

Below is an itemized list of all the comments received and our responses on how each one has been addressed in this submission.

Department	Municipal Comment	Applicant Response
<b>Development Services</b>	<p>The Gonzales Neighbourhood Plan identifies the preservation and enhancement of the urban tree canopy as a key objective for the neighbourhood. The Plan strongly encourages owner's to protect trees and provide green outdoor space for further tree planting through the development process. Staff, therefore, still recommend re-locating the bicycle parking pavilion elsewhere on the site to free space for a new large tree at the southeast corner.</p> <p>Consider reducing the footprint of the East building to provide a larger north setback that can accommodate the preservation of additional trees in the north east corner of the lot, reduce shadowing impacts on adjacent properties and provide a more sensitive transition in scale with neighbouring properties. This could be a good location for the bike pavilion in place of the most northerly units.</p> <p>Please provide more detailed information on the proposed CRD units, such as percentage below market, qualifying incomes, and unit location.</p> <p>New development should be oriented and designed to enhance public streets and encourage street vitality and safety. While the patio pathway connections are an improvement over the previous design, more prominent front entries facing Foul Bay Road are encouraged to ensure the proposal is consistent with the design guidelines. Also, see Engineering comments regarding frontage improvements along Foul Bay Road.</p>	<p>Though the site layout does not allow for a different location for bike parking, several measures have been taken to preserve as many trees as possible. The bike parking orientation has been revised and additional new trees have been added in this revision.</p> <p>The suggestion was considered but because of its impact to design intent and project feasibility, the north setback has been kept unchanged.</p> <p>The project will now include four affordable townhomes (22%) that fall under the Capital Regional District's price restrictive resale program where the homes are sold between 15%–20% below market value in perpetuity. The below market rate townhomes now proposed are two 1-bedroom units (location: North west corner of the West Block) at approx. \$360,000 and two 3-bedroom units (location TBD) at approx. \$640,000. The prices are an estimate and will be confirmed in future stages of the project.</p> <p>As recommended, plans have been revised to show entrances to the East Block units now facing Foul Bay Rd</p>
<b>Land Development</b>	<p>Condition to be met prior to Committee of the Whole:</p> <p>The Preliminary Servicing Plan indicates a proposed BC Hydro pole for dedicated service. Please provide confirmation that a dip service will provide the necessary power to the development and that a Pad Mounted Transformer (PMT) will not be required, as requested in the previous Application Review Summary comments. Confirm that this new pole will be situated in a location that will accommodate a 9.5 metre width curb-to-curb across Foul Bay Road, to ensure enough room for a future 1.5 metre painted bike lane and transit network. Please revise the next plan submission accordingly. Please also include this new pole location on the Landscape Plans.</p>	<p>As per the Electrical consultant's (AES) load calculation, a PMT will not be required for this project. The site will be serviced from the pole on Quamichan street as shown on the revised Civil drawings. This pole location is reflected on the tree plan on the landscape set.</p>
<p>Conditions to be met prior to Public Hearing:          For Information prior to Building Permit Submission/Approval:</p>		<p>To be addressed post COTW          To be addressed post COTW</p>
<b>Transportation</b>	<p>Conditions to be met prior to the Committee of the Whole:</p> <p>Thank you for revising the plans to include a sidewalk on Foul Bay Road and grades that meet the Subdivision and Development Servicing Bylaw on Foul Bay Road. The majority of the trees along Foul Bay Road fronting the east building are proposed for removal – sparing tree #448. Prior to COTW, please revise the plans (civil, architectural, landscape) to amend the area indicated “future sidewalk” to “proposed sidewalk” up to the last residential entrance (to the critical root zone of tree #421), connecting the residential entrances to Quamichan Street via Foul Bay Road, and have the sidewalk at the inner SRW line and retaining structures on private property. The “future sidewalk” is to be dashed in the north section of the sidewalk from the last residential entrance as this is where the trees are proposed for retention. Also, revise 'K' to add Foul Bay Road under Sheet Notes on the Preliminary Servicing Plan.</p>	<p>Plans have been amended to indicate proposed sidewalk. Sidewalk has been relocated to the inner SRW line, Future sidewalk has been dashed and Foul Bay was added to the notes of 'K'</p>

Below is an itemized list of all the comments received and our responses on how each one has been addressed in this submission.

