



March 10, 2026

City of Victoria
1 Centennial Square
Victoria BC, V8W 1P6
VIA ELECTRONIC DELIVERY

Attention: Mayor Alto, Council, and Planning Staff

**Re: REZ00902- Re-zoning and Development Permit Re-submission Package - 2580 & 2582
Vancouver Street, Victoria**

On behalf of the Victoria Native Friendship Centre (VNFC), M'akola Development Services (MDS) is pleased to submit the following material in response to the Application Review Summary received September 26th 2026 from City of Victoria Planning Staff. The submission regards the Re-zoning and Development Permit Application submitted on July 18th, 2026 that proposes 40 units of non-market Indigenous rental housing at 2580 & 2582 Vancouver Street, Victoria BC.

We are appreciative of the City of Victoria's review of this application, and have updated documents to clarify intent, fill in gaps, and align with the active regulatory framework. The re-submission package includes:

- **Itemized Narrative Responses:** Provides detailed responses to all CoV comments in the review summary and directs to relevant revision bubbles
- **Letters of Engagement:** From each consultant working within the right-of-way
- **Updated Project Plans:** Revised Architectural, Civil (includes Sanitary Attenuation Report), & Landscape Plans (includes Replacement Tree Plan)
- **Revision Marked Plans:** A duplicate set of the revised Architectural, Civil, & Landscape Plans with revisions bubbled and numbered
- **Revision Summaries:** A list describing each bubbled and numbered change per Plan per consultant

Thank you for your consideration and ongoing support for this non-profit Indigenous rental housing project.

Sincerely,

Jamie Bégin

Project Manager | M'akola Development Services
jamie.begin@makoladev.com | 778-400-3420

Itemized Responses to Comments:

Please see Rezoning and DP application for Owner information, discussion of the proposed project's general alignment with the OCP, and detailed information regarding the project's sustainability targets, inclusion of Indigenous artwork, community engagement, and more. **The following narrative provides a response to the City of Victoria Application Review Summary comments.** Staff comments are summarized for brevity, and are responded to in the order in which they appear in the City's Application Review Summary.

1 Development Services

Comment 1.1: Securing Tenure and Affordability

Response 1.1: The affordability approach for the project was clarified to the City through a meeting with Staff on December 11, 2025. The proposed project, which would be owned and operated by Victoria Native Friendship Centre (VNFC or the "Owner"), a **non-profit** Society, would provide **purpose-built rental** housing in all 40 dwelling units. VNFC initially submitted a proposal to the BC Housing Community Housing Fund for the project to provide deeply affordable units, however as of February 2026 this funding program has been cancelled and VNFC will now investigate other funding options. The vision for this housing project is for deeply affordable units that remain part of the rental supply – VNFC will continue to pursue provincial and federal funding opportunities which would allow for a depth of affordability suitable for their target tenants. Once funding is secured and the parameters for affordability under that funder are clear, VNFC intends to enter into a Housing Agreement with the City of Victoria if required, in addition to and in alignment with any funder agreements, to provide additional security of both rental tenure and affordability.

Comment 1.2: Floor Area and Density Calculations

Response 1.2: The project intends to secure rental tenure and affordability criteria against title, therefore aligning with the "affordable housing development" definition that allows for 2.75:1 FSR per zoning bylaws, and the proposed development has been designed to align with the associated regulations to "Affordable Housing Development" site use. The project team appreciates CoV Staff bringing to our attention that recent Zoning Bylaw updates amended the FSR definition to include elevator shafts and exterior walkways. With the implementation of these changes, the FSR for the proposed project now exceeds 2.75:1. A re-zoning application has been submitted to increase density to align with the proposed FSR of the building, which is 3.4:1.

