

To: Miko Betanzo  
 The City of Victoria  
 1 Centennial Square  
 Victoria, BC V8W 1P6

This document has been prepared by HCMA on behalf of Jawl Residential in response to the City of Victoria’s technical review received Tuesday, Oct 9, 2018. All pending requirements have been reviewed and responses are outlined below. The intent of this document is to portray how each comment received by the City of Victoria have been responded to. Please read this document in conjunction with provided updated and bubbled drawings.

Item Ref.	Comment	Drawing Ref.
-----------	---------	--------------

**Sign Posting**

It is your responsibility to check with Planning Support staff at (250) 361-0212 for further information on any sign posting requirements.

*Note: A landscape estimate will be required to calculate the landscape security deposit, which is a condition of a Development Permit. The estimate is required prior to the issuance of the development permit and the landscape security deposit will be required at the time of Building Permit application.*

*Further note: 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 on in the process as possible to ensure timely processing of this application.*

Response:

**Rezoning Notes**

**Agreements/ Confirmation**

- A third party land lift analysis will be required, with base densities set as per the City’s density bonus policy.
- The land lift analysis is contingent on confirmation or commitment for the form of tenure for the entire site. If at least 50% of all units proposed are non-market, secured by a housing agreement that provides for affordability for the life of the building, then the project is exempt from a lift.
- A Housing Agreement will be required to secure the proposed units as affordable and to ensure that future strata bylaws cannot prohibit rental or restrict age of residents.

Response:

- Please confirm the target demographic and level of affordability being secured (income quartile) for the affordable housing, how affordability will be secured and managed.

Response:

- Confirmation from the Ministry of the Environment that the conditions set out in their letter dated October 3, 2018 have been met

Response:

**Open Spaces / Plaza**

- RZ1
- A significant open space/ plaza is critical to the overall concept given the amount of density being introduced. As such, a minimum plaza area of 500m2 will be written into the zone.

Response:

	250 m2 has been determined to be the optimal size for this site. Refer to revised letter and drawings for further explanation.	p.15,16, 17,34
RZ2a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The current location of the proposed plaza, at an intersection, may not necessarily be the best location. In future massing models, please consider/ test alternative locations.</li> </ul>	
	Response: Two alternate plaza locations have been provided. Refer to revised letter and drawings for further explanation. One of the alterant plaza locations provided is mid-block, away from vehicle intersection. Refer to revised letter and drawings for further explanation.	p.16,17
RZ2b	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A plaza location will not be specified in the zone, however consideration should be given to a mid-block location, away from a vehicle intersection.</li> </ul>	
	Response: One of the alterant plaza locations provided is mid-block, away from vehicle intersection. Refer to revised letter and drawings for further explanation.	p.16,17
	<b>Massing</b>	
RZ3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Please provide two additional massing concepts to illustrate alternative ways this density may be realized in future phases. A massing model similar to that on page 15 of the Rezoning application document could follow this page.</li> </ul>	
	Response: Two alternate massing concepts have been provided. Please refer to revised letter and zoning document.	p.16,17
RZ4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Please confirm floor plate areas for proposed massing comply with the DCAP policies for maximum floor plate areas</li> </ul>	
	Response: Except for residential portion of Phase 1, all floor plate areas proposed comply with DCAP policies. Additional areas have been noted on drawings.	see full size set
RZ5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider re-orientating the 17 storey tower (or portions of it) to be narrowest in its east-west access to reduce shadowing impacts</li> </ul>	
	Response: One of the alternate massing concepts includes a re-oriented 17 storey tower.	p.17
RZ6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider increasing the height of the podium level/ redistributing more density to the podium level in the future phases (4-5 storeys with the same setbacks)</li> </ul>	
	Response: One of the alternate massing concepts includes a 5 storey podium which reduces density at upper levels (towers).	p.16
RZ7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider reducing the overhang/ cantilever on the south Cook St. tower. This cantilever looks substantial and may negatively impact the perception of the adjacent open space/ streetscape</li> </ul>	
	Response: The two alternate massing concepts illustrate this suggestion.	p.16,17
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider reducing the density to 6.05 FSR (after excluding the Fire Hall) to avoid an OCP amendment</li> </ul>	
	Response: The application will continue with an unchanged FSR.	
	<b>Additional Information / Clarification</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clarify how undeveloped sites will be managed as the development progresses. (e.g. it will be required that the remainder site is well maintained as the site develops. Please confirm interim site measures.</li> </ul>	
	Response: The undeveloped site will continue to operate as a car dealership until such time that future phases progress.	
RZ8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clarify the number of vehicle access points planned across the site, fewer access points will help to ensure a positive street relationship.</li> </ul>	
	Response: Up to four vehicle access points are anticipated.	p.34

