

June 16, 2022

RESPONSE TO APPLICATION REVIEW SUMMARY 2 dated March 4, 2022

Capital Culture District (REZ00796)

1824, 1900, 1908, 1924 and 2010 Store Street, 1907 Store Street and 530 Chatham Street

Zoning Plan Check (City of Victoria Technical Group Review)		Applicant Response/Drawing Reference
A	Provide site areas for each DA. If proposed property lines differ from the DA boundaries, provide site area for actual lots as well.	RESPONSE: Individual lot subdivision is not proposed at this time. For land areas for DA's (Development Areas) see Supplementary Project Data.
B	Provide the average street grade for DA-4 and 5 based on the front. Provide average grade calculation as set out in Schedule A for all DA's. Ensure that the lower grade of the proposed or existing is used. For Example, the proposed grade for DA-2 is lower at around 3.30m and not 8.73m. Located on Sheet no. A3.1	RESPONSE: Average grades are provided for the street frontage of each DA. Average grades are provided at the perimeter of each DA, calculated using the method in Schedule A. Building footprints are not provided as they are indicative and do not represent final designs. Maximum building heights for each DA have been provided from average grade at the street frontage as well as average grade at the DA boundary. DRAWING REFERENCE: A2.1 Site Plan/Average Grade Calculations.
C	It appears the building values are not labelled correctly on page A3.1. For example, elevation DA-1 should be labeled W9, W8 and W7. Revise height and storey values as required	RESPONSE: The building labels on Section 3 have been corrected. All other building labels and storey heights are correct. DRAWING REFERENCE: A3.1 Site Sections
D	Provide setback values as noted on the plan check above. Provide internal setbacks as well from DA and property boundaries.	RESPONSE: Setback values from DA boundaries are provided. Internal property lines that may be created by subdivision are not proposed at this time. DRAWING REFERENCE: Rezoning Application Book, pg. 28-30.
Development Services Division Comments:		Applicant Response/Drawing Reference
Area Planner: Miko Betanzo, 250.361.0604 Heritage, John O'Reilly, (250) 361-0484		
Agreements:		
1.	A Master Development Agreement is required as part of the OCP amendment for this application. Details to be included in the MDA include, but are not limited to:	
i.	timing and phasing of development and delivery of Community Amenity Contributions	RESPONSE: Phasing cannot be determined at the time of this application and is a conceptual reference only. Terms for flexibility of phasing and subdivision are to be included in the MDA (Master Development Agreement) between City of Victoria and the Applicant. The CAC (Community Amenity Contribution) is proposed to be subject to proposals for adjacent buildings. Phase 1 is anticipated to include buildings labelled E1, E2, E3, along with their adjacent street frontage, the Street Meet Square public open space and the mid-block lane between Chatham and Discovery Streets. Details are to be negotiated with the City as the project progresses and application for Site and Building Development Permits are made. DRAWING REFERENCE: Appendix C, pg 4, CAC Summary.
ii.	confirmation of CAC details (e.g. the waterfront pathway is depicted in various forms)	RESPONSE: Some aspects of future designs for the waterfront pathway have been illustrated in the indicative renders to help envision the development potential of the project. These include a semi-circular pier structure that could be developed should the waterlot leases be acquired. In addition, the potential massing of the adjacent city blocks are shown to help imagine the future context of this proposed redevelopment. The Community Amenity Contribution Summary itemizes and illustrates the proposed publicly accessible open spaces, including accesses to the waterfront. DRAWING REFERENCE: Appendix C, pg 3, CAC Summary.
iii.	utility upgrades and phasing approach identified	RESPONSE: Details to be negotiated with the City as the project progresses and application for Site and Building Development Permits are made.
iv.	SRW details for all CACs identified (operation, maintenance responsibilities, restrictions, areas)	RESPONSE: Details to be negotiated with the City as the project progresses and application for Site and Building Development Permits are made. Per the CAC summary, some SRW areas will be volumetric as they may be covered. SRW's adjacent to buildings may be closed overnight as may elevator areas. Maintenance will be performed by the owner. DRAWING REFERENCE: Appendix C, pg 3, CAC Summary for approximate areas.
v.	design and landscaping standards/ specifications for public realm and SRW areas	RESPONSE: Details to be negotiated with the City as the project progresses and application for Site and Building Development Permits are made.

