

May 29, 2026

City of Victoria

1 Centennial Square
Victoria, BC
B8W 1P6

Re: REZ00123 Application Review Summary

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:

- *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.

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

Noted.

- *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.

1. *Plan Check by the zoning team has not yet been completed*

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 significant 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.

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.

6. *Proposed unit substation and required retaining wall encroaches into road right of way. Substation & associated retaining wall must be located within the developing lands, encroachments for private electrical infrastructure will not be permitted.*

Revised drawings: A100, A101

See line item 27 for contradictory information on this wall. Engineering Structures suggests separating the portion of wall on private property from the one on public property. A retaining wall around the substation requires cutting into the slope and below what appears to be a foundation wall supporting a stair/wall at the building entrance. If it is found to be bedrock, scale/support of a near vertical cut is feasible. If soils and safe permanent cutslope is not feasible (soil conditions or

CoV property constraints) then a wall is needed. If a wall is needed, attempts will be made to keep the wall on property and any necessary permanent retainment will be investigated, assessed, and accommodated. If the wall is required to encroach on public lands, the private portion will be independent from the public portion per line item 27. The wall is assumed to be CIP concrete.

7. *All TDM measures as requested by the Transportation Department to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning.*

See attached TDM memo.

8. *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.*

Refer to the Civil Engineering drawings for the proposed and committed extent of frontage improvements associated with this renovation project. As previously outlined, the applicant cannot reasonably assume responsibility for an undefined or uncontrolled scope of frontage upgrades extending to the centreline of the road, particularly given the limited nature of the works contemplated under this revised application, which is no longer proceeding as a Rezoning application.

9. *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.*

Revised drawings:

Noted.

10. *The developer will be required to enter into a servicing agreement for all offsite works.*

Noted. See response to line item 8.

11. *Staff continue to prioritize strengthened pedestrian accessibility based on proposed hotel use and operations. With limited vehicle use on site, the majority of the demand is expected to be pedestrian focused mobility. Focused improvements on Burdett frontage of the site including pedestrian amenities and accessible design are required. Staff recommend to the applicant that agreeable terms and scope are considered with frontage design refinement be completed collaboratively with staff in preparation for building permit submission.*

Revised drawings: A100, A101

To improve pedestrian mobility, the applicant proposes improvements to the sidewalk at the Fairfield and Burdett intersection. The upgraded sidewalk will connect the existing sidewalk at the bus layby to the existing pathway through Penwill Green. Due to the challenging grades on Burdett, the sidewalk will stop at the Penwill Green pathway. A new sidewalk bump-out at the intersection is proposed to improve pedestrian mobility to the North side of Burdett where the grades and existing sidewalk width are more favourable for pedestrian movement. This work is proposed to coincide

with BC Hydro upgrades that are required to feed the unit substation for the proposed building as well as new infrastructure for future use. See also response to line item 8.

12. *Priorities for the mobility include;*
- *Prioritization of providing frontage sidewalk for pedestrians to and from the site accesses.*
 - *Improvements to meet accessible grades and pedestrian priority at the intersection nodes of Burdett/Blanshard & Burdett/Fairfield.*
 - *Safe operational movements at driveway crossings meeting the needs of hotel use*
 - *Existing and expected operational vehicular movements along Burdett are considered in conjunction with frontage and site access changes.*

Revised drawings: A100, A101

Through the installation of BC Hydro infrastructure, reconstruction of the existing sidewalk is anticipated at the Burdett/Fairfield intersection. Through this work, a new letdown can be provided for a future sidewalk connection across Fairfield. See also response to item 11. Further, see attached turning movement diagrams to illustrate functionality of new pick up/ drop area.

13. *Retaining the existing vehicular operations on Burdett (2-way for the western portion and 1-way from Blanshard) could be considered based on satisfying existing operational needs for properties along Burdett, reinforcing the existing condition using revised curb alignments, and surface treatments are to be considered.*

Noted. No updates or changes to existing curb alignments or surface treatments are proposed. See attached turning movement diagrams to illustrate functionality of new pick up/ drop area.

14. *Fairfield is identified as a Secondary Arterial with an average existing right of way width of 18.28m, with a desired width of 23m, resulting in a requirement of 2.36m. Based on existing conditions, non linear property bounds, existing sidewalk trespass, and proposed stair removal staff recommend aligning the width of area along the frontage to the existing building footprint, approximately 1.6m from face of building. .*

Revised drawings:

A continuous Statutory Right of Way (SRW) is proposed. Refer to the Civil Engineering drawings and Architectural Site Plan. The proposed SRW alignment is based on a 2.0 m setback from the innermost exterior wall of the building, creating a consistent straight-line frontage condition across the site, resulting in a minimum setback of approximately 1.3 m at the narrowest point where the stair is being removed.