Importantly, this re-zoning application is driven by a technical definition change and we hope CoV staff can support that the proposed density remains aligned with the neighbourhood's long-term planning goals as well as recent neighbouring and comparable multi-family developments. Based on the updated FSR definitions, a 2.75 FSR could only be achieved by this project if unit count was reduced by approximately 8 units, which would significantly impact the viability and core vision of the project. Receiving Staff support for the increased density would allow VNFC to maintain a unit count that will be cost-effective to build, appealing to future funders, and would provide 40 units of

much needed affordable family-size rental housing for urban Indigenous peoples in Victoria. Notably, the proposed project exceeds recommendations for the provision of family-housing units in new multi-family housing developments, by allowing for 25% 3-bedroom units, 25% 2-bedroom units and 12.5 % 4-bedrooms, which exceeds the zone standard of 10%, 20% and 0% respectively. Allowing for larger unit types, in alignment with Housing Need and Demand and OCP policy, significantly impacts FSR calculations.

Information requested by City of Victoria as per the Planning Review comments has been provided and FSR calculations have been adjusted to reflect the recently adopted FSR definition change. (See Updated Zoning Analysis and Architectural Drawings)

Comment 1.3: Massing and Open Space

Response 1.3: We appreciate staffs’ suggestions aimed at ensuring massing is balanced with open space. As a result, reduced massing, upper storey articulation and larger setbacks were all thoroughly tested in early design, however these design changes resulted in a significant reduction in the number of units achieved. Unfortunately, this resulted in a non-viable unit count based on non-profit housing targets. With a constrained site and a goal of maximizing the number of affordable family sized units offered, the project team is confident the proposed design, with minor revisions, aligns with the OCP and carefully harmonizes a functional public interface with the VNFC’s vision for creating Indigenous housing units and meaningful tenant indoor and outdoor spaces. The building’s massing, proposed setbacks, and public/private space allocation also align with other recent developments on neighbouring properties (ex. 1025 Kings Rd and 2570 5th Street) that collectively ensure densification is sensitive to existing residential neighbourhood character and complements the evolving and vibrant streetscape.

Many policies in the OCP have also been identified that support a courtyard-priority approach. For ease of staff review, we have compiled aligned OCP Design Guidelines and policies into **Appendix A**. The remaining portions of this response address specific recommendations and strategies made by CoV staff that aim to help move the proposal towards a balanced approach:

1.3.1 Consider greater setbacks on property frontages, especially if found beneficial for street tree retention, health and maintenance; Setbacks to sufficiently provide comfortable pedestrian spaces, areas for landscaping, and stormwater mitigation

The Site’s current and proposed setback variances are outlined in the table below:

	Current Zoning – GRD-1	Proposed Setbacks	Difference between Regulation and Proposed
Front Lot Line Setback North/Kings Road	4m	0.89m	2.69 m
Flanking Street Lot Line Set Back	4m	1.32m	2.68m

East/Vancouver St			
Flanking Street Lot Line Set Back West/Fifth Street	4m	0.58m	3.43m
Rear Lot Line Setback	8m	0.911m to rear lot parkade trellis 5.74m to building	7.089m to parkade trellis; 2.26m to building

While we appreciate staffs’ suggestion to increase setbacks and thus reduce the courtyard size in favour of the public realm space, we believe the designs proposed demonstrate that the quality of the public realm interface and street frontage is not compromised with the reduced setbacks. In alignment with **OCP General Design Guideline Policy 2.1.1(h)** “Residential buildings should be set back sufficiently from property lines to provide comfortable pedestrian spaces at the street or adjacent public open space, areas for landscaping and stormwater mitigation, and sun and air access for neighbouring buildings”, there is sufficient room to maintain many existing street trees and provide opportunities for additional trees, landscaping, green infrastructure, and a public walkway with seating along the frontages. In addition, OCP policies support reduced setbacks and unique building shapes on sites with constrained depths and multiple active frontages like this (See **Appendix A**).

The public realm interface has been guided by multiple other OCP policies, that promote clear site lines and access from public sidewalks to the primary entrance, minimizing the visual impact of parking by including an underground parkade, and including plantings along the primary entrance and pathway to create a green interface (See **Appendix A**).