vi.	subdivision areas/ approach defined and secured (including proposed air parcels)	RESPONSE: No subdivision is contemplated at this time. Subdivision or consolidation may occur in the future, as the project progresses. Details to be negotiated with the City as the project progresses and application for Site and Building Development Permits are made.
vii.	enhanced accessibility standards	RESPONSE: Universal access to the waterfront has been described under item #10 below.
viii.	TDM measures where parking standards are not met	RESPONSE: The amount of car and bicycle parking provided will be determined for each phase at the time of Development Permit Application and intended to comply with applicable City of Victoria processes and bylaws. TDM measures will be explored as necessary at that time. DRAWING REFERENCE: Rezoning Application Book, pg. 38 'Parking'.
ix.	Interim condition requirements	RESPONSE: Note that the entire site is currently occupied, subject to existing leases and regularly accessed by the public. The various businesses on site are also subject to business licensing. Details to be negotiated with the City as the project progresses and application for Site and Building Development Permits are made.
x.	Land Use – Noise and Nuisance Mitigation Measures	RESPONSE: Details to be negotiated with the City as the project progresses and application for Site and Building Development Permits are made.
xi.	Green building/ sustainability measures	RESPONSE: Details to be negotiated with the City as the project progresses and application for Site and Building Development Permits are made.
xii.	Mid-block SRW through the property connecting Chatham Street to Discovery Street intended for pedestrian access	RESPONSE: A volumetric SRW (Statutory Right-of-Way) is intended to accommodate multi-modal use. DRAWING REFERENCE: Appendix C, pg 3, CAC Summary for approximate areas.
2.	This is an atypical application and, per the Inclusionary Housing and Community Amenity Policy, requires a land lift analysis. To carry out the land lift, please provide the following:	RESPONSE: This information has been provided under separate cover and the Land Lift analysis was submitted by the consultant directly to the City in May 2022.
xiii.	Confirmation of proposed tenures (rental/ free-hold/ affordable) and allotted square footage	
3.	Heritage Designations will be sought, to run concurrently with the Rezoning Application.	RESPONSE: City staff is requesting the Heritage Designations run concurrently with the Rezoning Application. Although it is typical for such designations to accompany rezoning requests when heritage properties are involved, the three heritage registered buildings located at 1824, 1900, and 1910 Store Street are all in Heritage Conservation areas. The Victoria Rice and Flouring Mills building (Valhalla) at 1824 Store Street and the Dickson, Campbell & Co. building (Capitol Iron) are in DPA 9 (HC) Inner Harbour. The Spratt Building at 1910 Store Street is DPA 10B (HC): Rock Bay Heritage. In addition, each building is listed on the City of Victoria Heritage Register, which is analogous to designation by Bylaw, or subject to a Covenant, and all three situations require a Heritage Alteration Permit for heritage conservation. The only difference is designation legally protects buildings from demolition and, in this case, the intention of Reliance Properties is to retain these buildings (currently tenanted) as outlined within the Conservation Plans that form part of this application; the heritage designation is to be concurrently advanced at the Heritage Alteration Permit application stage where upgrade triggers for the buildings including seismic upgrade are to be advanced. The proposed zoning relocates the residential use from the heritage parcels, controls their height and massing, allowing retention of the buildings under more compatible uses, thus protecting the parcels. It should also be noted that the land lift analysis did not account for the loss of value from Heritage Designation.
Conditions to be met prior to the Committee of the Whole:		
4.	The applicant letter notes that the “locations, capacities, augmentation and improvements of underground services will be determined and coordinated at the appropriate time of Development Permit and subsequent Building Permit Applications”- however, given the scale of development, timeframe, and ability of the City to secure required upgrades, much of the utility demands of the site will need to be determined as part of the rezoning. Please refer to the Engineering and Public Works comments for details required.	RESPONSE: Noted.
5.	Please provide proposed floor space ratios for each proposed development area as well as a proposed breakdown of floor areas for the uses proposed.	RESPONSE: As discussed at the meeting with CoV Planning on December 16, 2021, the maximum residential floor area for each DA is provided in lieu of a breakdown of non-residential uses as this will not be determined until a later stage. FSR per DA is provided - see Supplementary Project Data.
6.	Please provide a proposed schedule for the delivery of CACs, noting which phases of development the proposed CAC will accompany.	RESPONSE: Refer to 1. i.