Department	Municipal Comment	Applicant Response
	Please revise the Preliminary Servicing Plan sidewalk width to the previously required 1.75 metre width along the Foul Bay Road frontage. Revise the landscape and architectural plans accordingly.	Revised as requested
	As mentioned in the previous summary comments, note that the new sidewalk along Foul Bay Road is to be standard broom finish concrete as per the Subdivision and Development Servicing Bylaw. Please revise the Landscape Plans accordingly.	Revised and notes on the drawings as requested
	Please revise the Statutory Right of Way (SRW) boundary on the Foul Bay Road frontage to exclude the heritage wall (i.e., jog the SRW after the wall to accommodate the sidewalk but not the retaining structure) across all plans (civil, architectural, landscape).	SRW boundary has been revised to keep the heritage wall and the retaining structure on private property
	On the Quamichan Street frontage, please indicate the walkway connections to the heritage wall on the Preliminary Servicing Plan. As mentioned in the previous summary comments, consider combining the two connecting walkways from the sidewalk to the property in order to reduce impacts to the rock wall.	As recommended, the walkways have been combined to reduce impacts to the heritage wall
	Please show the dimensions/label the revised SRW width (2.08 metres) along the Foul Bay Road frontage the Preliminary Servicing Plan and Landscape Plans.	Noted on drawings as requested
	On the Redfern Street frontage, please indicate the walkway connections from the sidewalk to the property line. All walkways in the public right of way must be broom finish concrete. Revise these walkways on the Landscape Plans to be solid on the City right of way (currently shown in separated blocks). As mentioned in the previous summary comments, consider combining these connecting walkways in the City right of way to preserve boulevard space for tree planting and for limited disturbance to existing trees.	Revised and notes on the drawings as requested. Also as recommended, the walkways have been combined to preserve boulevard space and for limited impact to existing trees
	Shrubs, hedges, etc., are not permitted to be planted closer than 45 cm to the property line as per the City's Streets and Traffic Bylaw No. 09-079. Please remove the vegetation shown on the Quamichan Street frontage on the Preliminary Servicing Plan accordingly.	Revised as requested
	Please remove the curb bulb from the west side of Redfern Street on L1 to ensure consistency across the drawing submission. A plan revision is required.	Revised as requested
	As requested in the previous Application Review Summary comments, please confirm that the existing northern utility pole will be moved to accommodate a 9.5 metre width curb-to-curb across Foul Bay Road and to ensure enough room for a future 1.5 metre painted bike lane and transit network. It is unclear from the plans and revision list if this comment has been addressed.	As directed to the Civil engineer over the phone, the utility pole on Foul Bay can stay as is. Subject site will be serviced through the pole on Quamichan Street

**Underground Utilities**

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

Below is an itemized list of all the comments received and our responses on how each one has been addressed in this submission.

