

November 30th, 2021
City of Victoria
No.1 Centennial Square
Victoria BC
V8W 1P6

Attn.: Permits & Inspections
Application: REZ00793 and DPV00182

Re: 1030 Fort Street – Response to Application Review Comments

Development Services Division Comments:

Land Use and Density:

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

General Comments:

2.1)

Comment:

Policy 6.8 in the OCP encourages the logical assembly of development sites that enable the best realization of permitted development potential for the area. Please provide staff with commentary on the applicant's attempts toward land assembly with adjacent lots.

Response:

Please refer to the updated Letter to Mayor and Council (Discussions with Neighbouring Building Owners Section).

2.2)

Comment:

Please provide more detail of the adjacent context on the streetscape elevation as well as additional renderings to show site context and relationship with adjacent sites/buildings. A north/south cross-section across Fort Street with Mosaic building would also be beneficial.

Response:

The streetscape elevation has been revised to include more detail of the adjacent context, and a north/south cross-section across Fort Street with the Mosaic building has been included in this resubmission. Please refer to Sheet A500 Context & Shadow Studies. Additional renderings showing site context and relationship with adjacent sites/buildings have also been included. These were initially included as part of the Proposal's Letter to Mayor and Council, but have now been incorporated into the drawing set itself. Please refer to Sheet A010 Perspectives.

2.3)

Comment:

Please provide an updated Letter to Mayor and Council confirming the approach to the rental tenure and the efforts made to consolidate with adjacent parcels.

Response:



CASCADIA ARCHITECTS INC
101-804 Broughton Street
Victoria BC, V8W 1E4
Canada

T 250 590 3223

www.cascadiaarchitects.ca
office@cascadiaarchitects.ca

A Corporate Partnership

Principals

GREGORY DAMANT
Architect AIBC, LEED AP

PETER JOHANNKNECHT
Architect AIBC, LEED AP,
Interior Architect AKNV Germany

Complete. Please refer to the updated Letter to Mayor and Council (Land Use and Density: Commentary on Rental Covenant / Residential Rental Tenure Zone).

Massing Form and Character

3.1)

Comment:

Please provide further commentary on how the proposal responds to the objectives of DPA(HC):Corridors Heritage other than the upper storey façade composition, which was well received by staff. Please reconsider contemporary approaches to how the heritage character of Fort Street may be incorporated into the proposal.

Response:

The at-grade commercial level design has been refined to express a more human-scale series of bays that contribute to a rich pedestrian experience and reflect the heritage character of this block of Fort Street. Please also refer to the updated Letter to Mayor and Council (Development Permit Area 7B(HC): Corridors Heritage Section) for further commentary on the proposal's response to the objectives of DPA(HC):Corridors Heritage.

3.2)

Comment:

The guidelines require articulation of building facades to provide visual interest to pedestrians. This is especially important along the Fort Street heritage corridor. Whilst effort has been made to articulate the upper stories, further refinement is required for the ground floor, which does not currently reflect the smaller scaled proportions of adjacent heritage building facades including structural chamfered bays and fenestration patterns. Consider incorporating distinct vertical elements on the street level façade to increase the ratio of solid to void.

Response:

The conceptual approach to the expression of the ground floor has been further refined. The distinctive rhythm of the terracotta pilasters has been extended to the façade at the ground floor through the integration of expressed concrete columns and beams, increasing the ratio of solid to void and echoing the vertical, smaller scale proportion of the surrounding heritage building facades. These revisions have led to some minor changes to the location of demising walls and exterior doors at grade. Please refer to Sheet A010, A100, A101 and A200. Please also refer to the updated Letter to Mayor and Council (Development Permit Area 7B(HC): Corridors Heritage Section) for a more detailed description of these revisions to the ground floor façade.

3.3)

Comment:

The proposed updated DCAP guidelines require a minimum 8 m rear yard setback for portions of the building located above the first storey that contain residential uses. The rationale for not affecting unit sizes is noted but staff maintain the importance of this setback requirement for privacy reasons. Please revise the plans accordingly.

Response:

After careful consideration of this comment, it is the Applicant's position that the net increase in privacy gained by increasing the rear yard setback by a full 1m does not warrant the substantial impact on the functionality of the compact and efficient rental units put forward with this Proposal. The livability of all thirty units would be negatively impacted by this relatively minor increase of the building's rear yard setback. Revisions of units to achieve this depth of rear yard setback would likely result in the loss of dens/home offices, considered a key element in providing adaptability and flexibility for residents, and layouts for studio units would no longer be practically viable. With privacy concerns in mind, vertical screening has been incorporated adjacent to all balconies, and rear facing guards are finished in a fritted glass. We believe that these privacy oriented measures reasonably balance out any negative impacts the Proposal's

variance from DCAP guidelines may produce. Nevertheless, the study of the floor plans that was undertaken in response to this comment indicated that it is possible to partially increase the rear yard setback to 7.34m (an increase of 0.34m) by removing the steps in the rear facing façade. Please note that this revision has led to a reduction in total floor area for the proposal. Please refer to A100 and A101.