Site Planning, massing and Accessibility		Applicant Response/Drawing Reference
7.	To expedite this application, the Applicant is encouraged to provide the alternative massing renderings and plans within the heights described in point 8 below, to be consistent with existing policy and to receive a positive recommendation at COTW (noting that height variances can be requested at the Development Permit stage, concurrent with Development Permit and more accurate building proposals).	<p>RESPONSE: Extensive studies were undertaken by the design team to determine the optimum building form for the project at a density of 3:1 FSR. A massing, without the inclusion of towers, results in taller, vertical street walls that impact the pedestrian and resident experience by reducing the amount of visible sky, decreasing sunlight, and eliminating the additional sidewalk space provided by a ground level setback. From an urban design perspective, the proposed massing (with tall buildings of 10, 13, 17 storeys), provides more generous pedestrian space at the street level, offers increased access to sky view and sunlight for both residents and passersby, and increased privacy within the commercial and residential buildings.</p> <p>From an economic perspective, the inclusion of tall buildings is key to achieving the land lift targets for the public realm improvements and the AGGV air parcel. The current proposal provides a significantly smaller number of north-facing, limited view, and, urban overlook units. A proposal without tall buildings would seriously challenge the economic viability of the project.</p> <p>This proposal seeks to support the intentions and aspirations of the Victoria 3.0 Arts and Innovation District by creating spaces for artists and makers to live and work, flexible zoning to permit a wide range of light industrial and commercial uses, a waterfront that provides a balance of marine industrial and recreational uses, a new location for the AGGV, and a high quality open space network. If development of land to the north of the site seeks approval for a similar building form and use, a similar level of site wide amenity should be provided.</p> <p>Additional commentary related to the massing is provided in the Advisory Design Panel report response.</p>
8.	The relevant policy for the area limits building heights to 10 storeys within the eastern block and 5 Storeys in the western block. While slightly higher buildings may be supported to achieve the level of amenities sought, the Victoria 3.0. economic action plan aims to support and promote core business functions while not destabilizing the sustainability of industrial and commercial uses to the north by inadvertently inflating adjacent land values and by providing precedents that pressure these adjacent areas.	
9.	The proposed elevator structure within the plaza area is not supported. A design revision should seek a location less obtrusive, coordinated with adjacent buildings and away from significant underground utilities (a large pump station is at that location).	RESPONSE: The location of the elevator - intended to provide access to the public and gallery parking - is proposed to be confirmed as part of an integrated design process with the involvement of the City at the Development Permit stage. There is an opportunity to coordinate the City planned upgrades to the lift station with the first phase of development which may result in a more positive outcome for the public realm.
10.	Please identify and include accessible options to access the waterfront (elevators, suitable ramp or sloped areas). These accessible amenities will be secured with a SRW.	RESPONSE: Access from Store Street to the waterfront will be provided via a publicly accessible elevator located adjacent to the Harbour Concourse and Discovery Square. DRAWING REFERENCE: Rezoning Application Book, pg. 25.
Uses		Applicant Response/Drawing Reference
11.	This area of waterfront is primarily intended to support light industry and working harbour functions. As such, residential uses are generally not supported within the western portion of the site, west of Store Street. Staff will be looking to the land lift analysis to evaluate the extent of residential proposed against the CAC's offered.	RESPONSE: Residential use is already permitted at 1824 and 1900 Store Street per the existing CA-3C zoning. With the extension to 1900 Store Street removed, there is an unbuilt density of approximately 86,000 sqft remaining on these sites. The proposal seeks to shift the residential use permissions (to a maximum of 51,100 sqft) slightly to the north to allow the Heritage buildings to continue to accommodate non-residential uses. DRAWING REFERENCE: Appendix C, pg. 6 (Comparative Analysis of Land Area), and, Existing Residential Density Study.