Department	Municipal Comment	Applicant Response
	<p>As per previous Application Review Summary comments provided, 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 enough 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. Therefore, a report prepared by a qualified Engineer comparing pre- and post- development sewage flow rates shall be submitted to the Engineering Department (attention: Deb Becelaere at dbecelaere@victoria.ca) by the next plan resubmission as the report shall be reviewed by staff and the requirement for attenuation determined prior to Public Hearing. The report is to include measures that the applicant intends to take to attenuate the sewage if required. Please contact Jack Hu, Sewer and Stormwater Quality Technologist, at 250.361.0551 or at JHu@victoria.ca, if further information is required.</p>	<p>Sewage Impact Assessment report prepared by JE Anderson &amp; Associates was shared with Planning via email on July 02, 2021</p>
	<p>If it is determined that sewage attenuation is required, the registration of a Section 219 covenant will be necessary to secure the commitment to attenuate sewage. Registration of the covenant is required prior to establishing a date for Public Hearing.</p>	<p>Sewage Attenuation is not required as per the Sewage Impact Assessment report submitted</p>
	<p>For Information prior to Building Permit Submission/Approval:</p>	<p>To be addressed post COTW</p>
	<p><b>Stormwater Management</b>          Recommendation prior to Committee of the Whole:</p> <p>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 parking stalls and other hard surfaces, rain gardens and green roofs and the preservation of as much green/open space as possible. Thank you for considering the integration of GSI in the development; the proposed stormwater management features (green roofs, permeable concrete and pavers) are supported, especially given the proximity of this development to the Bowker Creek Watershed. The property owner may be eligible for financial incentives if the designs meet requirements as per the City's Rainwater Management Standards. Please visit <a href="http://www.victoria.ca/stormwater">www.victoria.ca/stormwater</a> for more information.</p>	<p>No action was needed</p>
	<p>For Information prior to Building Permit Submission/Approval:</p>	<p>To be addressed post COTW</p>
	<p><b>Parks Division</b>          Condition to be met prior to the Committee of the Whole:</p> <p>Please ensure that the base plan used for all plans has tree locations plotted accurately at their legally surveyed locations. The Site Plan and Landscape Plans have many trees plotted in incorrect locations that do not match the legal survey by J.E. Anderson dated Oct 24, 2019. For example, tree #421 is shown on the site plan and landscape plans too far east and NT1 is shown offsite. Revisions are required.</p> <p>To coordinate frontage design and site servicing, please schedule a meeting with City of Victoria Parks, Land Development, and Transportation and the project Civil Engineer and Landscape Architect. In addition to what has been proposed, it should be possible to get at least one more new street tree on Foul Bay Rd.</p> <p>Laburnum tree NT2 proposed for removal is offsite and written authorization from the property owners of 1946 Hawes Rd. is required.</p> <p>It is strongly advised that the design team work with the Project Arborist to develop plans that allow for the long-term preservation of trees that are suitable candidates for retention.</p>	<p>Legal survey revised and all other drawings updated accordingly</p> <p>Meeting was held on June 29, 2021. Comments regarding sidewalk termination on Foul Bay, broom finish concrete and other parks and transportation concerns have been addressed</p> <p>NT2 is now proposed as retained</p> <p>Multiple coordination meetings with the Arborist were held in the past month and revised plans with best case scenario is being submitted</p>

Below is an itemized list of all the comments received and our responses on how each one has been addressed in this submission.