3.4)

Comment:

Access to sunlight is an important consideration that adds to the character and appeal of Fort Street. Please demonstrate compliance with shadow study requirements in the updated DCAP.

Response:

Located on the north side of the street, this building is in compliance with shadow study requirements in the updated DCAP guidelines by nature of its siting. As shown in the equinox shadow studies on Sheet A500, there is no shadowing from the building massing on adjacent sidewalks to the south, east, and west between 10am and 4pm per Section 2.1.f) of the Draft DCAP Guidelines. Please refer to the equinox views located on Sheet A500 Context and Shadow Studies.

3.5)

Comment:

Please provide staff with commentary on why a shared roof amenity deck has not been considered.

Response:

A shared roof amenity deck is not structurally viable for this Proposal, which is located on very poor soil conditions. Adding an occupiable roof level would require the building to be built in concrete, or a combination of concrete and steel, which is too heavy for the soil conditions. Additionally, even if permitted by the Building Code in wood frame, the additional shear walls would have considerable negative impact on unit layouts, particularly those in the E/W orientation. Please refer to the Response to TRG Review letter provided by RJC as part of the supporting documents included in this resubmission package for a further description of the structural implications in wood frame construction of a shared roof amenity deck.

3.6)

Comment:

Please consider incorporating a green roof to reduce the urban heat island effect, provide habitat and filter stormwater as discussed in the design guidelines.

Response:

As stated in the TRG Review letter provided by RJC, an intensive green roof is also not viable for this proposal due to geotechnical constraints. Though a very lightweight extensive green roof using sedum mats or similar products may be feasible, it is not currently clear that building insurance providers will insure a woodframe building with a green roof. Historically it has not been possible, and so it is the Applicant's preference to maintain the roof area for installation of solar photovoltaic panels and the Proposal will provide rough-in conduit in preparation for future solar panels instead.

3.7)

Comment:

Please confirm there will be no requirements for a gas meter along the street frontage.

Response:

The Applicant can confirm that the decision to commit to an all electric building has enabled the removal of gas servicing to the building and the associated metering infrastructure. This all-electric approach will significantly reduce

the GHG emissions of the building and further supports the rationale for the provisioning of the roof for future integration of solar panels.

Materials Comments

4.1)

Comment:

The photographic material panel was helpful. However, given the creative approach being applied to the building cladding, please provide a physical material board for all materials and examples of other applications of the terra cotta system.

Response:

As confirmed with City of Victoria Staff, a physical material board will be provided in advance of the Proposal's Advisory Design Panel presentation submission.

4.2)

Comment:

The guidelines support street vitality and safety through the creation of active and interesting streets. Please reconsider the metal paneling adjacent to the residential entrance and provide further detail of the proposed exit doors.

Response:

The metal paneling adjacent to the residential entrance has been reconsidered. Transparent glazing is now proposed, better connecting the lobby's interior to the streetscape and improving the composition of the frontage in this location. The two exit doors on the east side of the Fort Street frontage are now located between concrete columns in the easternmost 'bay' and are matched in colour to the metal siding. Metal mechanical louvers are located above each door, extending them vertically and tying them aesthetically to the remaining Fort Street frontage. Metal cladding matching the treatment of the residential balconies above has been introduced in this location, including a flat metal soffit and sidewalls to the extents of this proposed niche. Please refer to Sheet A100, A101 and A200.

4.3)

Comment:

Please provide a nighttime lit rendering.

Response:

A nighttime lit rendering has been included in this resubmission package. Please refer to Sheet A010.

Engineering and Public Works Department Comments:

Land Development Review:

Conditions to be met prior to Committee of the Whole:

5.1)

Comment:

Please show the details of the 'New Town' District on all relevant drawings, including on the preliminary Conceptual Site Servicing (civil) plan.

Response:

The preliminary Conceptual Site Servicing Plan has been revised and now includes details of the 'New Town' district. Please refer to Sheet C1 – Conceptual Site Servicing Plan and the updated Landscape Plan.