12.	Additional details are required for the proposed live-work units (how they will operate, be adjudicated, managed)	<p>The definition of 'Live/Work' proposed is borrowed from the City of Victoria zone CD-12 and includes uses such as artist studios, high tech, trades requiring artisan skills (leatherwork, jewelry, weaving, metal sculpture, seamstress work, tailoring, ceramics, stained and beaded glasswork, wood work and all forms of graphic art), etc. Per the zoning definition, at least one of those persons engaged in one of the permitted uses resides in the dwelling unit where the use they engage in is carried on. Additionally the building management will prioritize generating an art community by specifically encouraging people with backgrounds in art activities to locate in the building.</p> <p>Successful live work art studios are owned by Reliance Properties: Example 1: Arc Live Work Studios (https://www.arcstudios.ca/). Management information is provided, e.g. requirements to live here: "... <i>You do need to be an artist of some sort. IE: painter, sculptor, potter, musician, photographer, designer, inventor, actor, jeweler, etc. When looking for new tenants preferences are given to those showing the most passion for the work that they do. If you have some kind of portfolio, preferably online it can be checked out that is an added bonus...</i>"</p> <p>Example 2: 321 Railway - Raitown Studios: "<i>For painters, photographers, musicians, sculptors, and any kind of artist. Raitown Studios is a place to get serious about your craft. Please provide samples or a website of your work when inquiring about a vacancy.</i>"</p> <p>DRAWING REFERENCE: Rezoning Application Book, pg. 66 Land Use Definitions.</p>

Sustainability		Applicant Response/Drawing Reference
13.	Green building features are encouraged beyond Code requirements (green roofs, raingardens, green infrastructure, enhanced cycling facilities). These may be secured in the MDA should they be proposed.	RESPONSE: Retention and reuse of the heritage buildings is inherently sustainable. Per page 53 of the Rezoning Application Book, landscape rooftops featuring intensive or extensive plantings are under consideration and will be explored in the Development Permit stage of the project. Other current best practice sustainable building features will be considered at that time.
14.	Details of the existing shoreline state and whatever environmental mitigation measures are in place are required as well as what is proposed insofar as restoration or treatment, with the aim of creating a higher quality marine environment. Other professionals (such as a biologist) may be required at the expense of the applicant. Any contamination will be dealt with by the applicant in accordance with provincial regulations.	RESPONSE: There are Provincial Certificates of Compliance in place for all the sites that will govern their compliance with environmental standards. Shoreline improvements such as vegetation and landscape are subordinate to the COC requirements and limitations. A memo has been prepared by PGL Environmental Consultants, dated April 20, 2022 describing the shoreline conditions. Supporting text around a high-level approach to shoreline protection and enhancement has been added to the application materials. Further detail will be provided at the DP stage. DRAWING REFERENCE: Rezoning Application Book, pg. 50 Section 6.1 Blue infrastructure.
15.	As this has been identified as an area used by indigenous peoples and artifacts have been retrieved from the site, consideration to be given to recognize this within the development.	RESPONSE: The incorporation of historical artifacts and materials throughout the design has been outlined in Section 6.0 - Landscape and Open Space, in the first column titled "Celebrate History" (pg 49) as well as in Section 6.5 - Materials (pg 54). The text in section 6.2 - Green Infrastructure (pg 51) includes support for indigenous plantings. DRAWING REFERENCE: Rezoning Application Book, pages noted above.
Heritage Conservation		Applicant Response/Drawing Reference
16.	The scope of work outlined for the heritage buildings is not specified beyond noting future compliance with applicable standards. Staff are required to secure heritage improvements as part of the rezoning and therefore require a greater level of specificity to be included in the MDA. At a minimum, this will include seeking seismic upgrades to these buildings and their Heritage Designation.	RESPONSE: City staff is requesting greater specificity in the conservation plans and, at minimum, seismic upgrading, and heritage designation. However, the architectural package for a Rezoning Application does not provide the same level of detail as a Development Permit or Heritage Alteration Permit application. A scope of work with greater specificity for the heritage buildings requires a detailed architectural set to ensure a thorough, relevant, and accurate set of recommendations specifically related to the development and heritage alteration proposal rather than the schematics of a rezoning proposal. In addition, the intention is to concurrently seek heritage designation at the Heritage Alteration Permit application stage, after which an application to the Victoria Civic Heritage Trust would be sought to assist with the seismic upgrading of each of the three heritage buildings. Refer also to response included under TRG item #3.
17.	A number of refinements are requested for the Conservation plans which will be communicated directly to the Heritage consultant via the Senior Heritage Planner.	RESPONSE: In terms of refinements to the conservation plans, a meeting between the Heritage Consultant and the Senior Heritage Planner, John O'Reilly, occurred on December 21, 2021, to review the requested refinements. The Heritage Consultant completed and resubmitted the conservation plans on January 23, 2022. Additional minor revisions initiated by the Heritage Consultant led to a final resubmission of the conservation plans on April 28, 2022.
Engineering and Public Works Department Comments:		Applicant Response/Drawing Reference
<i>This preliminary review is for the applicant's plan submission received by the City on October 27th, 2021. Note that all plan resubmissions will be re-reviewed by the Engineering Department, so additional comments and/or requirements to the ones below will be sent to the applicant.</i>		
Land Development Review:		Applicant Response/Drawing Reference
Contact: Deb Becelaere, Engineering Technologist, at 250.361.0355 or dbecelaere@victoria.ca		
Conditions to be met prior to Committee of the Whole:		
18.	Confirm if subdivision is proposed and provide a preliminary plan. Also, indicate on the plan the proposed consolidation of the properties.	RESPONSE: No subdivision is contemplated at this time. Subdivision or consolidation may occur in the future, as the project progresses.