Figure 1. Demonstrates interface between building entrance and public realm, including landscaped walkways

1.3.2 Reduce courtyard dimensions

A courtyard was prioritized for the project in alignment with City of Victoria design guidelines (See **Appendix A**) and due to the Owner's vision to develop housing which promotes tenant wellbeing, cultural safety, and community building. In early engagement, prospective tenants and community members indicated that they valued safety in housing, expressing desire for an area for families to gather in the centre of the building, and designs which promote natural surveillance. The courtyard approach directly responds to this community feedback.

Reducing the size of the courtyard in favour of the public-realm interface along the frontage was explored. Options analysis indicated that a reduction to the courtyard would significantly reduce the quality of the outdoor community amenity space, which has been prioritized for families to gather, play, and build strong community bonds, without providing noticeable benefits to the public realm beyond what is already proposed. Reducing the courtyard dimensions negatively impacts functionality and accessibility of the space, specifically the children's play area, gathering areas, circulation, open green space, and availability of natural light. Furthermore, reducing the courtyard dimensions would lead to ecologically functional features, such as the raingardens and trees, being removed and would prevent the designs from achieving meaningful on-site stormwater management and quality green-space.

As described above (in Response 1.3.1), we agree with review comments on the importance of the public realm interface, and we aim to demonstrate with this narrative and in the designs that prioritizing a courtyard approach has not limited the frontage and public realm space beyond a human-scale. The proposed design works within the constraints of the site to maximize high-quality tenant spaces while providing high-quality public realm space. The frontage has been strategically designed to incorporate street trees, public seating, a raingarden along Fifth Street, and a sidewalk to a scale that aligns with the OCP and with other multi-family developments on neighbouring properties. The proposed public space, courtyard, and open space design aligns with multiple Design Guideline policies as highlighted in **Appendix A**.

1.3.3 Inboard staircases due to visual impacts to neighbours; Make smaller, or consider inboarding on top two storeys; Provide rationale for full-height mesh style screening

An important component to the proposed design is the external stairwells and hallways that surround a central courtyard, which are intended to promote interaction and connection between tenants. The need for community and cultural spaces was highlighted as a key priority area through the early community engagement undertaken by VNFC. As the site has a small buildable area and limited options for gathering spaces, external stairwells and hallways serve a dual purpose- for circulation and as useable outdoor amenity space for tenants. External staircases align well with VNFC's vision and General Urban Design Guidelines which promote outdoor amenity spaces in the form of balconies and porches (General Urban Design Guideline 2.1.1(m)). Apart from providing meaningful gathering space, the externalized hallways have the added benefit of providing direct access to air and natural light for all residential units, increasing natural ventilation and livability of the housing (General Urban Design Guideline 2.1.1 (o); See **Appendix A**). Each unit will have

windows along the exterior frontage, and a weather protected, outdoor entrance off the interior courtyard.

In the review comments, Staff expressed that the external staircases have a strong visual impact on neighbouring properties as viewed from the public realm. The intent in orienting the courtyard towards the rear yard was to reduce impact on public realm and neighbours, and elements have been incorporated to ensure screening and privacy for both neighbours and tenants alike. Notably, building massing is reduced and setbacks are increased to the rear of the property, and a large portion of the building is significantly stepped back from the property line. Where the building is closest to the property line, a visual buffer adds privacy for tenants and neighbours through the use of planters at ends of the external hallways, as shown in Figure 2 below. In response to review comments, the team explored stepping stairwells back at upper levels, or enclosing them, however this would create structural, constructability, and access control complications. As well, enclosing the stairwells would reduce natural lighting, affecting the livability of units. To maintain VNFC's vision, the external hallways have been maintained in the design.



Figure 2. Proposed design which demonstrates landscaping and screening elements to create privacy for neighbours and tenants with external hallways, next to an image from the City of Victoria

OCP Design Guidelines, which highlight that external hallways and staircases increase livability and natural light for inside corner units

The mesh-screen style treatment was guided by the City of Victoria's General Urban Design Guideline photos, shown in Figure 3 below. The mesh-style screening allows for the passage of light to the entrances of the dwelling units, without creating bird hazards, and aligns with the character or the building. In response to review comments, the full-height mesh-style planter screens, originally incorporated to provide additional greenery and screening to neighbouring properties, have been adjusted to railing height (See A0.07, A0.08, A3.01, A4.02). VNFC intend to mount planter boxes on the guard railings to maintain greenery and provide partial screening where possible.



