

August 24, 2026

City of Victoria
1 Centennial Square
Victoria, BC
B8W 1P6

Re: REZ00123 Application Review Summary 2

Legend:

Black – Condition to be met prior to CotW / HAP

Blue – For information prior to BP

Dear City of Victoria Staff:

We have reviewed the City of Victoria Application Review Summary provided to omb and have responded with the following answers and amendments to the drawing set:

Plans & Written Material

- *A letter with itemized responses to each of the comments in this review summary (not required for comments listed under the heading "Information for Building Permit Application").*

Refer to this letter. All site improvements requested for design, coordination, and approval through the Building Permit Application are proposed in their entirety for approval through the HAP. The intent is to clearly define the scope of work and to streamline the approvals process. No site upgrades beyond what is approved through the HAP will be considered by the applicant.

- *Full set of plans incorporating all changes to the previous submission.*

See attached revised plans with clouded revisions.

- *Full set of plans with revisions bubbled and numbered to identify all changes (bubbles indicate where changes have been made to the previously submitted plans, and each change is numbered).*

See attached revised plans with clouded revisions.

- *A list describing changes that have been made to the previous set of plans, relating to the 'bubbled' drawings preferably by a numerical reference.*

Refer to this letter and drawing set for description of changes.

Sign Posting

- *It is your responsibility to check with Development Services admin at developmentservices@victoria.ca for further information on any sign posting requirements.*

Noted.

Application Timing

- *All required zoning approvals and development permits must be approved in principle by Council before submitting your Building Permit application.*

Noted.

Notes

- *If your application involves landscaping to satisfy Development Permit requirements, an estimate for the landscape will be required prior to the issuance of the development permit and the landscape security deposit will be required at the time of Building Permit application. A minimum landscape security deposit of \$2,000 is required.*

A landscape cost estimate will be provided by the Landscape Architect based on the finalized landscape drawing set, following resolution of any outstanding comments and prior to issuance of the Development Permit, as required. The applicable landscape security deposit will be provided in the form of a Letter of Credit prior to issuance of the Building Permit.

- *A housing agreement, restrictive covenant, master development agreement or right-of-way requirements may apply to this development. If this is the case, then the applicant is advised to secure the services of the necessary professionals (lawyer, surveyor, engineer) as early in the process as possible to ensure timely processing of this application.*

Noted.

Development Services Division Comments

1. *Plan Check by the zoning team required more information.*

See separate Plan Check response letter.

2. *Public Realm/Urban Design comments should be cross-referenced with Engineering frontage requirements.*

Noted.

3. *The Plan Check for the proposal has outstanding issues/ missing/ or incorrect information. Please ensure that your resubmission addresses these items. If you need clarification on any of the items contained in the Plan Check, please contact the Zoning Administration staff as noted on the Plan Check.*

Noted. See separate Plan Check response letter.

4. *Updated letter to Mayor and Council providing more details on the proposal and to address the revisions.*

See attached revised Letter to Mayor and Council.

General

5. *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 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.

See attached letters of engagement.

Land Development Review

6. *Portions of ROAD will be required to be dedicated to the City so that the retaining walls (Blanshard / Fairfield) can wholly reside on City lands. We are also requesting SRW for the purpose of maintenance of the Blanshard facing wall (Blanshard frontage), that would extend from the building to the wall. It is recommended that the requests be satisfied prior to the issuance of a Building Permit. Further discussion is required on the SRW to ensure city needs for maintenance can be met.*

Revised drawings: A100, A101

Noted. The retaining wall along Blanshard has been provided a 1.5-2m SRW as requested by the city. See A100 for notes regarding proposed road dedications and SRW's, as discussed with the City.

7. *Proposed unit substation and grounding needs are to be located within the developing lands, encroachments for private electrical infrastructure will not be permitted. If current proposed location meets these requirements, please see comments from the Structures review regarding the retaining wall along Fairfield Rd*

Revised drawings: A100, A101

Electrical engineer has confirmed that the proposed unit substation and grounding can be accommodated within the subject property.

8. *It is recommended that, as a condition of rezoning, and secured in a legal agreement which is registered prior to DP approval: All TDM measures as requested by the Transportation Department to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning.*

See attached revised TDM memo.

Transportation Review

9. *Works & Services bylaw was adopted in January of 2026 and will apply to building permit conditions and requirements. As part of requirements, frontage improvements are to meet City specifications as well as the Downtown Public Realm plan 'New Town District'*

All site improvements requested for design, coordination, and approval through the Building Permit Application are proposed in their entirety for approval through the HAP. The intent is to clearly define the scope of work and to streamline the approvals process. No site upgrades beyond what is approved through the HAP will be considered by the applicant.