19.	Thank you for providing the letter from e2 Engineering with regards to contact with BC Hydro. Staff will require further information for review prior to Committee of the Whole and requests a meeting with the applicant and BC Hydro as soon as possible. This development will have a considerable impact on BC Hydro's network capacity and long term planning for this area.	RESPONSE: Please refer to the Technical Memorandum jointly prepared by E2 (electrical) and AE (civil).
20.	A conceptual civil plan, prepared by a professional civil engineer, for the surrounding street frontages (City right-of-way) is required. Please include in the plan:	DRAWING REFERENCE: Civil Conceptual Servicing Plan, revision B, dated April 27, 2022
	» the City's base map information, including the existing curbs, gutters, sidewalks, existing and proposed driveway crossings from the property line to the curb, etc.	RESPONSE: This is included in the Civil Conceptual Servicing Plan.

	» existing and proposed grades along the property line and the curb along all frontages	RESPONSE: Existing grades are included in the Civil Conceptual Servicing Plan. Proposed grades will be developed during the Development Permit stage, but no significant modification from existing grades is proposed along the property line or at the curbs.
	» indicate how power will be supplied to the development and include proposed locations for Pad Mounted Transformers (PMTs) (these must be situated on private property). If PMT(s) are required, they should be shown across all drawings. The conceptual conduit routing to the PMT(s) connection in the City right-of-way should be shown on the conceptual civil plan as well.	RESPONSE: The building design is not currently far enough along to determine this. Conduit routing and PMT locations will be shown at the Development Permit stage.
	» All existing utility pole locations and existing third-party infrastructure	RESPONSE: This is included in the Civil Conceptual Servicing Plan.
	» Note: As per Section 22 of the Victoria Subdivision and Development Servicing Bylaw No. 12-042, all third-party utility services supplied through wires to the property shall be installed underground in ducts.	Noted.
21.	Engineering requirements above and beyond the City's Subdivision and Servicing Bylaw that will form part of the Master Development Agreement with respect to underground utility requirements. These will be outlined in subsequent reviews of the rezoning plans and conceptual civil plans.	RESPONSE: Noted. A meeting with Engineering staff was held on January 31, 2022. It is anticipated that City of Victoria staff will confirm requirements and provide further feedback on the conceptual design of the underground utilities during the DP process.
22.	Staff support the undergrounding of BC Hydro services for both Discovery Street and Store Street and The City will apply for a BC Hydro Beautification Grant for both frontages on behalf of the developer. The beautification grant would not be applied for until at least September 2023. A letter from the developer is required confirming that the developer agrees to pay two-thirds of the cost (with BC Hydro paying one-third) if the grant is approved. There is no guarantee that the project will be approved by BC Hydro depending on other applications submitted. If the grant doesn't get approved, the developer would then have to proceed with undergrounding without the grant and solely fund the entire cost. A legal agreement to secure the undergrounding (either with the Beautification Grant or without it) would be required prior to Public Hearing. We would also include this in the MDA.	RESPONSE: Please refer to the Technical Memorandum jointly prepared by E2 (electrical) and AE (civil).
Community Planning Review (Public Realm)		Applicant Response/Drawing Reference
Contact: Joaquin Karakas, Senior Urban Designer, at 250.361.0535 or JKarakas@victoria.ca Contact: Anna Babicz, Urban Designer, at 250.361.0496 or ababicz@victoria.ca		
Conditions to be met prior to Committee of the Whole:		
23.	An approved design of the public realm improvements for all surrounding frontages will be required for the plan submission for the Committee of the Whole.	DRAWING REFERENCE: Rezoning Application Book, pages 32-36. RESPONSE: A description of each street's public realm character and components has been added alongside the previously submitted graphic representations. Further details will be provided at the Development Permit stage.
24.	Incorporate in the frontage plans the City's Downtown Public Realm Plan and Streetscape Standards (DPRP), specifically the 'Rock Bay' District area esthetics (benches, decorative pedestrian lights, bike racks, bins, etc.) that support the broader public realm composition and expression.	DRAWING REFERENCE: Rezoning Application Book, pages noted below. RESPONSE: The DPRP policy plan is noted as an important reference for the design of the streetscapes (page 11). Section 5.5 - On the Street (page 32) describes a public realm design approach that aligns with the DPRP as a guide. A similar reference is included in the Landscape Approach section under Section 6.5 - Materials (page 55).