Thermally broken balconies and decks help create private and semi-private outdoor spaces for residents at a high-performance multi-family residential development.

Building articulation and other architectural features incorporated into a highly energy efficient multi-family residential development.

Figure 3. Photos from City of Victoria OCP using mesh-style treatment

1.3.4 Increase building articulation and implement a step-back at the 5th or 6th floor of the current scheme

Implementing a step-backs at the 5th and 6th story was explored in response to the review comments. We understand Staff's recommendation as upper storey setbacks can help to reduce perceived building massing, increase privacy, and increase natural light. However, implementing this design change would not only reduce the unit count but would shift the number of units away from family sized units toward studio and one-bedrooms. If it was feasible to maintain the family sized unit counts and implement an upper-storey setback, the design team would have implemented this suggestion. However, the implementation of this change would result in a unit mix which no longer meet the needs of VNFC's target tenants or the targets outlined by the City of Victoria's Housing Needs Assessments. The City of Victoria Housing Needs Assessment sets a

target that 17% of the overall 5-year, 20-year, and 30-year net new homes should be 3+ bedrooms. OCP Urban Form and Land Use Policy 1.2.3 (See **Appendix A**) encourages new developments to support larger households by meeting or exceeding the requirements for family friendly units and designing family-oriented buildings and amenity spaces. The goals outlined in Policy 1.2.3 are shared by VNFC, and the proposed development would substantially increase the number of affordable family sized units (2, 3 and 4-bedroom units) for Urban Indigenous Families in Victoria through a culturally appropriate family-oriented design. The current design allows for 25% 3-bedrooms, 25% 2-bedrooms and 12.5 % 4-bedrooms, which exceeds the zone standard of 10%, 20% and 0% respectively and meets the needs of VNFC’s target population. The provision of 4-bedroom units is a significant priority to the Owner to address the needs of their target population, urban Indigenous families.

Maintaining the family sized units has been prioritized over implementing an upper-storey step-back, Despite this, the design team has worked diligently to propose a design that not only achieves other Building Composition and Expression Design Guidelines (See **Appendix A**), but also meets BC Housing and City of Victoria sustainability and energy efficiency objectives. As provincial and federal funders encourage the prioritization of materials which are cost-effective and durable, with long life-spans, the architectural team achieves additional expression by prioritizing higher-quality and natural materials (such as masonry and wood) at the public interface. As well, the building includes several siding types, varying texture and colour, to add visual interest to the building (See Figure 4 below).

Building articulation is achieved through façade breaks, placement and treatment of windows, and use of varying materials, colours and textures. The exterior expression utilizes trim details, moldings, and the use of score lines, and patterns (See Figure 4 below). In addition, VNFC intends to commission an Indigenous artist who will be designing an artistic wall panel into the design of the building that will add texture, dimension and opportunity for cultural connection.



- ① Integration of trim and moldings
- ② Natural wood and wood-finish materials
- ③ Variation in colours and materials, with higher quality materials at public realm
- ④ Use of textures and patterns
- ⑤ Weather Protection elements at entrance
- ⑥ Quality public-realm transition that incorporate street trees, plantings, green-infrastructure and walkway



- ① Use of façade breaks and step backs
- ② Use of masonry and wood
- ③ Use of score lines to distinguish between floors
- ④ Variation in the treatment of windows
- ⑤ Variation in colour and material that uses a colour palette that reflects the variety of historic and natural colours in the area

Figure 4. Highlights building articulation, texture, and material that enhances the architectural expression and articulation of the building, in direct alignment with Building Composition and Expression Guidelines

In summary, the design team has put in significant effort to align the building with guidelines focused on natural and architectural elements, articulation, and quality material in lieu of upper-storey step-backs, which are not achievable while prioritizing efficient construction and family units. The proposed character and expression of the building directly align with multiple Urban Design Guidelines Building Composition and Expression Guidelines (See **Appendix A**).