This approach will improve sidewalk width and functionality while also accommodating the proposed shared bicycle parking stalls within the property limits, clear of the right-of-way area, thereby contributing a valuable community-oriented Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measure.

15. *Blanshard is identified as an Arterial with an existing right of way width of 18.28m, with a desired width of 30m. Based on existing conditions a 2.0m SRW is required and a realignment of property bounds to define retaining wall. Further details are provided by Bridges & Structures comments.*

Revised drawings:

In response to this comment, the project can commit to advancing a realignment of the property line to rectify the existing condition whereby the public road retaining wall currently encroaches onto the subject property, ensuring the wall is ultimately located fully within City property. In addition, the project can accommodate a limited Statutory Right of Way (SRW) of approximately 1 m (or as otherwise defined by the extent of the building edge at Stair 3), along the northeastern portion of the site, where grade differentials are most pronounced and where access for maintenance of the public road retaining wall is most reasonably required. The extent of this SRW would be limited to the portion of the site where the proposed building separation from the property line can accommodate it, specifically terminating north of the existing exit stair.

As referenced under Comment Item 22, a road dedication to the inside face of the retaining wall could similarly be advanced to ensure the public road retaining wall remains fully within City lands. However, extending the access and maintenance SRW approximately 1 m beyond the inside face of the wall, south of the existing exit stair, is not feasible due to the constrained site conditions associated with the existing heritage building footprint.

In this southeastern portion of the site, the proximity of the building to the property line necessitates the construction of a new retaining wall within the subject property. This wall would be constructed immediately adjacent to the existing public road retaining wall and is intended to provide additional structural stability and long-term support to the retained condition, consistent with the structural consultant's recommendation that a parallel wall system may be required in localized areas.

This new internal retaining wall is required to facilitate the operational functionality and circulation of the constrained loading area and garbage enclosure associated with the hotel use. Introducing an SRW over this area would significantly impair the project's ability to utilize the limited space necessary to support these essential building functions (including waste and recycling operations). The proposed approach therefore represents a balanced and practical solution that rectifies the existing public wall encroachment condition, provides reasonable maintenance access where feasible, incorporates additional structural stability where appropriate, and preserves the functional viability of the development within the constraints imposed by the existing heritage building footprint and constrained site geometry.

16. *Blanshard at Fairfield intersection; To resolve existing trespass, improve accessibility and meet DCAP standards staff recommend a portion of land dedication with bounds to align with updated internal wall boundary.*

Revised drawings:

Along the Blanshard frontage, the existing sidewalk currently encroaches into the subject property. The project can accommodate a road dedication to establish a consistent sidewalk width and regularize the existing condition, including the area occupied by the public retaining wall, consistent with the approach discussed under Comment Item 15.

Along the Fairfield frontage, the existing landscaped softscape area, which is primarily located within the subject property, has limited or no formal extension into the public realm. In this context, a minor property line adjustment could be considered to better align with the existing physical conditions, generally following the inner face of the existing retaining wall. This would help rationalize the property boundary and resolve existing discrepancies between the legal property line and the established site conditions.

This approach would resolve the existing frontage irregularities in a coordinated manner while also providing a reasonable offset relative to the proposed dedication along the Blanshard frontage. Refer to drawings and see line item 22 for clarity in terms of proposed property line adjustments in the area.

17. *Burdett is identified as a Local with an existing right of way width of 15.29m, based on existing conditions no further right of way is recommended.*

Noted. No updates or changes proposed.

18. *Proposed site servicing works, stair removal, and on site surface improvements on Fairfield St frontage result in further rationale to attribute frontage improvements to this proposal. Staff encourage the applicant to consider these improvements to achieve mutual goals. A realignment of curb to enhance the sidewalk widths to meet Downtown Core Area plan Local street type, with overall sidewalk width of 3.6-4.5m in addition to the consideration of new tree canopy and public realm elements.*