25.	All public realm areas and areas intended to be used by the public as part of an SRW require a set of design standards/ guidelines that suitably describe each area, its location, extents, and dimensions for the purposes of securing those details within the MDA. With regards to surface treatments and designs within publicly accessible SRW areas, consider:	DRAWING REFERENCE: Rezoning Application Book (RAB). Appendix C, pg 3, CAC Summary for approximate areas and dimensions. RESPONSE: Text for each streetscape and open space within the site area has been provided in the RAB (section 5.5, pages 32-36, and sections 6.6-6.8, pages 55-63). The open space descriptions have been enhanced to touch on the following topics: paving materials, site furnishings, accessibility, sustainability and stormwater management, planting material, public art and special features, and programming and events. As a reference to the site's industrial past, steel rail may be incorporated into the paving design of the public plaza in a barrier-free manner. Further details, including loading specifications for individual streets will be provided at the Development Permit stage.
	» high quality natural materials	
	» curb-less environments where appropriate, using bollards and other approaches to delineate pedestrian zones from the roadways	
	» universal and accessible design approaches throughout (please remove references to rail being used on the public realm and SRW areas)	
	» where pavers or other special surface treatments are proposed in the roadway, include a specification that confirms suitability for commercial truck traffic	
	» incorporating innovative stormwater approaches where appropriate	
	» incorporating interpretative information and public art celebrating not only industrial heritage but other parts of site history, ecology, function evolution (such as telling the story of the innovation district, etc.)	

Transportation Review		Applicant Response/Drawing Reference
Contact: Steve Hutchison, Transportation Planner, at 250.361.0338 or shutchison@victoria.ca		
Condition to be met prior to Committee of the Whole:		
26.	In addition to the “Harbour Concourse” and “Discovery Square” SRWs offered by the applicant, as a condition of rezoning, staff will make a recommendation to Council that two Statutory Rights-of-Way (SRW) through the property be secured for the purposes of advancing the 2008 Harbour Pathway Plan objectives. Recognizing the applicant’s intent to provide waterfront industrial uses, and the supporting policy, the harbour pathway SRW is proposed to run along Discovery Lane (annotated as SRW 1 in the below diagram) so long as active industrial uses are operating at the waterfront. If industrial uses cease operations for a period of >6months, SRW1 will be discharged and SRW 2 would be enacted. In addition to the proposed SRW, a cash contribution will be sought to construct a harbour pathway at SRW2 when SRW2 is discharged.	RESPONSE: SRW 1 - As discussed at a meeting on April 13, 2022 attended by CoV staff M. Betanzo, K. Hoese, A. Meyer, Discovery Lane is to remain a private service lane and no SRW will be provided. SRW 2 - A new SRW has been added along the waterfront south of Harbour Concourse to accomodate a Harbour Pathway. If industry no longer requires direct harbour access and onsite uses are compatible with public access, the Harbour Pathway could continue north along the harbour edge. A statutory right-of-way (SRW) will secure this as a future possibility. In the meantime, the extension of the Harbour Pathway is routed around the working harbour edge to allow marine industrial activities to continue. DRAWING REFERENCE: Rezoning Application Book, pg 25. Appendix C, pg 3, CAC Summary.
27.	Accessibility to the waterfront is a key objective within the Harbour Pathway Plan. As part of, or in addition to, the requested harbour pathway SRWs, alternative accessibility approaches will also be considered (accessible elevators, ramps etc. (secured via a SRW)	RESPONSE: refer to the response included under item 10.
28.	Please provide commentary/ analysis on whether or not the applicant would consider dedicating the midblock laneway between Discovery and Chatham Street and how this might affect the proposal.	RESPONSE: The lane can only be provided as an SRW. The underground parking will run below the lane and portions of the building will be overtop of it.
29.	GoVictoria was adopted in 2019 and should form part of the Policy Context (Page 10) of the Capital Culture District-Comprehensive Development rezoning document.	DRAWING REFERENCE: Rezoning Application Book, pg. 11. RESPONSE: GoVictoria has now been included in the Policy Context review.
30.	Some of the view images are incorrectly labeled (Page 15) of the Capital Culture District-Comprehensive Development rezoning document.	DRAWING REFERENCE: Rezoning Application Book, pg. 15. RESPONSE: The labels have been corrected.
