas and Toronto and Douglas and Avalon. |
| Response: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Resolved ✓ – <i>The Civil Drawing package has now included dimensions for all proposed SRWs, boulevards and sidewalks, including curb alignment.</i> – <i>Driveway style street crossing and pedestrian lighting has been added.</i> – <i>Please refer to updated Civil Plans for reference.</i> |
| Comment: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Staff do not support the proposed variance to the visitor accessible parking. The bylaw requirement for accessible parking is 10 accessible spaces, 2 van accessible spaces, 1 visitor accessible and 1 visitor van accessible space. Please clearly show these space designations on the next round of drawings. A plan revision is required. |
| Response: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Resolved ✓ – <i>The site plan and parkade design has been amended to provide 10 accessible spaces which include 2 van accessible spaces, 1 visitor accessible space, and 1 visitor van space. A parking variance is no longer required.</i> |
| Comment: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Recommendations for TDM measures should be shown integrated into plans and identified in the applicant response letter for clarity of proposal support. (At minimum, Car share memberships and usage credits for all residential units, 2 EV car |

| | |
|-----------|---|
| | share vehicles & parking spaces, 10% oversized bicycle parking, 50% of required long-term bicycle parking has access to an electrical outlet, bicycle maintenance station). |
| Response: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Resolved ✓ – <i>The resubmission has been amended and all request TDM measures have been implemented. Please refer to updated Site Plan and Architectural Drawings for reference.</i> – <i>2 EV charging stalls have been incorporated into the revised application.</i> – <i>10% oversized bicycle parking will be provided in the existing building.</i> – <i>The revised application proposed that 50% of long-term bicycle parking will have access to an electrical outlet. This equates to 177 stalls, of which 97 are provided in the new building bike room at level 1, 32 in the freestanding bike shed, 28 in the P1 level, and 20 in the existing buildings. A bicycle maintenance station is accessible to all bike users and is located at grade level near the short-term bike spaces.</i> |
| Comment: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Please revise site access so that it complies with Schedule B and C of the Highway Access Bylaw. The maximum width for a Type A crossing is 6m. Please include the proposed driveway flares and sight access triangles to ensure compliance with Schedule C of the Highway Access Bylaw. A plan revision is required. |
| Response: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Resolved ✓ – <i>Please refer to updated Site Plan that includes a 6m crossing, driveway flares and sight access triangles.</i> |
| Comment: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Please provide typical dimensions for parking stalls and maneuvering aisles in all areas, including those on the ground level, as per Schedule C requirements. In addition, further detail the 'loading' parking configuration, which is not a Schedule C requirement. A plan revision is required. |
| Response: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Resolved ✓ – <i>Please refer to updated Site Plan that includes typical dimensions for all parking stalls, maneuvering aisles and parking configuration in all areas. Typical parking stalls are 2600mm x 5100mm and loading spaces are 3000mm x 9000mm.</i> |
| Comment: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Please provide typical dimensions for bicycle parking in all areas, including in the parkade and the new bicycle shed between the new and old building. A plan revision is required. |
| Response: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Resolved ✓ – <i>Please refer to updated Site Plan that includes typical dimensions for all parking stalls, maneuvering aisles and parking configuration in all areas. Typical bike spaces are 450mm x 1800mm, vertical bike rack spaces are 450mm x 1200mm, and oversized spaces are 900mm x 2400mm.</i> |
| Comment: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Please provide previously requested tracking drawings demonstrating that 2 vehicles can concurrently use parkade ramps without causing a collision. |
| Response: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Resolved ✓ |

| | |
|-----------|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Please refer to the Turning Radius Movements Plan for a passenger vehicle. |
| Comment: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Please confirm vehicle and bicycle parking numbers, as they are not consistent between the data table and the submitted plans. |
| Response: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Confirmed ✓ – <i>57 stalls are provided on grade and 157 in the parkade for a total of 214 parking stalls. This includes 2 car share stalls and 16 visitor stalls.</i> |
| Comment: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – As part of pre-application discussions, it was made clear to the applicant that we would expect bicycle parking to be provided to schedule C rates for the existing units as well as the proposed units. The applicant mentions providing 67 new bicycle parking spaces (39 of which are to be oversize) within the existing building, however these are not shown on any of the plans. We would require details of the location of the proposed bicycle parking, including a room plan, room height and access route, to ensure that the proposed bicycle parking will meet Schedule C standards. |
| Response: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Resolved ✓ – <i>Please refer to the existing building proposed bike room plans.</i> |
| Comment: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Thank you for providing an executive summary dated 2024.07.03 regarding the interim on site parking strategy. Staff encourage the applicant to find alternate vehicle parking arrangements that provide safe, accessible, and reliant parking options throughout the disruption period. A Traffic Management plan will be required as part of the building permit submission package. In addition, as a condition of rezoning, staff will recommend portions of the TDM program are provided prior to issuance of the Building permit, that will include the Car share memberships and credits. |
| Response: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Acknowledged ✓ |
| Comment: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – For Information prior to Building Permit Submission/Approval: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. A time of Building Permit, a Transportation Management Plan will be required, including details on relocation of existing parking provisions. |
| Response: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Acknowledged ✓ |

