



## RE: RESPONSE TO THE APPLICATION REVIEW SUMMARY - 561 TORONTO STREET

We are pleased to submit to City of Victoria staff responses to the comments and Plan Check. Submitted with this written response is:

- two 8 ½ x 11 revised drawing sets with changes bubbled
- one 11 x 17 revised drawing set with changes bubbled
- four full size revised drawing sets with changes bubbled
- one full size revised drawing set (no bubbles)
- one 8 ½ x 11 revised drawing sets (no bubbles)
- one 11 x 17 revised drawing sets (no bubbles)
- a written summary of all of the bubbled revisions
- a USB drive with digital copies of the above

Below are the written responses to comments received from the City. Our responses are in [blue](#).

### DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DIVISION COMMENTS:

1. Consider adding larger, three-bedroom units.

*The unit mix has been carefully considered. After careful market analysis the team believes that the proposed unit mix meets demand for the area and larger 3 bedroom units is not something that can be incorporated into this development.*

*As an additional response to this comment, this type of conversation would be expected as part of a rezoning process. This proposal falls under existing zoning and as part of the Development Permit process items such as the unit mix are question of land use, not form and character, so we are surprised to receive the comment.*

2. A housing agreement is requested in order to restrict the strata from prohibiting the units as for long term rental use.

*The project team is amenable to register a covenant on the property that prohibits the future strata council from passing bylaws that may restrict an owner from renting their suite.*





*As an additional response to this comment, this type of conversation would be expected as part of a rezoning process. This proposal falls under existing zoning and as part of the Development Permit process items like housing agreements are a question of land use, not form and character, so we are surprised to receive the comment.*

3. Please consider adding an affordability element either by way of below market units or by secure some or all of the units for rental.

*This project as proposed will provide modest market home ownership opportunities. Our market analysis indicated significant demand in Victoria for this type of housing and we are happy to contribute to providing it. Adding a below market component to the development would add complication to the development process, which would likely add cost to the modest market units, as well as considerable delay. We consider this an undesirable outcome and so a below market component is not something that can be incorporated into this development.*

*As an additional response to this comment, this type of conversation would be expected as part of a rezoning process. This proposal falls under existing zoning and as part of the Development Permit process items like the inclusion of an affordability element are a question of land use, not form and character, so we are surprised to receive the comment.*

4. Enhance the ground level, by accentuating residential entryways to develop the relationship with the street: To encourage openness and interaction with the street, the front entry should be more prominent, as should the street-facing entries of the ground-oriented units. Consider bringing in the cedar material to at the base of the building as part of addressing these comments.

*We have made modifications based on this comment, specifically: adding a landscape wall element with the building's address adjacent to the walkway to the main entrance. Please see revised site plan and landscape plan and revised renderings.*

*We've also added a gate to the patio of the units adjacent to the main entrance to the west on the ground floor, to give direct access to the patios from outside.*

5. Consider breaking up the massing through articulation and greater use of a variation in materials along the front (North) and West facades.

*The massing has been carefully considered and many options were explored. Keeping the exterior wall a relatively simple shape is part of the strategy for both affordability and thermal performance. The exterior wall is both structure and envelope. With the new BCBC 2018 seismic requirements we are consciously trying to avoid structural complication, which inevitably adds cost. In addition, articulation in the envelope creates thermal bridging challenges and increase the envelope area to floor area ratio, both of which can have a significant impact on energy performance. As part of the strategy for complying with new energy*





*efficiency requirements avoiding unnecessary corners in the envelope is part of our energy strategy as well.*

*The project team believes that the proposed massing is appropriately articulated with fenestration and material changes to add interest to the facade. In particular, the use of a vertical “stripe” on each facade, and the variation of white and cedar that reflect the unit divisions. Each change of material also incorporates a change in plane, providing shadow lines at each intersection (see also comment #8)*

6. Please demonstrate how the design responds to the privacy of adjacent lots. While the lots to the west and the South currently have surface parking closer to the building, future developments could bring result in buildings much closer to this site. Anticipate future building adjacencies by looking at options to increase privacy on the sides and rear at ground level, and where balconies overlook adjacent properties. (particularly those closest to the property line) on the sides and rear.

*The west side of the building has no balconies, private patio space, or main windows, in anticipation of future development there. The east side has the public landscape amenities with the largest setbacks. The south is where issues of privacy are most likely to come up if the adjacent site is developed. Said lot is relatively large for the neighbourhood and would offer the design team for that hypothetical project opportunities to respond to privacy concerns relevant to their own project, which by default would maintain privacy for this proposal.*

7. Related to the previous two comments, please consider recessing the balconies or turning them into Juliet balconies, particularly in places where they are close to lot lines or, as is the case at the front, overly exposed, and giving an integrated ‘stuck-on’ feel. They should be better incorporated with the rest of the building.

