

Wednesday, December 29, 2021

Charlotte Wain
Area Planner
City of Victoria
#1 Centennial Square
Victoria BC V8W 1P6
250.361.0340



dHkArchitects

Victoria
977 Fort Street V8V 3K3
T +1 250-658-3367
Nanaimo
102-5190 Dublin Way V9T 0H2
T +1 250-585-5810
mail@dhk.ca
www.dhk.ca

DPV 00051 - 937 View Street – Proposed Design Revisions for Discussion

Dear Charlotte;

This list is intended to summarize the major points of revisions that are proposed in response to comments received in reviews with CoV planning staff and summarized in an email dated Aug 13, 2021 (attached for reference).

We look forward to your feedback on our proposed revisions. Please call me directly if you have any questions or concerns.

Sincerely Yours,

Alex McCumber, Architect AIBC, LEED AP
Project Architect
dHkArchitects Inc.

Design Response to Department of Planning Comments

Note: The comments in italics below are taken directly from email response with dated 21/08/13 (attached for reference), provided by Charlotte Wain. Response to comments are noted below in green text.

Setbacks have improved and will be fully compliant with DCAP in future submissions. Staff still encourage setbacks to exceed DCAP requirements as part of the justification for additional height.



dHKarchitects

Victoria

977 Fort Street V8V 3K3

T +1 250-658-3367

Nanaimo

102-5190 Dublin Way V9T 0H2

T +1 250-585-5810

mail@dhk.ca

www.dhk.ca

Primary building site setbacks and building separations exceed DCAP guidelines. One DCAP setback variance remains at the North elevation (DCAP 6.184.5 - setbacks above 25m) and is proposed to allow for levels 9 to 11 to be proportionally designed to complement the primary elevation and visual definition of the secondary street wall at View St. This variance is for a limited portion of the primary elevation and represents a design approach that balances the intent of DCAP to reduce overshadowing of narrow streets and the overall composition of podium, primary and secondary street walls as described within the DCAP guidelines.

Building articulation remains a key concern, and breaking up the uniform appearance of the facades.

The revised proposed elevations break the uniform façade of the previous application into a series of layered complimentary street walls composed of podium, primary and secondary street walls as outlined in DCAP guidelines. The sum of the composition is strong podium base with active uses and entries with a series of secondary and tertiary towers layered in the receding elevations.

Applicant will submit a physical material board and precedent images of similar projects to provide a rationale for the current materials.

The applicant will provide additional renderings and a physical material board prior to COTW.

A bolder design is warranted to make a case for the height variance – taller buildings should be exemplar in their design. A move towards the modulated 2017 submission would likely receive a favorable response from planning staff.

The design team has reviewed the previous work and endeavored to implement a modular expression similar to the first submission. The proportional colour blocking of the layered towers and podium combined with varied panel depths and strong shadow lines of recessed rainscreen panels provide visual movement and interest for the project.

Key aspects of DCAP that will always be important considerations are podium height (4 storeys max), 1:5 setback ratio, side and rear setbacks, building articulation and finishes.

The current proposal meets these DCAP guidelines. Note, the project does meet the 1:5 ratio (DCAP 6.184.6) and is asking for minor variance of (DCAP 6.184.5 - setbacks above 25m) for a portion of levels 9 to 11 at the View St elevations as previously noted in design responses above.

Revised design may shift building north (reducing front yard setback and triggering a variance to R-48 zone) as a means of providing a more meaningful setback on upper floors. Staff are OK with this since it's within the DCAP guidelines for setbacks between 0-3m, and provided there is still sufficient space to distinguish between public and private space through adequate landscaping. Short term bike parking will still need to be accommodated on site.



dHkArchitects

Victoria

977 Fort Street V8V 3K3

T +1 250-658-3367

Nanaimo

102-5190 Dublin Way V9T 0H2

T +1 250-585-5810

mail@dhk.ca

www.dhk.ca

The design team has maintained the existing front yard setback to provide the best landscaping, bike parking and public private spatial separation for ground floor units. The applicant wishes planning staff to provide similar consideration for the previously noted proposed variance of DCAP 6.184.5 for a limited portion of levels 9 to 11.

Applicant may wish to consider a voluntary second review by ADP prior to presenting at COTW.

The applicant would requests to move directly to COTW.

Applicant may wish to consider additional amenities as part of the proposal – e.g. electrification of on-street stalls.

The applicant is open to discussion of additional amenities.

End of Planning Comments.

List Drawings Revisions to Drawings – DPR4 (dated 21/12/20)

Sheet # / Title	Revision Bubble # & Description
A000 Cover	Revised image and drawing list
A108 Street Elevations	Revised elevation
A301-302 Building Elevations	Revised elevations and materials

End of Revision list.



dHkarchitects

Victoria

977 Fort Street V8V 3K3
T +1 250-658-3367

Nanaimo

102-5190 Dublin Way V9T 0H2
T +1 250-585-5810

mail@dhk.ca
www.dhk.ca

937 View Street - summary of discussion

Charlotte Wain <CWain@victoria.ca>

Fri 8/13/2021 10:41 AM

To: Charles Kierulf <crk@dhk.ca>

Cc: Alex McCumber <adm@dhk.ca>

Hi Charles and Alex,

Thanks for the call earlier this morning. It was encouraging to hear that there is a desire to move forward with a positive staff report. With this in mind I thought I would summarise some of the key points of our discussion:

- Setbacks have improved and will be fully compliant with DCAP in future submissions. Staff still encourage setbacks to exceed DCAP requirements as part of the justification for additional height.
- Building articulation remains a key concern, and breaking up the uniform appearance of the facades.
- Applicant will submit a physical material board and precedent images of similar projects to provide a rationale for the current materials.
- A bolder design is warranted to make a case for the height variance – taller buildings should be exemplar in their design. A move towards the modulated 2017 submission would likely receive a favorable response from planning staff.
- Key aspects of DCAP that will always be important considerations are podium height (4 storeys max), 1:5 setback ratio, side and rear setbacks, building articulation and finishes.
- Revised design may shift building north (reducing front yard setback and triggering a variance to R-48 zone) as a means of providing a more meaningful setback on upper floors. Staff are OK with this since it's within the DCAP guidelines for setbacks between 0-3m, and provided there is still sufficient space to distinguish between public and private space through adequate landscaping. Short term bike parking will still need to be accommodated on site.
- Applicant may wish to consider a voluntary second review by ADP prior to presenting at COTW.
- Applicant may wish to consider additional amenities as part of the proposal – e.g. electrification of on-street stalls.

I believe this captures the key points but please let me know if I missed something off. Enjoy the weekend.

Kind regards,
Charlotte

Charlotte Wain, MCIP, RPP, MRTPI

Senior Planner - Urban Design

Development Services Division

City of Victoria

1 Centennial Square, Victoria BC V8W 1P6

T 250.361.0340 F 250.361.0386