| Category: Underground Utilities Review | |
|---|--|
| Comment: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Preliminary civil servicing plan shows only the proposed SS/SD service connections for the existing buildings on the site. Please show proposed service locations for the new building (SS/SD & water service locations) |
| Response: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Resolved ✓ – <i>Please refer to Civil Servicing Plan. New services have been identified.</i> |
| Comment: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Civil servicing plan shows a drain main extension on Avalon St. This will not be supported. Drain services should connect to existing main in the street. |
| Response: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Resolved ✓ – <i>Please refer to Civil Servicing Plan. Drain services have been revised.</i> |
| Comment: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The sanitary attenuation report is being reviewed. If attenuation is required, it must be shown on the plans prior to Committee of the Whole and staff will recommend |

| | |
|-----------|---|
| | that Council secure the commitment to attenuation through a legal agreement registered on title prior to final approval of the rezoning. |
| Response: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Acknowledged ✓ – <i>JE.Anderson (Civil) confirmed that no attenuation is required.</i> – <i>A SIA was previously submitted in December 2023.</i> |
| Comment: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – For Information prior to Building Permit Submission/Approval: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The details of the approved Sanitary Attenuation report will be required to be met. ii. The applicant is required to retain the services of a Qualified Professional to characterize soils to be excavated and removed from the jobsite in order to inform the disposal location and ensure compliance with Provincial Legislation. The soil assessment must include samples from proposed service trench locations, with a report to be provided to the City. This is required to allow the City to provide the most accurate estimate and to install the new services most efficiently. The cost to serve (including sampling and disposal of soil) is through a fees established through Bylaw, and for more information, refer to the City of Victoria's FAQs found on the City's website. iii. Additionally, soil from a property with a current or former BC CSR Schedule 2 Activity must comply with provincial soil relocation requirements, including the one-week notification period prior to soil relocation. iv. A Street Occupancy Permit from Transportation Engineering will be required for work in the roadway. – Prior to commencement of excavation or soil relocation, contractors shall be registered under Bylaw 14-071, Schedule G: Code of Practice for Construction and Development Activities. Contact Adam Steele, Stormwater Management Specialist, at 250.361.0318 or asteel@victoria.ca to register. |
| Response: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Acknowledged ✓ |

| Category: | Fire Department |
|-----------|--|
| Comment: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Turning radius for fire apparatus has not been provided for the on site access. Provide turning radius and underground parking design must also meet the weight requirements for the fire apparatus. |
| Response: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Resolved ✓ – <i>Please refer to the Turning Radius Plan for a Bronto fire truck.</i> – <i>The turning radius analysis confirmed that the fire truck movements achieve the 6m building code access route requirements.</i> – <i>The parkade structure will be designed to support the weight of the fire truck and this has been confirmed by our structural engineer.</i> – <i>Please refer to the letter prepared by Skyline Engineering for your reference.</i> |

| | |
|-----------|--|
| Comment: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Noted for BP: You will be required to install BDA (bi-directional amplifier). During the design process you should plan on providing space for a signal booster to cover the below grade portions of the building. Typically, this involves 1.5m x 1.5m wall space in an equipment room, a 53mm conduit to the roof from the equipment room and conduits to each of the below grade levels for the installation of antennas. Provide documentation of either design or commitment to install by qualified electrical engineer at building permit submittal. These systems are also part of the integrated systems testing required for final occupancy. Best to engage one of the approved contractors that provide this equipment in our area. They should be able to provide any information that you require: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. https://www.radioworks.ca/ ii. http://www.cartelsys.com/ iii. VicMobile - Turnkey Wireless Solutions |
| Response: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Acknowledged ✓ – <i>The CREST System will be designed and coordinated as part the Building Permit Application.</i> |

Conclusion

We appreciate the guidance, collaboration, and feedback from the City of Victoria Staff throughout this process. We believe that we have now resolved and/or responded to all issues related to our application and ask that we be moved forward for Mayor and Council's review.

Sincerely,



Ben Smith
Director of Development
Starlight Developments



Kelsey Tyerman
Assistant Development Manager
Starlight Developments