1.3.5 Explore Stronger expression of at-grade community uses and weather protection

Additional community-serving and weather protection elements have been incorporated into the designs in response to review comments. Specifically, expanded overhang protection has been added to the Fifth and Vancouver Street frontages, the amenity seating at the intersection of Kings Road and Fifth Street, and to the main entry at Vancouver Street and Kings Road. Further detail on cladding treatments have been provided, such as additional wood cladding at the ground level (refer to A0.00, A0.07, A3.00, A3.01). The additional public seating and overhangs will not only activate the frontage and enhance the public realm experience, but will increase visual interest and architectural expression of the building.

2 Engineering and Public Works – Land Development Review

Comment 2.1: Letters of Engagement

Response 2.1: Please See attached letters of engagement from Architectural, Electrical, Landscape, and Civil consultants

Comment 2.2: Land Consolidation

Response 2.2: VNFC's intends to consolidate the land once funding is confirmed. At this time, we will apply for a permit to demolish the existing structures on site and pursue any SRW's requested by the City of Victoria that are associated to the consolidation.

Comment 2.3: Previous Occupancy

Response 2.3: The units are considered to have no previous occupancy. It is not VNFC's intent to stratify the building.

Comment 2.4: PMT ducting route

Response 2.4: Please refer to civil drawing C01 which indicates the preliminary ducting route to service the PMT from the BC Hydro line.

Comment 2.5: Secured Legal Agreement at re-zoning

Response 2.5: VNFC acknowledge that the requirements of the Sanitary Attenuation Report may be secured through a registered legal agreement. No TDM measures are currently being requested per additional email conversations with CoV staff.

3 Engineering and Public Works – Transportation

Comment 3.1: Fifth Street Parking Bay

Response 3.1: As per further email conversations with CoV staff, the initial request to remove the parking bay along 5th street is no longer being requested. Staff comments indicated they are supportive of “short-term passenger loading zones that best serves nearby property and the public”. We clarified the intent of the parking bay is a short-term loading zone, and Civil drawings have been re-designed to the standard curb alignment and bulb out at the intersection as recommended by staff (please refer to site plan A.1.00, L1.1, and C01). The Landscape and Civil design team were able to include a raingarden and additional street tree along the Fifth Street frontage with the short-term parking bay maintained, in alignment with staff suggestions (See Response 5.4). Appropriate short-term parking signage will be erected if required by CoV.

Comment 3.2: Raingardens and Shrubs adjacent to on Street Parking

Response 3.2: Modifications to raingardens have been made. Please refer to landscape drawing L1.1, the site plan on A1.00, and civil drawing C01 for updates.

Comment 3.3: TDM Measures

Response 3.3: Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures were initially recommended by staff in the Application Review Summary, as parking requirements were calculated using “Apartment” definition rather than “Affordable Housing Development”. However, through further discussions with CoV Staff, it was clarified that the use of the site is “Affordable Housing Development”, and no further TDM measures were requested. Email correspondence confirmed that “If a parking variance is no longer needed mitigating TDM programs justifying a variance and

supporting future residence with their affordable and sustainable transportation choices will no longer be recommended.”

4 Engineering and Public Works – Underground Utilities

Comment 4.1: Size of Sanitary and Storm service connection

Response 4.1: The size of the proposed sanitary and storm service connection has been integrated into the plans. Please refer to civil drawing C01 for updates.

Comment 4.2: Size of meter size

Response 4.2: A City standard drawing with proposed water meter size has been incorporated. Please refer to Water Meter Sizing Calculation Sheet and civil drawing C01.

Comment 4.3: Sanitary Attenuation Report

Response 4.3: Please see the provided Sanitary Attenuation Report.

5 Engineering and Public Works – Stormwater Management

Comment 5.1: Onsite Stormwater Management

Response 5.1: The roof area is intending to be directed to the 5 onsite raingardens, and this information has been included on the Stormwater Management Plan L1.7 for clarity.