5.2)

Comment:

For the next plan submission, please make the following revisions on L1.01:

- a. Relocate the proposed tree grate to be outside of the 450mm banding but directly adjacent. Show the concrete pattern such that the tree grate defines a set of joints in the pattern.*
- b. Show the score lines continuing through the 450mm band every third panel.*
- c. Label the existing decorative heritage light as Heritage Cluster Globe Light Type A Circular.*
- d. Add a backed bench to the frontage (facing the bike lane) in the furnishing zone consistent with the heritage globe light location as per the DPRP.*
- e. Add 203 standard (inverted U) racks to be in the same alignment as the existing bike rack, consistent with the new bench and new street tree location.*
- f. Indicate soil cells for the street tree.*
- g. Show the existing heritage cluster globe light in the frontage on A100.*

Response:

The Landscape Materials sheet has been revised to incorporate all comments above. Please refer to Sheet L1.01.

5.3)

Comment:

With regards to power supply to the development, the Applicant's September 15th, 2021, Letter to Mayor and Council indicates a customer-supplied interior substation transformer will be installed. Staff will require more detail on the power supply to the development. Please confirm that BC Hydro has approved this substation transformer. (Note that a PMT is not permitted on City right-of-way). Also, confirm the requirements with BC Hydro to access this substation and indicate it on the plans. Revise the Conceptual Site Servicing Plan to show the proposed substation on the private property and indicate conceptually how the power will be supplied to the substation in the City right-of-way from the connection source (existing utility poles are on the south side of the street.)

Response:

Please see supporting documentation included with this resubmission including; BC Hydro Variance Application describing transformer room conditions which contravene utility standards, Transformer Room Plan and Sections showing the transformer contained within the electrical room within the building, and the BC Hydro Letter of Acceptance outlining BC Hydro's acceptance of a substation room at the back of the property. Additionally the civil drawings now include indicative design for how this transformer will be serviced from the Right-of-Way.

5.4)

Comment:

Staff requests that this be named the Conceptual Civil Plan. Please revise the next submission as follows:

- a. Indicate existing and proposed grades along the property line of the frontage and the slope of the sidewalk.*
- b. Show connection to the power source for the development in the City right-of-way.*
- c. Show concrete scoring pattern and banding on the plan to match the landscape plan.*
- d. Revise 'existing streetlight to remain' to 'existing Heritage Cluster Globe Light to remain'*
- e. Provide dimensions from the proposed street tree to the underground utilities to ensure that the proposed tree can be located as shown.*
- f. Relocate the tree grate location as per comment above.*
- g. Indicate soil cell extents for the street tree.*
- h. Show paving rehabilitation extent on the frontage to include the northernmost travel lane. Include rehab of the bike lanes as required by servicing. Add note to the plan that the road base is concrete on Fort Street at this location.*

- i. Show old streetcar tracks on the roadway.
- j. Ensure the civil, landscape and architectural plans match.

Response:

The Conceptual Site Service plan has been revised to incorporate all comments above. Please refer to Sheet C1. Please refer to additional Sheet C02 Conceptual Surface Works and Site Grading for more detailed grading information. Please note that the finished floor elevation for Level 1 has been minorly adjusted (geodetic height 19230m to 19280m) in response to this more detailed grading analysis.

For Information prior to Building Permit Submission/Approval:

5.5)

Comment:

As per the authority given to municipalities under the Local Government Act, as a condition of building permit approval, the applicant is financially responsible for frontage (off-site) works to the centreline of Fort Street to current (i.e., at the time of building permit) City of Victoria standards, as per the Victoria Subdivision and Development Servicing Bylaw No. 12-042, and to the satisfaction of the Director of Engineering and Public Works.

Response:

Noted.

5.6)

Comment:

As part of the building approval process, a fully dimensioned and detailed civil plan for the frontage, prepared by a professional civil engineer, shall be submitted for approval.

Response:

Noted.

5.7)

Comment:

The civil plan shall detail all existing and proposed third-party utilities (such as hydro, phone, cable, internet, gas) associated with the development.

Response:

Noted.

5.8)

Comment:

Note that after building permit issuance, the applicant's contractor(s) will require temporary Street Occupancy Permits through the Engineering Department (Transportation Section), as all work in the City right-of-way requires such permits.

Response:

Noted.

Transportation Review Comments:

Conditions to be met prior to Committee of the Whole:

6.1)

Comment:

To support the additional density proposed and associated parking shortfall and to help offset impacts to parking availability for surrounding businesses and residents, a more comprehensive TDM (Transportation Demand Management) program is required. In addition to the enhanced bike parking proposed, car share memberships and usage credits for each of the residential units is required along with 3 BC Transit eco passes for a 3-year term for the commercial retail unit. Staff will be recommending to Council that the TDM program be made a condition of rezoning. A plan revision is required.