31.	Provide cycling network design recommendations that integrate Street Meet Square with the wider cycling network, transitioning from the 1-way north-south protected cycling lanes north and south of the extended plaza area. Reference the integrated design guidance from the BC Active Transportation design Guidelines and other best practice examples.	RESPONSE: Refer to TIA section 3.3.1 'Street Meet Square and Store Street Treatments - Concept', and 3.3.2 'Integration into Forthcoming Cycling Improvements' The final design will be developed in coordination with the City in a future stage of the project.
32.	To support the proposed OCP amendment, rezoning request, and increased densities proposed, staff will make a recommendation to Council that a sidewalk constructed on the north side of Discovery Street between Store Street and Government Street be required as a condition of rezoning.	RESPONSE: The sidewalk on the north side of Discovery falls outside of the frontage and scope of this proposed development.
33.	To support the proposed OCP amendment, rezoning request, and increased densities proposed, staff will make a recommendation to Council that a contribution of \$150,000 toward the installation of a traffic signal at the intersection of Pembroke Street and Government Street be required as a condition of rezoning.	RESPONSE: The traffic signal at Pembroke and Government is already installed and in operation as of +/- April 2022. The need for the signal pre-dates the proposed development (pedestrian and vehicle safety + vehicle turning issues).
With regards to the Transportation Impact Assessment (TIA) completed by Watt Consulting Group, dated October 25th, 2021:		
34.	Provide trip allocation diagram at study intersections pre- and post-development.	RESPONSE: Refer to TIA Appendix B
35.	Add the intersections of Fisdard Street at Store Street and Pandora Avenue at Store Street to the study scope.	RESPONSE: Refer to TIA section 2.3. Text has been added to address the lack of these two intersections.
36.	Complete observations of existing truck traffic movements within the precinct. Include a rerouting diagram of truck traffic with potential removal of Store Street from the truck route network between Chatham Street and Discovery Street, along with turning templates of a design vehicle representative of existing industrial tenants, including the asphalt plant. Please illustrate using turning template software how large commercial vehicles including those typically used by Island Asphalt will negotiate turns at the intersections of Discovery Street and Store Street, Store Street at Pembroke Street, and Pembroke Street at Government Street.	RESPONSE: Refer to TIA section 9.0 'Heavy Truck Discussion' Truck traffic is currently accommodated on all the noted streets and therefore further detailed turning movement analysis is deemed unnecessary. The recently installed traffic signal at Government and Pembroke was designed by the City and is assumed to adequately control truck movements.
37.	Please provide an analysis of the impacts resulting from the recommendation to reduce the ability of trucks to utilize Store Street.	RESPONSE: Refer to TIA section 9.0 'Heavy Truck Discussion'
38.	Please provide an analysis of truck routing and turning movements to support the assertion that the City should encourage truck traffic to utilize Government Street.	RESPONSE: Refer to TIA section 9.0 'Heavy Truck Discussion' See comment 36 above and refer to TIA section 9.0 'Heavy Truck Discussion'. The improvement of safety, air quality and the acoustic environment for people in the emerging district were the main impetus for suggesting limiting the through-routing on Store, Chatham and Discovery Streets of truck traffic from adjacent heavy industry.

39.	Please provide analysis of the impacts related to the recommendations for Pembroke Street to be the sole truck route to and from the area and anticipated impacts on adjacent properties.	RESPONSE: Refer to TIA section 9.0 'Heavy Truck Discussion'
40.	Please provide details in the TIA on the size and type of vehicles proposed to be prohibited on Store Street, how Store Street will be designed to prohibit these types of vehicles, how this prohibition will be posted and how this prohibition will be enforced. The anticipated financial costs and likelihood of enforcing this restriction will also be required in consultation with City of Victoria Police.	RESPONSE: Refer to TIA section 3.3.1 'Street Meet Square and Store Street Treatments - Concept'. During special events where this section of Store Street is temporarily closed, all vehicles would be prohibited and potentially controlled by bollards. The final design is to be determined and will be worked out in collaboration with the City.
41.	Please provide information on the origin of "the desire to re-route asphalt plant truck" noted in Section 9.0 of the TIA. Also, please provide supporting policies and documents, dates, contact information, and correspondence with impacted businesses, including the asphalt plant, which support the "desire" to restrict traffic on Store Street and "reduce Store Street as a major road in the area".	RESPONSE: Refer to TIA section 9.0 'Heavy Truck Discussion'. The aspirations of Victoria 3.0 and other City policies pertaining to resilient and livable city planning point to a more equitable allocation of space and the safety for people of street rights-of-way. The City's recent (occurring some time after the applicant's assertions) redesign and signalization of the Pembroke and Government intersection positively addresses and potentially resolves the potential issues identified in the site analysis phase of this project. The new signalized intersection will effectively reduce the heavy truck traffic on Store Street near Capital Iron that is heading to Government and out to the highway. Refer also to Item 44 below. No businesses were consulted.