Revised drawings: A100, A101

A new sidewalk and curb realignment is proposed at the Fairfield and Burdett intersection, extending from the pathway at Penwill Green along Fairfield Road to the new unit substation. The proposed curb realignment for this stretch is consistent with the proposed curb realignment from the previous HAP and Rezoning submission, which provides an expanded passenger zone for the proposed in-lane bus stop while maintaining the desired BC Transit bus layby area. The proposed curb realignment has been developed in coordination with City of Victoria Transportation Planner, Bronwyn Crowder and is consistent with their expectations. Refer to the TDM report for more information on the bus layby area and analysis on the anticipated bus maneuvering. The existing planted strip along the Fairfield façade is also being removed, resulting in a wider effective sidewalk width across the building frontage. The revised frontage condition achieves approximately 89% compliance with the DCAP Local Street Type sidewalk width objective of 3.6–4.5 m, with only two localized pinch points at the southeast corners of the building measuring approximately 2.8 m and 3.2 m respectively. Dimensions have been added to the plans for clarity. In addition, a new public bike share facility is proposed to enhance frontage activation and support Transportation Demand Management objectives. With respect to the request to consider additional tree canopy along Fairfield Road, the project arborist has reviewed the frontage conditions in detail and determined that the existing subsurface conditions along this frontage consist predominantly of shallow bedrock directly beneath the existing sidewalk area, with little to no viable soil volume available to support boulevard tree planting. As such, there is insufficient plantable depth and soil capacity to sustainably accommodate new street trees along this frontage. In addition to these significant geotechnical and subsurface constraints, the introduction of boulevard trees within this area would further reduce the operational flexibility of the proposed BC Transit layby configuration and impose additional physical constraints on passenger loading and unloading activities associated with the transit stop frontage. Given the constrained nature of the corridor, maintaining clear and flexible frontage conditions is important to support safe and efficient transit operations and pedestrian circulation along Fairfield Road.

19. *Thank you for the Driveway Access & Loading Bay memo providing rational and expected use of the proposed vehicular operations of the hotel. While staff support the removal of the exit on to Blanshard at the proposed front door there are components that continue to not align with the Highway Access Bylaw. Based on site constraints and overall shared mobility goals for the site staff are generally supportive of a site access proposal that is shown in the provided drawing sets. Further consideration and design development is required; staff will continue to collaborate with the applicant to refine detailed designs for further proposal applications.*

Noted. See attached turning movement diagrams in TDM to illustrate functionality of new pick up/drop area.

20. *Based on the increase of proposed use, and anticipated trips to and from the site a parking shortfall is anticipated. A comprehensive TDM package is recommended; Staff support a package specific to the use and site such as enhanced bicycle parking (ex; bicycle share station, additional secure bicycle parking for guests and employees, access to electrical outlets & maintenance station, provision of oversized stalls (0.9mx2.4m)). In addition, staff support considering recommended pedestrian accessibility improvements to the public realm.*

The original TDM proposal has been enhanced to provide additional TDM measures in keeping with the proposed site's usage as a hotel and its placement in the neighbourhood, while also considering what is possible within the constraints of the heritage building and its parcel configuration. The complete TDM package now includes:

- **Pedestrian and accessibility improvements** that include a new at-grade entrance replacing the existing stairs and ramp, two accessible parking spaces with EV charging (one of which is van accessible), new sidewalk connection on the southwest end of Burdett Avenue and an expanded sidewalk on the northwest side of Fairfield Road at Burdett Avenue.
 - **At-grade bicycle parking entrance** off Fairfield Road to facilitate easy access to the secure bike storage facilities.
 - **Additional short-term and long-term bike parking**, including an additional 12 long-term spaces (200% above requirement) using advanced ground-mounted lift assisted horizontal racks, plus 1 additional short-term space (20% above requirement).
 - **Non-standard bike parking**, including provision of energy sources to all proposed long-term spaces, plus the configuration of two long-term spaces and one short-term space for non-standard cargo bikes.
 - **Bicycle end-of-trip facilities**, including staff changeroom facilities and bicycle maintenance station in proximity to the secure bike storage room.
 - **Public bikeshare space is designated along the Fairfield Road frontage, with roughed-in electrical supply** to accommodate the potential future installation of a 10-bike or e-bike bikeshare docking station. The dedicated space will be provided on private property for use and operation by the City. The bikeshare program type, as well as whether the system is docked or dockless, would be determined and managed by the City.
 - **Transit zone curb reconfiguration and space for improved passenger amenities** that (in keeping with City and BC Transit feedback) includes extension of the northwest curb of Fairfield Road at Burdett Avenue to create a "bus bulge" to provide easier passenger boarding, drop off and expanded space for passenger amenities. The curb reconfiguration along the remainder of the Fairfield frontage also provides expanded layover space that could also potentially facilitate independent access to bus charging at one of the positions. (Charging infrastructure and confirmation of feasibility and location would be BC Transit's responsibility, in consultation with the City).
21. *With regards to the existing retaining wall along Blanshard Street that supports the roadway (i.e., the section that has the pipe railing on the sidewalk above it), ownership of this portion is confirmed to be that of the City. However, the exact location of the existing wall is not clear and some or all of this wall may be situated on private property. Please 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 developer will be required to provide a road dedication for those sections of the private wall that are currently on private property (as determined by the survey) to ensure clarity and ownership of the wall in*

the future. The road dedication shall be indicated across all drawings with the building permit submission.