Department	Municipal Comment	Applicant Response
	Based on the Arborist Report and staff review onsite, the following municipal or bylaw- protected trees appear to be good candidates for retention: #269, #270, #313, #334, #335, #336, #337, #338, #339, #340, #341, #345, #361, #384, #385, #387, #421, and #446.	#269, #270, #313, #337, #361, #362, #384, #385, #387, #421 are being retained
	To fully understand potential negative impacts to trees, input from a geotechnical engineer is needed to determine the excavation cutslope/shoring and size of pad footings required. Please provide construction details for the excavation and foundation being proposed. This will allow the Project Arborist to understand the extent of disturbance in tree critical root zones and analyze potential negative impacts. A revised arborist report is required to review the impact of the building excavations.	Geotech Engineer was engaged to determine the impact of excavation on the trees. A revised Arborist's Report is submitted
	To promote long-term tree preservation of horse chestnuts #269 and #270, the extent of hard surfacing within their CRZs should be reduced. A3.2 – Street/Context Elevations	Arborist recommended and supervised floating permeable techniques will be used to reduce the impact to trees #269 and #270
	The tree shown to the north of the driveway on Redfern is not consistent with the Arborist Report and does not match A3.3, the site plan, or the landscape plans. L4 – Tree Removal and Retention Plan	Revised based on updated site survey
	For all landscape plans, please ensure that the base plan used has the tree locations plotted accurately at their legally surveyed locations. Many trees are plotted in incorrect locations that do not match the legal survey by J.E. Anderson dated Oct 24, 2019. Revisions are required.	Revised based on updated site survey
	NT1 is shown offsite, but the legal survey shows it onsite. Revise accordingly.	Revised based on updated site survey
	The tree protection fencing shown is insufficient and does not match the markup in the Arborist Report. Please work with the Project Arborist to ensure that fencing locations will isolate trees and soils from construction activities for as long as possible. If fencing has to be shifted in the later phases of the project for landscaping, etc, it must be done under the direction of the project arborist. If phased tree protection fencing is proposed, it needs to be clearly identified as such and at locations approved by the Project Arborist.	Tree Protection Fencing has been updated on Arborist report. Phased fencing areas have also been identified
	L6 - Tree Planting Plan The [10] columnar Liquidambar trees shown between the north PL and the property line are too close to the covered parking area and cannot be accepted as Replacement Trees. Revise accordingly.	Revised as requested
	L8 - Shrub Planting Plan The extent of site disturbance from the installation of the proposed landscape design within CRZs of retained trees should be reconsidered (especially near Garry oak #313). Design should aim to minimize soil and root damage from plant and hardscape installation.	Phased tree protection fencing plan as per Arborist report will be implemented to minimize root damage
	The pollinator, food-bearing, and native designations in the shrub list need review and revision. There are inaccuracies in the species designations. Note that the native species designation is for plants generally considered native to southern Vancouver Island. For example, Sarcococca is not edible and creeping raspberry is not native, etc. Please indicate methodology for percentage analysis.	Species have been revised in the shrub list. Methodology for percentage analysis was by plant quantity
	Site Servicing Plan To coordinate frontage design and site servicing, please schedule a meeting with City of Victoria Parks, Land Development, and Transportation and the project Civil Engineer and Landscape Architect. In addition to what has been proposed, it should be possible to get at least one more new street tree on Foul Bay Rd.	Meeting was held on June 29, 2021. Comments regarding sidewalk termination on Foul Bay, broom finish concrete and other parks and transportation concerns have been addressed
	A legend must be provided.	Legend has been added

City of Victoria  
Sustainable Planning and Community Development  
Development Services  
1 Centennial Square, Victoria BC V8W 1P6

For: 902 Foul Bay Road  
Application: REZ No. 00737 & HAV No. 00022  
Date: August 05, 2021

Below is an itemized list of all the comments received and our responses on how each one has been addressed in this submission.

Department	Municipal Comment	Applicant Response
	The CRZ layer does not match tree locations.	CRZ layers have been revised to match tree locations
	The callout "Trees to be removed (Typ). See Arborist Report" points to the same symbol that is used for trees to be retained. It is very challenging to identify what trees are shown as retained. Also, the double reference ID labels are confusing. Revise.	Revised for clarity with different symbols
	The locations of proposed street trees are not consistent with the Site Plan and Landscape Plan.	Revised for consistency with updated landscape drawings
	The Site Servicing Plan should show the existing and proposed locations of sanitary sewer, storm drain, and water, as well as third party utilities such as gas, BC Hydro, and telecommunications. The locations of pad mounted transformers, kiosks, vaults, and conduits can significantly impact design feasibility. BC Hydro and telecommunications companies need to be consulted early in the planning phase, so that requirements can be understood. Arborist Report Revision	Revised to show all utility locations including redline from BCHydro. Arborist report has also been updated to provide input on new utility locations
	The Summary states that [30] trees are to be removed, including [3] on municipal land. According to the Tree Resource Spreadsheet, [4] municipal trees are proposed for removal, which makes total trees proposed for removal [31]. Also, NT8 has been listed as an onsite tree; however, it is shown on plans as located on the municipal frontage. Revision required.	Revised Arborist report with updated summary is submitted
	A revised arborist report is required to review detailed plans for the excavation for building construction.	Revised Arborist report submitted
	For Information prior to Building Permit Submission/Approval:	To be addressed post COTW

Please let us know if you have any questions or need any more information.

Sincerely,

Luke Mari,  
Principal, Development  
ARYZE Developments Inc.