*Juliette balconies have been considered, as has variations in the facade (see also comment #5).*

*In response to this comment we have altered the balconies to be wider while maintaining the same depth, which we feel improves the look and alleviates the ‘stuck-on’ feel. We have also changed the guardrail material to glass, which we feel also improves the look and incorporates them better into the building as a whole (see also comment # 12).*

8. Will the different finish materials have different depths, or will they be a contiguous plane? The renderings and elevations are not clear on this. If it is not already the case, consider creating changes to the depth where the materials change in order to add articulation and depth.

*Yes, the changes in material do have changes in depth. (Please see also the answer to comment # 5.)*

9. Please show the elevator shaft and any other associated rooftop structures.





*The required elevator overrun is taken up in the roof truss space and is not expected to project above the roof plane. Rooftop structures will be kept to a minimum, and will likely only include plumbing vents, gas exhaust vents, and a roof access hatch. Air will be handled on a unit by unit basis through wall vents, avoiding large mechanical equipment on the roof.*

10. Provide details on the sun shades at the north elevation and the privacy glass screens on the ground floor. Include these on the site plan.

*An image of the sun shade has been added to the materials page, and their outline has been added to the site plan.*

11. The materials page indicates white vinyl windows, however the rest of the elevations and renderings showing black. Please clarify.

*This discrepancy has been corrected on the drawing set. Window frames will be black.*

12. The balcony railings are inconsistent between the materials page and the drawings. Please consider a higher quality railing than the one pictured on the materials page.

*The railings have been changed to aluminum frame with glass panels. (See also comment #7.)*

13. Please provide a materials board.

*A materials board will be provided as part of the Large Project Submission Package prior to the COTW meeting.*

14. If possible, please move the location of the transformer to a less prominent spot. Additionally, on the elevation, landscape and materials list, please show details on the required screening (screening/barriers will likely be required for a location so close to the building). Confirm if proposed screening is permitted by BC Hydro.

*As detailed design proceeds we will look at alternative locations. If it is not possible to relocate the intent is to screen the transformer on three sides - exposing it only to the exit path to the west. The screening will comply with BC Hydro requirements and be incorporated into the landscape design.*

15. Please consider softening the driveway and parkade entrance. Please also provide the driveway width. Additionally, the existing curb cuts will need to be removed. On the site plan, please show the proposed configuration at the sidewalk, including the relationship to the neighbouring driveway crossing.

*The ramp is a suspended slab with parking below and hence cannot be any other surface. The site plan has been modified so that the entry is at a right-angle. Please see the site plan also for the proposed configuration of the sidewalk and the driveway width.*





16. Please contact Marinda Conley, Senior Heritage Planner, regarding potential relocation of the existing houses. She can be reached at: 250.361.0533 or [mconley@victoria.ca](mailto:mconley@victoria.ca)

*The project team will be in touch with the Senior Heritage Planner*

17. The garbage facilities appear to be quite small for a building this size. Consider increasing this to create a more usable space and refer to Engineering's comments in this review.

*See also answer to comment # 25.*

*This would require reducing the parking count. A private waste removal service will be contracted to the strata, who will collect waste directly from the garbage and recycling room on the parkade level. The frequency of collection will ensure that the garbage facilities don't go over capacity.*

18. The context elevation drawing is misleading by only showing the front elevation of the house to the East. Please revise the drawing to more accurately reflect the angled position of the building beside it and include the accessory building. Please also remove the four-storey building on the lot behind it, as it is misleading to the actual experience on the street. Provide renderings that show how this proposal fits in with the neighbourhood context.

*Please see revised street elevation sheet. A bird's eye view of the neighbourhood context has been added to better illustrate neighbourhood context.*

19. On the site plan the short-term parking does not appear to meet the minimum aisle dimensions without encroaching into the walkway. The landscape plans appears to show more depth. Please dimension the bike parking and ensure these are consistent. The bike parking should not impede the ability for people to walk on the path when a bike is parked.

*Please see revised site plan.*

20. Look at making the second bike room more accessible in term of both the entry and the location.

*The original submission proposed a case whereby the parking would be reduced to the required spaces in an urban village which allowed us to included more generous bike facilities, but the city determined the parking variance would undermine the FAR allowances needed for this building and would therefor not be allowed. This has left limited options to fit the bike storage into the building.*

21. The perspective elevation drawings are mislabeled.

*These have been corrected.*

22. This proposal impacts the future redevelopment of 569 Toronto, and a lot consolidation with this lot as well would be in line with relevant policies and avoid orphaning this property.