Noted. To be coordinated with BP submission. See also Line item 15.

22. *The developer will be required to provide a road dedication at the corner of Blanshard Street and Fairfield Road so that the portion of the existing wall on Blanshard Street that curves around that corner will be under ownership of the City. The road dedication shall be indicated across all drawings with the building permit submission.*

Please also refer to Comment Item 16 for additional context and coordination regarding frontage adjustments and boundary rationalization.

While the project can support a road dedication required to address the existing retaining wall condition and ensure it is appropriately brought under City ownership where applicable, the intent is not to advance a full corner dedication up to the curved wall extent. Retaining the balance of this corner area within the subject property is important to preserve future flexibility for site planning considerations, including potential landscape treatment, signage opportunities, and other hotel-related functional or operational uses.

Accordingly, any dedication will be carefully coordinated to resolve the existing infrastructure and property boundary requirements while maintaining a reasonable and functional residual site area. A modest offset from the curved wall, to be confirmed through survey and existing wall geometry, could also be considered as part of this coordination. To be fully coordinated with BP submission.

23. *With regards to the existing retaining wall along Blanshard Street that supports the roadway (i.e., the section that has the pipe railing on the sidewalk above it), the developer will be required to provide an approx. 2m wide SRW along this portion for ongoing inspection, maintenance, wall drainage, repair and replacement. The width of the SRW can be determined by the east corner of the "Stair 3" building. The SRW shall include wording: 1) that the proposed diesel generator shed and waste and recycling area shall not be affixed to the City's wall, 2) that the City requires access to the wall from Fairfield Road via the proposed loading zone area for future maintenance activities as required. The SRW shall be indicated across all drawings with the building permit submission.*

Noted. To be coordinated with BP submission. See also Line item 15 for extent of SRW viability.

24. *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.*

Noted. To be coordinated with BP submission. See also line item 15.

25. *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.*
- o 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.*
 - o With regards to the set of stairs being removed, both the City railing and retaining wall shall be made good after removal.*

Noted. To be coordinated with BP submission.

26. *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.*

Noted. To be coordinated with BP submission.

27. *The drawings indicate a new retaining wall on City property on the Fairfield Road frontage for the private BCH substation. 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.*

Revised drawings: A100, A101

See response to line item 6.

28. *The City may require retaining wall improvements along Penwill Green Park on the Fairfield Road frontage depending on the Transportation Section's final mobility desire lines.*

Revised drawings: A100, A101

Proposed retaining wall improvements are limited to those that are required to support the proposal for new sidewalk and unit substation pad as described in the response to items 11, 12, and 18.

29. *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.*

Revised drawings:

Noted. Civil will re-route service so storm service is perpendicular to the City Storm main.

30. *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.*

Revised drawings:

Noted. Removed from Civil plans.

31. *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.

32. *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.

33. *The City encourages Green Stormwater Infrastructure (GSI) and offers financial incentives for properties to manage rainwater on-site. We support and encourage the use of permeable surfaces for the entry court, parking stalls and other hard surfaces, rain gardens and green roofs and the preservation of as much green/open space as possible. The property owner may be eligible for financial incentives if the designs meet requirements as per the City's Rainwater Management Standards. Visit www.victoria.ca/stormwater for more information.*

Noted. No Green Stormwater Infrastructure is proposed beyond preservation of existing green space.

34. *Permeable pavers are strongly encouraged for the entry court, parking spaces and other hardscaped areas to offset increases to site impervious areas. To qualify for Rainwater Rewards incentives the pavers must meet requirements in the City's Rainwater Management Standards and be designated "permeable" by the manufacturer.*

Noted. Permeable pavers will not be implemented in this proposal.

35. *Your letter to Mayor and Council dated October 31, 2025, mentions measures to enhance on-site stormwater management. Please confirm what measures are proposed and where they will be located. See the City's Rainwater Management Standards for GSI options, simplified sizing and design standards. Any impervious areas being directed to rainwater management areas should be delineated on the Landscape or Civil plans.*

The measures to enhance on-site stormwater management include rooftop planters for the roof terraces and the preservation of existing green space.