The Downtown Public Realm plan 'New Town District' standards will be the point of reference for the proposed improvements.

10. *Note as part of the requirements, provision of a transit stop and a Transit shelter meeting BC Transit Design Guidelines at the Fairfield bus stop will be the responsibility of the applicant.*

As discussed with the City, a transit shelter will not be provided with this application. Please refer to the TDM for other provisions included with this proposal.

11. *Thank you for indicating a proposed location within the site for bike share including access to electrical outlets. Staff recommend a statutory right of way is secured for the access and use of bike share (An area of 6mx2m is required). The City has recently confirmed bike share provider Lime and can provide further guidance on station requirements. Staff's preference for a station to be closer in proximity to Blanshard however staff can support the proposed Fairfield location.*

An SRW will be provided for the bike share space. Refer to plans for extents and location.

12. *Proposed improvements at the hotel front door continue to rely on the public right of way – at time of building permit frontage will be required to meet the works and services bylaw -highlighting the future desire for a sidewalk along the length of Burdett. Driveway access design and grades will need to accommodate the future design.*

Revised drawings: A100, A103

As discussed with Brent Molnar, without design grades at the property line, there is insufficient information to design future sidewalk accommodation along Burdett.

As discussed with Brent Molnar, the corner at Burdett and Blanshard has been extended with a flared letdown to allow tour buses to turn from Blanshard onto Burdett. The widened corner shortens the pedestrian crossing and discourages right turns from the hotel apron onto Blanshard. See attached A100, A103, and turning diagrams to illustrate functionality.

13. *Thank you for indicating frontage improvements in association with required electrical servicing. As highlighted previously, mobility goals are focused on accessibility to and from the site. Provided conceptual plans do not provide enough detail to confirm these goals have been met.*

Grades for the new curb on Burdett are proposed to follow the existing grade of Burdett. As noted in point 12, the City has not provided the future desired grades so there is insufficient information to design future sidewalk accommodations.

As discussed with Brent Molnar, mobility goals for vehicular traffic were identified as the priority for this corner. Refer to the revised TDM which includes turning radius studies from Fairfield to Burdett. WATT consultants recommend maintaining the existing right turn prohibition.

The letdown for future crosswalk across Fairfield at Penwill Green has been moved east of the bus stop between the bus stop and the bus layby to create a shorter crossing path and better visibility for pedestrians. Final location of crosswalk to be coordinated with the City at Building Permit. Refer to Civil and TDM for more information.

14. *Fairfield – please provide more information identifying the proposed scope on the frontage. Plans indicate replacement of soft-scaping with hard-scaping however clarity is required on existing sidewalk improvements.*

Refer to A100, Civil, and Landscape where plans indicate that a portion of the existing curb and sidewalk will remain in front of the existing building. The blue dash denotes the extent of the proposed sidewalk improvements.

15. *Burdett driveway entrance – applicant's response noted turning movements within the TDM memo however staff we unable to locate. Please provide further information for detailed refinement prior to BP submission.*

Turning radius studies have been included in the updated TDM. Please also refer to item 12 for more information on the revised configuration.

16. *Fairfield/Blanshard property line realignment requires further comments from Bridges and Structures before staff can resolve a recommendation.*

Revised drawings: A100

As agreed with the City, a road dedication is proposed in lieu of a property line realignment. See A100 for extents. Along Blanshard, the stone landscape wall will be removed and the City will restore the sidewalk to the property line. The existing landscaped area will be regraded and landscaped within the development lands to meet the new sidewalk condition.

17. *In response to the expected parking variance staff support the applicant's proposed TDM measures however the 'Precinct Level' public realm improvements proposed are baseline expectations within the Works & Services bylaw. Staff continue to identify pedestrian accessibility as prioritization.*

Refer to attached TDM.

Engineering Structures Review

18. *The applicant has responded to indicate that they are not in favour of a road dedication at the corner of Blanshard Street and Fairfield Road. The SRW required for maintenance along the concrete wall along Blanshard Street may have to be extended to include the portion of that concrete wall that curves down to Fairfield Road in this area. A meeting to discuss this, or other options, with the applicant is recommended as an SRW is required prior to HAV approval.*

Revised drawings: A100, A101

A revised SRW is proposed for the curved portion of the concrete retaining wall. The proposed waste and recycling fencing is demountable to allow the City full access to the 1.5m SRW if/when required. A new retaining wall at the exterior exit door is proposed and described in the site plan. The new retaining wall encroaches into the 1.5m SRW as shown in the plans. Final details of encroachment to be coordinated at Building Permit.