Comment 5.2: Boulevard Raingardens along Kings Rd

Response 5.2: The raingarden along Kings Rd frontage has been removed. Please refer to landscape drawing L1.1 and civil drawing C01 for updates. The adjustment prioritizes existing street tree retention over raingarden incorporation as per review comments.

Comment 5.3: Boulevard Raingarden along Vancouver Street

Response 5.3: The raingarden along Vancouver Street has been removed. Please refer to L1.1 and C01 for updates. This adjustment will allow for two additional street trees to be added and for existing street tree M8 to be retained (See Comment/Response 6.3 below) that allows for CoV to maintain access to the existing gas service in this location.

Comment 5.4: Boulevard Raingarden along Fifth Street

Response 5.4: Please refer to response 3.1 above that confirms staff support for the proposed short-term parking bay. A raingarden along this frontage was able to be incorporated while maintaining the parking bay – please refer to L1.1, Site Plan A1.00, and C01 for amendments. Sanitary and storm drain service connections were moved south to accommodate the raingarden, and a curb wall with integrated seating is proposed along the sidewalk.

6 Parks – All Plans

Comment 6.1: Replacement Tree Plan

Response 6.1: A Replacement Tree Plan is included in the resubmission and includes as many replacement trees that will fit on the subject site, taking into account grade, topography, tree location, and soil depth. Two on site replacement trees are proposed due to site constraints and required soil volumes. Refer to Landscape Drawing L1.3, Site Plan A1.00. In addition, 5 off-site trees are proposed.

Comment 6.2: Boulevard Raingardens along Kings Rd and Vancouver Street.

Response 6.2: Please refer to responses 5.2 and 5.3 that confirm the removal of the raingardens on Kings Rd and Vancouver Street. The existing street trees along Kings Road will be maintained.

Comment 6.3: Additional Street Trees along Vancouver Street

Response 6.3: Two trees have been planted along Vancouver St. in planting space, ensuring minimum offsets and requirements. Refer to Landscape drawing L1.4.

Comment 6.4: Raingardens and street trees along Fifth street

Response 6.4: Please refer to response 3.1 above that confirms staff support for the proposed short-term parking bay. Raingardens have been integrated and two trees have been planted along fifth street in planting space. One of the trees will be planted within the rain garden with a minimum 7m clearance from other trees along Fifth St. Please refer to L1.4 and C01.

7 Parks – Landscape Plan

Comment 7.1: Indicate Tree planting Details into Boulevard Detail SD P4

Response 7.1: Tree Planting in Boulevard Detail SD P4 has been added to landscape drawings.

Comment 7.2: Street Trees Inspection Notes

Response 7.2: Tree Inspection Notes have been added on L2.1.

8 Parks – Arborist Report

Comment 8.1: Arborist Report

Response 8.1: Please refer to response 5.2. The Arborist Report has been updated to be coordinated with landscape and civil design amendments.

9 Parks – Civil Plan

Comment 9.1: Storm and sewer line

Response 9.1: The Storm and Sewer line within the driveway has been relocated. Please refer to civil drawing C01.

Comment 9.2: Water Vault

Response 9.2: Review comments requested the water vault to be moved 10m west to provide space for municipal tree M3, however this would interfere with the storm catch basin west of the water vault. Best practice is to maintain 3m separation between storm and water, therefore the water vault has been relocated slightly eastwards so that it is outside of the tree's critical root zone. Please refer to C01.

Comment 9.3: Irrigation

Response 9.3: A separate water service line for irrigation has been integrated into civil drawing C01. The irrigation inspection notes have been integrated into C01.

10 Building and Inspection Services

Comment 10.1: Confirm Spatial Separation

Response 10.1: Spatial separation calculations, elevations and site plan with limiting distances are included on A0.03 of the proposal. The proposed design meets BCBC 2024 requirements for spatial separations.

Comment 10.2: Show Siamese connection

Response 10.2: The fire department connection is located by the main entry in the northeast corner of the site. Refer to the site plan on A1.00.