36. *Please remove or relocate the oil/water separator receiving runoff from the proposed entry court to reduce impacts to landscape areas. If relocated, please place the facility in the hardscape area.*

Revised drawings: C103

Oil/water separator to be moved into the hardscape area.

37. *Please include a rainwater management plan with design details, sections, and product specifications for site rainwater management, demonstrating how the design meets the City of Victoria Rainwater Management Standards, and achieves the rainwater management target of retaining the first 32 mm of rainfall on all site impervious surfaces in a 24-hour period.*

Noted. To be coordinated with BP submission. See Line item 35 for proposed limited scope extent.

38. *Please show the locations of all proposed on-site drains and their connection to the City storm drain main on the Building Permit plan submission.*

Noted. To be coordinated with BP submission.

39. *If permeable pavers will be used, please include product specifications on the Building Permit plan submission.*

Noted. To be coordinated with BP submission. See Line item 34 for proposed limited scope extent.

40. *Indicate on the Building Permit plan submission, in square meters, the:*
- o *site impervious areas (i.e., building roof areas/hardscape)*
 - o *rainwater management areas (e.g., permeable paving)*
 - o *landscaped areas.*

Noted. To be coordinated with BP submission. See Line items 34, 35 for proposed limited scope extent.

41. *Please review Schedule "G" of the City's Codes of Practice for Construction and Development Activities and submit a signed Codes of Practice registration form. Information can be found at www.victoria.ca/stormwater.*

Noted. To be coordinated with BP submission.

42. *Removal of tree #1000 (Atlas cedar, 125 cm Diameter) for the new entrance will result in significant canopy loss. To align with the Official Community Plan's Urban Forest objectives and maintain canopy cover targets, please incorporate frontage upgrades along Fairfield Road and at the Blanshard-Fairfield corner. These upgrades should create sufficient soil volume and planting space for new boulevard trees, helping offset canopy loss and support long-term urban forest goals. Boulevard tree locations must respect the spacing requirements and minimum offsets from infrastructure outlined in Victoria Subdivision and Development Servicing Bylaw, Schedule C. Trees planted 1.0m or less from curbs or sidewalks are to have root barriers to protect civil infrastructure. Proposed street tree locations and species selection requires Parks approval.*

Arborist response: Tree replacement on site is governed by the bylaw and that is the tool with which the tree minimum/ replacement tree objectives are being met. See also response to line item 18.

43. *If municipal trees require removal for any upgrades for the walkway through Penwill Green, Parks expects that the trees will be replaced so there is no net loss of public trees.*

Efforts will be made to maintain all existing trees in Penwill Green during construction of the BC Hydro infrastructure and new sidewalks. All trees removed in the Penwill Green area will be replaced at a 1:1 ratio. See attached Tree Management Plan for more information.

44. *Please look at different locations for the proposed oil/water separator so underground piping does not interfere with planting areas where replacement trees can be located to meet tree minimum on-site.*

Revised drawings: C103

Oil/water separator to be moved into the hardscape area.

45. Please update the arborist report to reflect the new scope of work for the proposed hotel upgrades.

See attached updated Arborist report.

46. Please provide a Tree Management Plan. The Plan must meet the requirements outlined in Schedule "B" of the Tree Protection Bylaw 21-035. The purpose of submitting the tree management plan is to show the location of trees along with their canopy spread and protected root zones in relation to proposed changes, so potential impacts can be analyzed, and trees can be identified as retained or removed. Additionally, the tree management plan is used to show where tree protection fencing, arborist supervision, ground protection or other mitigation measures are required.

See attached Tree Management Plan.

47. 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.

See attached Replacement Tree Plan.

48. 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 replacement trees will have to be planted to achieve the tree minimum. Replacement trees will become Bylaw protected.

Tree minimum continues to be assessed and included in all relevant submissions.

49. The plans were reviewed with the 2024 BCBC for items that may alter the appearance of the building only.

- Exit shown on level 2 requires protection of exits for the glazing as per 3.2.3. of the BCBC.
- Please provide the 3.2.2. of the building.

Revised drawings: A021

Exit protection to be provided via alternative solution with interior water curtain sprinklers and safety glazing. Exposed doors to be fire rated. No impact to the exterior appearance of the building is

anticipated. The building is proposed to be classified as 3.2.2.49, Group C, up to 6 Storeys, Sprinklered, Non-combustible per code report.

50. 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.
- o <https://www.radioworks.ca/>
 - o <http://www.cartelsys.com/>
 - o <http://www.vicmobile.com/>.

Noted. To be coordinated with BP submission.

51. 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, omb