19. *As well, at the time of building permit submission, the applicant will be required to remove the existing encroachment of the smaller mortared rock wall on the Fairfield Road frontage, which is independent of the concrete retaining wall, along with remediation of the sidewalk where the wall is removed.*

The rock wall will be removed. The City has agreed to remediate the sidewalk up to the property line on Fairfield and to the former rock wall extents on Blanshard. Refer to item 16 for further information.

20. *In the applicant's response to #15, a proposed new wall in the southeast portion of the site constructed immediately adjacent the existing concrete wall is referred to. This will not allow City access to the City's concrete wall. Also, the wall footing width and depth of the City's concrete wall is unknown. As per the January 24, 2024 Ryzuk Geotechnical Memo provided to the applicant, access to the wall from the side of 780 Blanshard will be required for future work/improvements to this wall. Further information and discussion with the applicant is required regarding this parallel wall and the provision of the SRW prior to HAV approval.*

Revised drawings: A100, A101

A parallel wall is no longer being considered. The 1.5-2m SRW is being provided per A100. An encroachment for a small retaining wall by the exit stair is required for the exit path. Brent Molnar confirmed this was acceptable to the City. Refer to item 18 for further information.

21. *If a wall is needed for the private BCH substation shown on the Fairfield Road frontage, it is required to be contained within private property. The City does not permit private BCH infrastructure on City property. Note that a retaining wall will be required along the widened sidewalk to the west so an option is that wall is curved up to the property line at the BCH substation and terminated to then match the private portion of the wall. Please revise the note on A100 accordingly.*

A retaining wall will be required within property. As discussed with Brent Molnar, a non-dependent landscape wall less than 1.2m will be installed from the property line to the sidewalk. The landscape wall is to be confirmed at the time of building permit after further geotechnical investigations.

22. *Thank you for your response that the provision of a road dedication for those sections of the private wall that are currently on private property will be coordinated at building permit. Provide a survey plan that clearly shows the wall location in relation to the east property line. Add a note on the survey plan that the location and width of the wall footing below grade is unknown. The road dedication shall be indicated across all drawings with the building permit submission. ADDED NOTE: Existing buttresses along the wall must be included in the road dedication area as they are integral to the wall. The survey plan must indicate the buttresses along the entire length of wall to ensure that they fall within the new road dedication.*

All SRWs and road dedications will be indicated on the building permit submission.

23. *Regarding the previous review comment "With regards to the portion of existing wall along Blanshard Street that supports the property (i.e. the section that is just south of Burdett Avenue), since this wall does not retain the roadway, the City does not want ownership of it so the drawings shall indicate clearly that it be on private property. A report from a Qualified Professional to indicate the condition and stability of this portion of the wall will be required. The City wants to ensure that future issues such as an outward lean which could pose a safety issue for pedestrians is avoided.", the applicant has responded that this is to be coordinated with BP submission. Does this mean that the applicant agrees? Also, this is comment is not related to the applicant's response to #15 as its about the northern portion of the wall that supports the private property.*

A report to confirm wall condition will be provided at building permit submission.

24. *Regarding the previous review comment "With regards to the northernmost set of stairs that will remain along the Blanshard Street frontage, since they are connected to the City's retaining wall, they shall be added into the document for the 2m wide SRW along the wall as being owned and maintained by the owner. The railing on this set of stairs is currently integral with the railing system along Blanshard Street. The stair railing shall be separated from the City railing. The City requires the stair railing to act independently from that of the City's*

railing as its part of the owner's infrastructure. With regards to the set of stairs being removed, both the City railing and retaining wall shall be made good after removal.", the applicant has responded that this is to be coordinated with BP submission. Does this mean that the applicant agrees?

Yes, the applicant agrees.

25. *Regarding the previous review comment "The drawings indicate a new 1.2m high retaining wall on the Burdett Avenue frontage at the entrance, part of which is on City property. Staff requires that the portion of wall on private property be independent of the wall on public property due to future ownership and maintenance issues given that the City's portion would be mutually reliant on the private property wall if connected. Staff will also require a geotechnical assessment of the area by a Qualified Professional and an engineered wall design with the building permit submission.", thank you for indicating this on A100 and A103 of the resubmission. This will also need to be indicated on the civil and landscape plans in the building permit submission. Staff's preference, however, is that a wall on City property not be required, which should be explored by the applicant at time of building permit submission.*

As discussed with Brent Molnar with the City, the concrete wall that is beyond the property line will no longer be a retaining wall but a landscape wall less than 1.2m.