Comment 10.3: Show Fire Hydrants

Response 10.3: The fire hydrant is shown on A1.00. A label for the fire hydrant has been added to the resubmission. The fire hydrant is also shown on L1.1 and C01.

Appendix A – Aligned OCP Policies

Review Comment	OCP Policy Number	Policy
1.3.1 Consider greater setbacks on property frontages, especially if found beneficial for street tree retention, health and maintenance; Setbacks to sufficiently provide comfortable pedestrian spaces, areas for landscaping, and stormwater mitigation	General Design Guideline 2.1.1(h)	<i>“On corner sites, develop both street facing facades as front elevations. This may entail the use of L-shaped massing and floorplate configurations, supported by potential variances to side yard and rear yard requirements.”</i>
	General Design Guideline 2.1.1(h)(ii)	<i>“Consider reduced front yard setbacks where lot depths are constrained, where the ground floor may have a more active frontage, like a storefront, or where the lot fronts onto a generous boulevard or green open space, while avoiding impacts on existing or future street trees.”</i>
	General Design Guideline 2.1.1(b) –	<i>“The primary building entrance should have clear sight lines and be directly accessible from the public sidewalk or open space.”</i>
	Vehicular Access, Parking, and Back of House Guideline 2.1.2(b)	<i>“Parking should be located underground or tucked near the rear or side of buildings so as to minimize the impact on streetscape appearance, pedestrian circulation and to maximize ground level and underground space for trees and landscaping and appropriate soil volumes. Consolidate driveway access points where possible, to minimize curb cuts and impacts on the pedestrian realm or common open spaces.”</i>
	Residential Buildings Guideline 2.2.3(a)	<i>“Residential use at street level should have strong entry features and building designs that encourage interaction with the street while considering privacy and liveability for individual homes.”</i>
	Landscaping and Open Space Design Guideline 2.4.1(c)	<i>“Incorporate plantings at entryways, patios and pathways to create a green interface between buildings and streets.”</i>
1.3.2 Reduce courtyard dimensions	General Guideline 2.1.1(a)	<i>“Site and design buildings with a front-to-back orientation with primary facades facing streets and interior open spaces (rear yards)</i>

		<i>to achieve a perimeter block form of development. Alternative forms of site planning may also be considered if the Urban Design Fundamentals of these guidelines can be met.”</i>
	General Guideline 2.1.1(b)	<i>“Provide outdoor amenity spaces that create and contribute to a cohesive, green interior courtyard experience within the block.”</i>
	General Guideline 2.1.1(n)	<i>“Provide shared open space in the form of courtyards, green spaces, terraces, yards, play areas or rooftop gardens. Consider buildings with upper-level step-backs to provide opportunities for balconies and upper storey terraces that take advantage of sunlight and views.”</i>
	Landscape and Open Space Design Guideline 2.4	<i>“ensure a landscape and open space design that strives to re-introduce nature into the city and supports the urban forest, mitigates heat island effect, and retains and absorbs stormwater on-site; Ensure new development provides a range of shared or common outdoor amenity spaces that encourage social interaction, play, urban food systems and access to nature” – designs include a natural play feature for children and families”</i>
	Landscape and Open Space Design Guideline 2.4.1(a)	<i>“Design on-site open space that is usable, attractive, ecologically functional and is well-integrated with the adjacent open space, streetscape and building design. Incorporate and integrate required stormwater management facilities, urban forest and amenity spaces into site planning and design from the outset.”</i>
	Landscape and Open Space Design Guideline 2.4.1(e)	<i>“Design and landscape rear yards to create shared outdoor amenity spaces that are integrated with the urban forest, stormwater management facilities and other ecological functions.”</i>