RZ9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Please provide distant view analysis from the corner of Cook and Hillside, Cook and Mason, Johnson and Chambers and Cook and View</li> </ul>	
	<p>Response:</p> <p>Distance views have been provided in resubmission as requested. See rezoning document.</p>	p.46,47
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Please provide a CPTED analysis of the site as a whole</li> </ul>	
	<p>Response:</p> <p>CPTED has been addressed for phase 1 in the Letter to Mayor and Council. Remainder of the site will continue as a car dealership and as such should continue to address CPTED concerns.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Please confirm if and how the interior of the site may be accessed via pedestrians or vehicles.</li> </ul>	
	<p>Response:</p> <p>Please refer to revised letter to mayor and council for response.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider establishing plans to underground overhead servicing.</li> </ul>	
	<p>Response:</p> <p>To be considered in the future.</p>	
RZ10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>On page 15, please annotate the final number of storeys proposed for each tower. Page 14 labels the Cook St south tower as 15 storeys. The reduction in storeys is not communicated for this tower similar to how this has been illustrated for the firewall in the "Shaping Density" section.</li> </ul>	
	<p>Response:</p> <p>Annotation provided as requested. Refer to rezoning document.</p>	p.15,16,17
RZ11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide building separation dimensions on plans page 32-34</li> </ul>	
	<p>Response:</p> <p>Drawings continue to show 'Increased separation' for this rezoning application to permit future flexibility of massing alternates. Future development permit applications will address actual dimensions.</p>	
RZ12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>On page 21, please also indicate actual building separations achieved. This illustration is very useful in terms of demonstrating accord with the step-back ratio and minimum tower separation distances, however</li> </ul>	
	<p>Response:</p> <p>Drawings continue to show 'Increased separation' for this rezoning application to permit future flexibility of massing alternates. Future development permit applications will address actual dimensions.</p>	see full size set
RZ13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Please note in the rezoning document on page 21 that on Cook and Yates Street the ROW width is in excess of 25m making them wide streets. On wide streets, the 1:5 step-back ratio starts at 20m (please label this on the diagram).</li> </ul>	
	<p>Response:</p> <p>Drawings have been revised.</p>	p.23
RZ14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Please note in the rezoning document on page 21 that Johnson St. is a narrow street and as such the step-back ratio must start at 15m. Please label this on the diagram.</li> </ul>	
	<p>Response:</p> <p>Drawings have been revised.</p>	p.23
<b>Development Permit Notes</b>		
<b>Massing</b>		
TRG1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Confirm floor plate areas on levels 4-9 (must not exceed 930m<sup>2</sup> each) and on levels 10 and 11 (must not exceed 650m<sup>2</sup> each)</li> </ul>	
	<p>Response:</p> <p>Floor plate areas exceed the DCAP requirements. Refer to revised letter to mayor and council for explanation and justification.</p>	A206-A208
TRG2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Please indicate on the elevation plan how the proposal meets the step-back ratio for a narrow street (narrow street step-backs starts at 15m)</li> </ul>	