26. *The applicant has indicated new sidewalk on Fairfield Road at the west end of the site. A retaining wall will be required along this new sidewalk along the Penwill Green Park and the boulevard up to the location of the proposed BCH substation as per the City's Works and Services Bylaw No. 26-004, Schedule A.*

The new sidewalk extends from the roadside edge of the existing sidewalk and does not impact the interface with Penwill Green Park. A new retaining wall for Penwill Green Park will not be required as it is an existing condition.

Underground Utilities Review

27. *Storm Drain at the west end on the Fairfield frontage. All new services are installed perpendicular to the City mains. This service location needs to be changed, or a main extension considered, which would be charged to the applicant.*

Noted. To be coordinated with BP submission.

28. *Plans show a storm drain cutting through the corner of the property at Blanshard and Fairfield with a note that it is to be relocated. This main does not exist in real life and should not be shown.*

Noted. To be coordinated with BP submission.

29. *The applicant is required to retain the services of a Qualified Professional for any project requiring excavation and disposal of any volume of soil for the purpose of characterizing the soil and determining a suitable disposal facility. 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. 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.*
 - o *A Street Occupancy Permit from Transportation Engineering will be required for work in the roadway.*

Noted. To be coordinated with BP submission.

30. *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 asteele@victoria.ca to register.*

Noted. To be coordinated with BP submission.

Stormwater Management Review

31. *Please be aware that the proposed storm drain servicing for the oil/water separator crosses onto private property along the Fairfield frontage. As per Bylaw 14-071, a property must not drain stormwater from one parcel onto, or through, another parcel unless an easement permitting that drainage, in a form satisfactory to the City Solicitor, is first registered against title to the parcel the stormwater flows or discharges onto or through.*

The proposed parking lot storm drain has been re-routed around the unit substation so that connections are made within the lot, prior to discharge into a single drain service at PL.

32. *Please review Schedule "G" of the City's Codes of Practice for Construction and Development Activities (under Bylaw 14-071) and submit a signed Codes of Practice registration form. Information can be found at www.victoria.ca/stormwater.*

Noted.

33. *Please provide an erosion and sediment control (ESC) plan that demonstrates how the site will ensure no silt laden water, gravel, debris or prohibited waste from demolition or construction works enter roof drains, perimeter drains, adjacent properties, adjacent storm drain catch basins or the City's drainage system. All disturbed surfaces and stockpiles are to be stabilized and contained to prevent sediment mobilization, paved surfaces to be regularly swept to manage dust and debris tracking, and appropriate measures must be in place to prevent runoff from crossing property boundaries or entering exiting drainage infrastructure.*

Noted. To be coordinated with BP submission.

34. *Please review Part G, Section 4.53 of the Engineering Standards and Specifications (ESS) Manual.*

Noted.

Parks Division Comments

35. *Thank you for looking into the possibility of adding boulevard trees to the frontage along Fairfield Rd. It was noted in the response to staff that the project arborist reviewed the frontage in detail and determined that there is insufficient plantable depth to accommodate new street trees along the frontage. Please provide the methods used by the arborist to determine this and any relevant supporting documents for the City to review. Has the possibility of a hydro vac or excavator been considered to excavate along the frontage to create tree pits or a trench, so growing medium can be added and appropriate depth provided for new street trees?*

The plantable space along the Fairfield Road frontage has been assessed based on both the existing condition and the proposed future condition. The project team has also considered the constraints associated with the existing road geometry, sidewalk configuration, and known underground conditions.

Early coordination between the civil, mechanical and geotechnical consultants identified significant concerns regarding shallow bedrock along the frontage. These discussions were also informed by the anticipated requirements for new underground services, where it was understood that excavation through bedrock could require hoe ramming, hydro fracturing or blasting. Based on these anticipated conditions, extensive excavation to create additional planting depth was not considered feasible at this stage.

The project team also requested available City as built information to better understand the existing underground conditions and soil profile. The City confirmed that no relevant as built are available. As such, the current assessment has conservatively assumed that the available boulevard depth is not suitable for accommodating new street trees.

Further geotechnical investigation is currently being undertaken, including drilling along Fairfield Road scheduled for August 25, 2026 which will provide additional information regarding the depth and profile of the underlying bedrock nearby building edge. The results will be shared with the City once available.

With respect to the City's suggestion of using hydro vac or excavation equipment to create tree pits or a continuous planting trench, we suggest that this be considered only once the subsurface investigation has confirmed the actual bedrock conditions. At present, there is insufficient information to demonstrate that such an approach would be technically feasible or could provide the required growing medium and root depth without significant impacts to the existing road, sidewalk and underground infrastructure.