	<p>Landscape and Open Space Design Guideline 2.4.1(f)</p>	<p><i>“Consolidate open site space to maximize contiguous soil volumes that facilitate successful tree health and useable green space.” – one large open space allows for more impactful landscaping while providing sufficient space to support accessible landscaped pathways, usable gathering space, and new trees.</i></p>
	<p>Landscape and Open Space Design Guideline 2.4.1(g)</p>	<p><i>“Integrate comfortable, accessible and landscaped pathway connections from the fronting street to rear yards and interior courtyards.”</i></p>
<p>1.3.3 Inboard staircases due to visual impacts to neighbours; Make smaller, or consider inboarding on top two storeys; Provide rationale for full-height mesh style screening</p>	<p>General Guideline 2.1.1(m)</p>	<p><i>“Provide private outdoor amenity space in the form of balconies or porches for individual residential units, with a minimum depth of 1.8 m, a minimum width of 2.4 m, and a minimum overall size of 4.6 m²”</i></p>
	<p>General Guideline 2.1.1(o)</p>	<p><i>“Design buildings to allow direct access to air and natural light for individual units and common areas. Buildings should be designed to maximize the number of individual homes that receive daylight and natural ventilation from at least two sides of the building (such as a corner or from front and back) or, from one side and a roof.”</i></p>
<p>1.3.4 Increase building articulation and implement a step-back at the 5th or 6th floor of the current scheme 1.3.4 Increase building articulation and implement a step-back at the 5th or 6th floor of the current scheme</p>	<p>OCP Urban Form and Land Use Policy 1.2.3</p>	<p><i>“New development should advance a family-friendly city, support larger households that want to stay in the city and seek to meet the evolving needs of families with children at home, including by:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>• Meeting or exceeding any established requirements for a minimum number of family-oriented units in new multi-unit development as prescribed in regularly reviewed and updated City policies and regulations informed by current and future demographics and market conditions.</i> <i>• Designing family-oriented buildings, building amenities and open spaces in accordance with City policy and design guidelines.</i>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Incorporating flexible and adaptable housing designs that can support families as their needs change over time.”</i>
	Building Composition and Expression Guideline 2.3	<i>“encourage development that is long-lasting, functional, energy-efficient and sustainable. To encourage design that fosters diversity and visual interest, comfort, livability, and a positive relationship between the outstanding natural environment of Victoria and its buildings.”</i>
	Building Composition and Expression Guideline 2.3(a)	<p><i>“Consider building designs with simple forms and massing to address building performance objectives (including for building energy performance) while incorporating variation in facade treatments to achieve architectural interest. Strategies include, but are not limited to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>i. Introducing bays, façade breaks or step-backs.</i> <i>ii. Articulating building façades into a series of intervals, through placement and treatment of windows, entries and balconies, materials, colours and textures.</i> <i>iii. Integrating architectural features and details such as punched windows, trim details and moldings, treatment of siding (e.g., the use of score lines, textures, different materials or patterning to distinguish between different floors).”</i>
	Building Composition and Expression Guideline 2.3(l)	<i>“Use façade cladding and materials that are of high quality and durable, utilized to weather gracefully over time.”</i>
	Building Composition and Expression Guideline 2.3(m)	<i>“Prioritize the use of higher quality materials, architectural features and details in feature areas of the building envelope, especially at grade and on lower storeys, and for soffits facing the public realm.”</i>
	Building Composition and	<i>“Consider variation in colours and materials between buildings along the street.”</i>

	Expression Guideline 2.3(n)	
	Building Composition and Expression Guideline 2.3(o)	“Consider colour palettes that reflect the full variety of historic and natural colours found in the area”
	Building Composition and Expression Guideline 2.3(p)	“Incorporate intangible and cultural heritage into the design of new buildings through public art, culturally appropriate design features and colours, material choices and landscape elements.”
	Building Composition and Expression Guideline 2.3(q)	“New buildings should strive to incorporate substantial, durable and natural materials into their façade that are reflective of the materials used in nearby historic properties. Materials such as masonry and natural wood are encouraged. Regionally sourced materials and finishes with low carbon footprints are strongly recommended.”
	Building-Open Space Interface Guideline 2.2.1(c)	“Emphasize entrances to buildings with a combination of architectural detail, lighting, weather protection or other design strategies. Entrances accessed off side yards should be avoided where possible.”
	Building-Open Space Interface Guideline 2.2.1(d)	“Incorporate weather protection such as awnings, canopies, and overhangs to support pedestrian activity and comfort.”