Response:

Please refer to the revised Letter to Mayor and Council (Transportation Section), which confirms that the requirements stated above will be met.

6.2)

Comment:

Please describe how garbage, recycling, and organics are collected from the site. Placing bins on the City right-of-way for any period of time is not permitted.

Response:

Please refer to the Garbage, Recycling, and Organic Collection letter provided by Waste Connections Canada to the Applicant, which outlines the proposed waste collection strategy for this site and confirms its compliance with all City Bylaws.

6.3)

Comment:

*Fort Street is an important commercial street with high pedestrian activity. It is also part of the City's All Ages and Abilities Cycling Network, and Frequent Transit Network. An acceptable Traffic Management Plan must be submitted to the Engineering – Transportation Section by a Traffic Control Professional at least one week prior to the commencement of any works taking place. **If the applicant has information on any construction strategies being proposed that can minimize impacts to these mobility networks and access to/from neighbouring businesses and residents, please provide these at this time.***

Response:

Noted. At this time no construction strategies have been developed. Those conversations will begin after completion of the rezoning process should the proposal be approved.

Underground Utilities Review Comments:

Conditions to be met prior to Committee of the Whole:

7.1)

Comment:

The sewage attenuation review document provided by WSP, dated September 20th, 2021, has been received and is being reviewed by staff. If it is determined that sewage attenuation is required, the registration of a Section 219 covenant is required prior to establishing a date for Public Hearing.

Response:

Noted.

7.2)

Comment:

Thank you for submitting the Conceptual Site Servicing Plan. A detailed review of the City underground servicing to the development will be completed at the building permit stage; however, please make the following revision for the next plan submission: Show the existing sewer services and label them as being abandoned/capped at property line.

Response:

The Conceptual Site Servicing Plan has been revised to show the existing sewer services and labels them as being abandoned/capped at the property line. Please refer to Sheet C1 - Conceptual Site Servicing Plan.

For Information prior to Building Permit Submission/Approval:

7.3)

Comment:

Site servicing to the property is required to comply with the City's current bylaws and BC Plumbing Code.

Response:

Noted.

7.4)

Comment:

Prior to the commencement of excavation or soil relocation, contractors shall be registered under Bylaw 14-071, Schedule G: Code of Practice for Construction and Development Activities.

Response:

Noted.

Stormwater Management Review Comments:

Recommendation prior to Committee of the Whole:

8.1)

Comment:

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 patio areas, pathways and other hard surfaces, rain gardens and the preservation of as much green/open space as possible. The property owner may qualify for financial Rainwater Reward incentives if the design meets requirements as per the City's Rainwater Management Standards. Please consider integrating GSI into the design, such as a green roof or rain garden planters.

Response:

Rainwater management was considered on site but was found to not be practical. Managing road runoff is not feasible for this site.

For Information prior to Building Permit Submission/Approval:

8.2)

Comment:

Please submit the product specifications for any permeable materials used.

Response:

Noted.

8.3)

Comment:

Please show locations of all on-site drains and their connection to the City storm drain main on the on-site landscape plan.

Response:

Noted.

8.4)

Comment:

The on-site landscape plan shall clearly indicate the proposed on-site stormwater management details.

Response:

Noted.

8.5)

Comment:

Note that construction must be completed prior to application of the Rainwater Rewards Program.

Response:

Noted.

Park Division Review Comments:

The following revisions are required on Sheet L1.01 and or in the Arborist Report:

9.1)

Comment:

Relocate the proposed tree grate to be outside of the 450mm banding but directly adjacent. The tree grate outline should indicate how it fits into the overall joint/score line pattern for the proposed sidewalk.

Response:

Noted and complete. Please refer to Sheet L1.01.

9.2)

Comment:

Please indicate on the site plan and landscape plan, any proposed furniture or bike racks on the frontage ensuring a 2 m pedestrian clearance from nearest obstacles (existing and proposed trees).

Response:

Noted and complete. Please refer to Sheet A100 and L1.01.

9.3)

Comment:

Parks requests that soil cells are provided on the plans for the proposed street tree. Please indicate on the plans that soil cells will be installed for the proposed street tree planting. Indicate soil cell extents and soil volume to be provided.

Response:

Noted and complete. Please refer to Sheet L1.01.

9.4)

Comment:

Remove the tree grate shown for the off-site tree to the East of the property. This tree will be protected but will remain with its current planting specifications.

Response:

Noted and complete. Please refer to Sheet L1.01.

9.5)

Comment:

Parks requests that irrigation be provided for the proposed Municipal tree planting on frontage. Please indicate on plans.