There are also significant geometric constraints along this frontage. The existing curvature of Fairfield Road results in the sidewalk encroaching onto the private property in order to achieve the required pedestrian clearances and sidewalk configuration. The available boulevard area is therefore already constrained, and the introduction of tree pits would need to be assessed against the applicable City standards and existing road and sidewalk geometry.

The project is already meeting the applicable Tree Minimum and replacement tree requirements. We would also note that the additional frontage improvements being contemplated in response to this comment go beyond what would ordinarily be expected as part of a heritage building renovation and change of use. This project is not a rezoning application involving a density injection, where broader public realm improvements may be considered in the context of additional development rights. Rather, this is a heritage building renovation and change of use, and the project is already proposing meaningful improvements to the existing public realm, including the removal of existing landscaping and stairs and accommodating the required road dedication and SRW arrangements where applicable.

On this basis, we consider the provision of additional boulevard trees along Fairfield Road, particularly where this would require significant excavation into anticipated bedrock and intervention within the existing road and sidewalk infrastructure, to represent a scope beyond the standard requirements reasonably associated with this type of heritage renovation and change of use.

Accordingly, we propose to provide the City with the findings of the upcoming geotechnical investigation as supporting information. However, based on the current understanding of the site constraints, we do not anticipate that the Fairfield Road frontage will be capable of accommodating additional boulevard trees without significant and disproportionate intervention into the existing road, sidewalk and subsurface conditions.

Please refer to attached ASK-006 for illustration of the constraints.

36. Please update the Tree Inventory table to include municipal trees M9047, M9046, M9049 and M904.

The above noted additional trees have been added to the inventory and the report.

37. Please provide a Replacement Tree Plan. The Plan must meet the requirements outlined in Schedule "E" of the Tree Protection Bylaw 21-035. The Replacement Tree Plan must meet Part 4 requirements for siting, soil volume, and size of stock.

- Remember to show the defined planting areas for your replacement trees as defined in schedule "E" 2(f) of the bylaw.
- Remember to include a table showing calculations for the estimated soil volume that will be provided for each planting Area. An example of the table to be used is under Schedule "E" 2(g).
- Replacement trees planted on site must first be selected from Part 1 of Schedule "E" of the bylaw; unless it is clearly demonstrated that it is not possible to plant replacement trees of species described in Part 1 (due to grade, topography, tree location, soil depth, or other requirements).
- Please indicate on the plan which newly planted trees will be chosen as replacement trees.
- Please include quantities beside proposed tree species.
- The replacement tree plan must be completed by an arborist or landscape architect.

Revised drawings: L0.3

Refer to Replacement Tree Plan.

38. The scope of work triggers the requirement to meet the tree minimum as outlined in Schedule "F" of the Tree Protection Bylaw 21-035. According to the Zoning Plan Check, the lot area of this property is 2,272 m²; therefore, 11 Bylaw protected trees are required on this property. It appears 11 replacement trees are being proposed on the site; however, it is not clear what species are being proposed. Please provide the requested replacement tree plan for Parks review.

Revised drawings: L0.3

Refer to Landscape drawings and Arborist Report.

Building and Inspection Services Comments

39. The glazing in the proposed Level 5 exterior walkway must be protected in accordance with Article 3.2.3.13. of the BCBC, as the exit path demonstrated does not meet the requirements for an exterior passageway under Article 3.4.4.3. due to the absence of a stair at each end.

All hotel room windows in the north exposing building face that are within 3m horizontally of the exterior egress path will be provided with exit exposure protection with water curtain sprinklers and tempered glazing.

40. An alternate solution is referenced in the applicant's response letter. The city assumes the 5th floor noted above will a portion of the interior passageway and will be part of the alternate solution. Please confirm.

TCCP will prepare an alternative solution for the exit exposure protection.

Fire Department Comments

41. *You will be required to install BDA's (bi-directional amplifiers). During the design process you should plan on providing space for signal boosters. 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 levels identified by your approved designer 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 provides this equipment in our area. They should be able to provide any information that you require.*
<https://www.radioworks.ca/>
<http://www.cartelsys.com/>
<http://www.vicmobile.com/>

Noted. To be coordinated with BP submission.

42. *Fire department connection must be installed on the address side of the building, within 45 meters of a hydrant and in a location acceptable to the fire department where it will not create a tripping hazard or impede exit access/ egress.*

Noted. To be coordinated with BP submission.

Best regards,



Steve McFarlane Architect AIBC FRAIC LEED AP
Principal

CC

Juan Pereira, Jon Stovell, Jonathan Lim, Reliance Properties
Rory Fulber, Alex Robinson omb