Item Ref.	Comment	Drawing Ref.
	Response: Drawings have been revised.	A301,A302
TRG3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider a horizontal break in the podium level to break up the perceived length of this portion of the building.</li> </ul>	
	Response: This was considered by the proponent and discussed at advisory design panel. Horizontal breaks are provided at the first floor (and mezzanine) to articulate the building at the pedestrian level. The overall building massing benefits from the strong two storey office raised podium by providing a base to the residential portion above. Refer to letter to mayor and council for further explanation.	A000,A301
TRG4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider altering the massing of the residential portion of the building at the north east corner to better reflect the site lines and indicative master plan identified on page 21 of the rezoning document.</li> </ul>	
	Response: Altering massing was considered but was not determined to be an improvement.	A000,301
<b>Clarifications / Additional Information</b>		
TRG5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Please indicate the building separation dimensions on the site context plans on A102 between the proposed building and immediately adjacent buildings.</li> </ul>	
	Response: Additional dimensions provided.	A102
TRG6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Please provide set-back dimensions on the elevations on Plan A301. Show the set-back from the property boundary to all portions of the building where the set-back differs.</li> </ul>	
	Response: Additional dimensions provided.	A301
TRG7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Please label the property line in plans A301 to A313</li> </ul>	
	Response: Additional information provided.	A301,313
TRG8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Please expand the west site context image on A102 to include Pandora Street to the north and View Street to the South.</li> </ul>	
	Response: Extent of context image increased as requested.	A102
TRG9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Staff note that the renderings show a range of materials and architectural elements being used on the front elevation of the building which helps to break up the massing. Please confirm the intended material/ cladding/ glazing approach.</li> </ul>	
	Response: Renderings and elevations revised to be coordinated and materials are noted.	A301,A302
TRG10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Please provide two, dimensioned cross-sections on Cook and Johnson Street that detail the lower levels of the building, the sidewalk on either side of the street, the road width and the building across the street, where it meets the sidewalk.</li> </ul>	
	Response: Additional drawing has been provided.	A313
TRG11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clarify the materials of the bay doors to the fire hall.</li> </ul>	
	Response: Bay doors to be glazed aluminum doors.	A301
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Confirm that the soil volumes and the species of trees proposed on the third level will yield the size of trees depicted on the renderings.</li> </ul>	
	Response:	

**Bike Parking**

- TRG12
- Move long-term bicycle parking to the first level of underground parking to be consistent with Schedule C. Also consider locating the long-term bicycle storage to ensure conflicts with vehicles are mitigated.

Response:

All long term bicycle parking has been moved to first level of underground parking.

A101,A201,  
A313**Considerations**

- Consider reorganizing the second floor to limit the amount of dorm space facing Johnson Street as it is expected that this space will often have blinds closed.

Response:

- Location of dorm space has been carefully considered and is closely linked to response routes within the building.
- Consider methods to increase the amount of outdoor and indoor resident amenity space.

Response:

- Indoor and outdoor resident amenity space has been developed in cooperation with possible housing provider and has been determined to be adequate for this development.

- TRG9
- Ensure that the materials of the whole building are of a high durable quality.

Response:

- All materials are of high durable quality. Refer to letter and drawings for further explanation.

A301, A302

**Engineering and Public Works Department Comments:**

- BC Hydro Information: Preliminary site plan and zoning information has been reviewed by BC Hydro. It is the applicant's responsibility to determine infrastructure requirements associated with the development. It is recommended that the applicant contact BC Hydro well in advance of submitting for building permit to expedite the site servicing plan review and building permit approval process.
- Please note that there are outstanding requirements identified with the Rezoning review which need to be resolved prior to the Rezoning being approved. Engineering will require confirmation from the Planning Department that these requirements have been addressed by the applicant or have been identified as conditions of approval for the rezoning. It is recommended that these conditions be addressed prior to the Development Permit being approved.
- It is recommended the applicant meet with City of Victoria Engineering and Building staff prior to Building Permit plan submission.
- Should a form of Subdivision Application be contemplated, the proponent should submit the applicable Subdivision application to the Approving Officer upon receipt of the Technical Review Group Minutes from Development Services.

Response:

**Conditions to be met prior to Public Hearing**

- A draft of the plan check was provided however inconsistencies exist between this document and the applicant's letter to Mayor and Council dated Sept 17, 2018. It is unclear if applicant is pursuing a variance in parking and what TDM measures are included. Please recirculate plans once this is clarified.

Response:

- TRG12
- Bike parking does not appear to meet Schedule C of the Zoning Bylaw. A plan revision is required

Response:

Bicycle parking revised.