Response:

Noted and complete. Please refer to Sheet L1.01.

9.6)

Comment:

Please clearly indicate the planting areas on the tree management plan. Planting Areas 1-5 appear to be one planting area which means that $B > 1$ so the Soil volume required per tree in the planting area is 6 m³ per tree amounting to 30 m³ for the entire planting area (the planting bed in rear should be counted as a single planting area as there is no barrier to root growth between two areas of soil). The table on the following page is an example of the revisions required. A minimum of 75 mm of depth of growing medium will be required to adequately reach the required soil volume.

Response:

Noted and complete. Please refer to Sheet L1.01.

9.7)

Comment:

Section 1 on sheet L1.01 indicates a growing medium depth of 400 mm at the given scale of 1:50, and the Materials Legend indicates 600 mm. Please confirm depth of growing medium for the rear planting area.

Response:

The depth of growing medium for the rear planting area is 900mm. Please refer to Sheet L1.01.

The following revisions are required for the Site Servicing Plan (SSP), or Civil Plan

9.8)

Comment:

Please update the SSP to indicate how the power will be supplied to the substation in the City right-of-way from the connection source.

Response:

Complete. Please refer to Sheet C1.

9.9)

Comment:

Show connection to the power source for the development in the City right-of-way.

Response:

Complete. Please refer to Sheet C1.

9.10)

Comment:

Parks requests that irrigation be provided for the proposed Municipal tree planting on frontage. Please indicate on plans.

Response:

Complete. Please refer to Sheet C1.

Conditions to be met prior to the Building Permit Stage:

9.11)

Comment:

The off-site tree removal and replacement will require the approval of the owner of the off-site property.

Response:

Noted.

9.12)

Comment:

The off-site tree removal is surveyed to be on the property at 1039 View and not 1038/1040 Fort. The arborist must review the potential to plant the proposed replacement tree at 1039 View where it is proposed for removal to facilitate the development. This is contrary to what the plans indicate. There appears to be limited space for replanting and the off-site planting area OS1 as indicated in the Arborist Report will require revision to reflect the site conditions at 1039 View.

Response:

The Arborist Report (including Tree Management Plan, Tree Replacement Plan, Tree Impact Summary, Tree Preservation Summary, Recommended Replacement Tree List, and Soil Volume tables) has been revised. Please refer to the revised Arborist Report included as supporting documentation in this resubmission.

Permits and Inspections Division Comments:

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

10.1)

Comment:

Owner, designer, and structural engineer to consider building sway over the property line in a seismic event.

Response:

Building sway over the property line in a seismic event has been reviewed by RJC and accounted for in the proposed design. Please refer to the Response to TRG Review letter provided by RJC as part of the supporting documents included in this resubmission.

10.2)

Comment:

Designer to consider the location of the Siamese connection and ensure that the location and connection of hoses will not be a tripping hazard to the occupants while exiting the building.

Response:

The Siamese connection has been located so that connection of hoses will not be a tripping hazard to the occupants while exiting the building. Please refer to Sheet A100.

10.3)

Comment:

Designer to ensure the spatial separations and unprotected openings meet the requirements set out in the BCBC

Response:

Please refer to Sheet A050 for spatial separations and unprotected openings information.

10.4)

Comment:

Designer to consider the egress obstructions in the storage area when the doors are in the open position.

Response:

Door swing orientation has been flipped as a resolution to the question of egress obstructions in the storage area when the doors are in the open position. Please refer to Sheet A101.

10.5)

Comment:

Cladding is to be non-combustible

Response:

Noted. Cladding as tagged in elevations is non-combustible. Please refer to Sheet A200 and A201.

Fire Department Comments:

11.1)

Comment:

Fire department connection must be at an un-obstructed location approved by the fire department.

Response:

The fire department connection has been located in a non-obstructive location and has been approved in concept by the fire department.

Zoning Plan Check Comments:

12.1)

Comment:

Provide a separate floor area calculation that includes elevator shafts at all levels.

Response:

Complete. Please see Sheet A100 and A101.

12.2)

Comment:

Provide setback dimensions from roof edge and % coverage of mechanical equipment (includes screen).

Response:

Complete. Please see Sheet A100 and A102.

Cascadia has carefully reviewed the City's feedback regarding the proposed design. The subsequent changes resulting from this review are bubbled and itemized in the drawing set as requested. If you have any questions or require further clarification of any part of the application, please do not hesitate to contact our office.

Sincerely,

CASCADIA ARCHITECTS INC.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Damant', enclosed within a large, loopy circular flourish.

Gregory Damant, Architect AIBC, RAIC, LEED AP
Principal