*The project team would also have preferred to incorporate 569 Toronto into the proposal. The owner was approached and an offer was made. However, the owner was not willing to sell.*

*This proposal would not prevent 569 Toronto from being consolidated with 566 Simcoe at some future date.*

23. The garden plots and garden shed are a nice amenity for the development and supports the City's Urban Agriculture Policy.

*Thank you.*

## ENGINEERING AND PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT COMMENTS: GENERAL ENQUIRIES

### TRANSPORTATION REVIEW

24. **Revision Required.** 3.0 m sight triangles are required on each side of the proposed driveway. Objects higher than 1.0m are not permitted within these areas to ensure indivisibility between motorists and pedestrians using the sidewalk. Sight triangles are located within the lot.

*The parkade driveway has been revised so that it is not obstructed by the neighbouring building. Site triangles are shown on the revised plan.*

25. **Revision Required.** Please describe how garbage, organics, and recycling will be removed from the property. Bins are not permitted to be placed on the public right of way for any period of time.

*A private waste removal service will be contracted to the strata, who will collect waste directly from the garbage and recycling room on the parkade level.*

26. **Revision Required.** The maximum permitted ramp grade for the first 6.0m into the lot is 8%. Please see the Highway Access Bylaw for additional information. The ramp to the underground parking should also be designed to anticipate a future sidewalk in area of the requested 2.0m SRW.

*The first 6.0m of the ramp are graded at 8% in compliance with that requirement. See Parking Level Plan.*

*requested 2.0m SRW - see response to comment # 27*

27. **Revision Required.** The standard right-of-way for a secondary collector street is 20.0m, however, future transportation / greenway - related needs on the corridor can be met in a right-of-way width of 14.0m. To achieve this minimum on this portion of Toronto Street, a statutory right of way of 2.0m is requested. No





permanent structures are to be permitted in this area, nor is any required parking, ramps or turnaround area to be permitted within 1m of this area. The applicant is required to respond to this request prior to resubmitting plans.

*Conrad Nyren will be in touch with the Engineering and Public Works Department to discuss.*

## UNDERGROUND UTILITIES

28. Any existing pipes disconnected and capped as a result of this project cannot be reused without passing a "test for re-use". New services must be purchased at the expense of the applicant as per standard fee schedule if the existing pipes fail this test.

*Understood*

29. Contractors are to be registered under Bylaw 14-071 Schedule G: Code of Practice for Construction and Development Activities prior to commencement of excavation or soil relocation. Contact Marcin Jedynak 250-361-0550.

*Understood*

30. Parking area exceeds 10 spaces, storm water treatment is required under Bylaw 14-071 Schedule H: Code of Practice for Automotive and Parking Lot Operations. Business or strata occupier to register under Schedule H at occupancy. Marcin Jedynak to contact at a later date.

*Understood*

31. Information obtained from City plans is provided without guarantee of accuracy and the applicant must verify this information in the field.

*Understood*

32. New services are charged as per the City's standard fee schedule. The City cannot guarantee municipal site servicing elevations at property line for this project. It is recommended that any proposed services be installed by City crews prior to commencement of construction.

*Understood*

## Storm Water Management

33. Applicant is encouraged to demonstrate how rainwater from the new impervious areas is to be managed





*Roof water will be collected and pass through stormwater retention & treatment planters (shown on Landscape Plan) before heading to the City's stormwater system. Landscaped areas above the parkade will have various soil depths that will temporarily retain stormwater as well, and water from these areas will be collected and piped into the City's stormwater system.*

*Stormwater from the parkade ramp (and the minor amounts from parkade itself) will be dealt with either by connecting to the City's stormwater system or with a rock pit beneath the parkade, depending on the storm system's depth and on soil conditions.*

34. Applicant is encouraged to consider using a permeable surface for the new driveway and patio areas

*Patio areas are above the parkade. Some planters will be used for temporary stormwater retention, and we can route water from the patios into these. The parkade ramp is a suspended slab over parking below and cannot be permeable.*

35. Applicant is encouraged to preserve as much green/open space as possible

*We have done what we can to preserve as much open green space as possible.*

#### **PERMITS AND INSPECTIONS DIVISION COMMENTS:**

36. Roof access shall be provided as per 3.2.5.3

*A roof access hatch compliant with 3.2.3 will be provided.*

37. Protection of exit pathway from windows at main level on west exterior side as per 3.2.3.13(2)

*The intention is for that window to be of sprinkler protected glazing. An alternative solution will be submitted along with the building permit.*

38. As the Building Permit application will be after December 10, 2018, BCBC 2018 Code will apply

*We are aware of the change and are designing this building according to BCBC 2018 requirements.*