A101,A201,  
A313**Information at Building Permit**

- Applicant is required to hire a consultant to design the necessary traffic signal improvements to reduce response times of emergency vehicles and enhance traffic safety, including signal pre-emption, pavement markings, and any associated signage and signals.
- Full frontage replacement is required as a condition of BP. For civil drawings please also incorporate the City of Victoria Downtown Public Realm & Streetscape Standards for BP submission.
- Plans are to be circulated to Infrastructure Design – Transport (Keith Kresse) and Electrical (Dennis Galisky) for comment.
- Proposed sidewalk is at curb edge within the driveway crossing. As a result, this portion of sidewalk may have a cross slope greater than 2% and be located close to moving traffic. Also, this portion of sidewalk will not be protected by a barrier curb causing pedestrians to feel close and vulnerable to passing motor vehicles. The better sidewalk alignment for pedestrians is the current alignment adjacent the property line.
- Page

### **Underground Utilities**

Installation of municipal service connections to the proposed Development. These may include but not limited to; new connections, main upgrades as required and existing service upgrading to the proposed Development. Servicing connections are available from Johnson Street, Cook Street and Yates Street as per the Schedule of Fee for Service Connections – **Bylaw 14-071** and may be subject to additional charges.

#### ***Conditions to be met prior to Public Hearing - Sewage Attenuation (Rezoning only)***

- A change in zoning may allow for changes in permitted use and density resulting in increased sewage flow rates. The City's sanitary sewer system may not, at present, be sufficient to accommodate the increased flow rates. If the anticipated peak flow rate produced by the new development is greater than the estimated peak flow rate of sewage that would normally be generated by permitted development under the existing zoning regulation, then attenuation of flows will be required.
- A report prepared by a qualified Engineer comparing pre and post development sewage flow rates shall be submitted to the Engineering Department. The report is to include measures that the developer intends to take to attenuate the sewage if required. Please contact Randy Chang at 250.361.0512 if you require further information.

### **Storm Water Management**

- The City continues to offer financial incentives for properties to manage rainwater on-site.

We encourage applicants to;

- Demonstrate how rainwater from the new impervious areas is to be managed
- Consider using a permeable surface for the new driveway and patio areas
- Preserve as much green/open space as possible

#### ***Conditions to be met prior to Public Hearing - Sewage Attenuation (Rezoning only)***

A change in zoning may allow for changes in permitted use and density resulting in increased sewage flow rates. The City's sanitary sewer system may not, at present, be sufficient to accommodate the increased flow rates.

If the anticipated peak flow rate produced by the new development is greater than the estimated peak flow rate of sewage that would normally be generated by permitted development under the existing zoning regulation, then attenuation of flows will be required.

A report prepared by a qualified Engineer comparing pre and post development sewage flow rates shall be submitted to the Engineering Department. The report is to include measures that the developer intends to take to attenuate the sewage if required.

Response:

### **Parks Division Comments:**

***Conditions to be met prior to the Committee of the Whole:***

- No objections to rezoning or DP applications.
- For Information: Parks supports the proposed removal of four existing *Carpinus betulus* (Hornbeam) trees along Johnson Street. They will be too impacted by the underground excavation required for the parkade and building construction. A fee for their appraised values will be attached to the BP.
- New street trees and planting beds are to be irrigated on a city separate system and installed to COV standards set out in the Subdivision and Development Servicing Bylaw –Schedule C.
- For Information: A consulting project arborist will be required to provide a review and report for the retained Hornbeam tree on the west portion of the Johnson Street sidewalk. The applicant should note, the retention of this tree may be difficult.

**Permits and Inspections Division Comments:*****Conditions to be met prior to the Committee of the Whole:***

- This building is required to meet the BCBC as a post disaster building.
- Designer to review all windows in proximity to property line/spacial separations including the hose tower.
- Ensure the location of the Fire Pump room meets the requirements of NFPA 20-2013 / 4.12.2
- If the building permit is applied for later than December 10, 2018, it will fall under the 2018 BCBC requirements.
- No vehicle repairs to be conducted in the building as this would make the building include a Group F 2 occupancy. An F2 occupancy is prohibited to be in a building with more than one residential unit.

Response:

**Fire Department Comments:**

- No Comment