42.	Please evaluate and describe how emergency vehicles and emergency response time will be impacted by the proposed changes on Store Street between Discovery Street and Chatham Street.	RESPONSE: Refer to TIA section 10.0 'Emergency Services'
43.	Note that the TIA is not intended to be a proposal to implement a road closure. It should focus on the impacts from potentially closing the road.	RESPONSE: Road closures were not analyzed as Store Street is only proposed to be closed occasionally for special events. Traffic volumes and performance in TIA show short term closures will have little effect on vehicle traffic as alternative routing options exist.
44.	Note that to complement the land uses in the Rock Bay neighbourhood, Store Street, Pembroke Street, Discovery Street and Chatham Street are included in the truck network. This grid provides flexibility for accessing and servicing the neighbourhood and reduces the distances travelled by larger vehicles. This network also disperses traffic, improves safety and reduces the number of turns at intersections by large vehicles. Direct access to all portions of the City as well as Douglas Street and Blanshard Street to and from the Rock Bay employment area is also best provided by a comprehensive truck network. Existing residential and future land uses and redevelopment on Pembroke Street is also considered.	RESPONSE: Heavy use of large trucks increases danger to pedestrians and cyclists - the size, visual limitations, weight, exposure of wheels, noise, and pollution, are also negative impacts. Prioritization / accommodation of uses and modes in the area ultimately rests with the City, and trade offs will be necessary to balance as the mix of uses change in the area in accordance with the City's vision and larger mobility goals in Victoria 3.0 and GoVictoria plans. Please also see rationale provided for point number 41. above and TIA section 9.0 'Heavy Truck Discussion'.
45.	Please provide the data sources to support the statement of "near-normal" traffic conditions have returned in Section 2.3 of the TIA. Also please elaborate on the "City of Victoria has 0% growth of traffic in the core area" statement in this section referencing the previously provided screen line counts including how (tubes counters), where (screen line locations), and when (annually in the summer) this data is collected.	RESPONSE: Refer to TIA Section 2.3 'Traffic Volumes'. The COVID traffic statement is based on WATT's extensive traffic counting program.
46.	The motor vehicle volume captured at the driveway at 1515 Douglas Street may not accurately reflect the trip generation rates for this property. Staff are aware of the limited supply of parking at this property and that many employees of this property park at the two City owned parkades located within one block of this property. Additional research and evaluation of the trip generation rates including using suitable ITE rates for urban developments should be used to further test anticipated impacts of the proposed development. Please provide details on the transportation observation dates and times. Please provide pre- and post-floor areas by land uses and related trip rates.	RESPONSE: Refer to TIA Section 4 'Trip Generation'
47.	Please remove site observations completed but not included in the analysis. An observed site was not included in the proposed rate and is an order of magnitude larger than the rate chosen. A more appropriate approach may instead be to use a discounted rate from ITE. This may better capture vehicle trips generated but parked at adjacent public and private parking facilities which is expected at 750 Pandora Avenue and 1515 Douglas Street.	RESPONSE: Refer to TIA Section 4 'Trip Generation'
48.	Please provide commentary and additional information on how the anticipated trips generated will inform and relate to the quantity of parking proposed on the development.	RESPONSE: The amount of parking provided will be determined at the Development Permit stage and comply with City requirements.
49.	Following any necessary adjustments to the trip generation rates once additional analysis is completed, provide potential mitigation measures at Chatham Street and Government Street, Pandora Avenue and Store Street.	RESPONSE: Refer to TIA Section 4 'Trip Generation'
50.	For future information, as a result of redevelopment, the on-street parking on all frontages will be changed to metered parking. Please illustrate metered parking equipment including pay station placements on drawings submitted for the development and building permit.	Noted.
51.	It is unclear if recent major redevelopment has been included in LOS estimates, notably but not limited to 1628 Store Street, 515 Chatham Street, 533 Chatham Street, and 610 Herald Street. Please clarify.	RESPONSE: Refer to TIA Section 4.2 'Concurrent Developments'

52.	Please provide an estimated vehicle volume and the future anticipated speed of traffic on Store Street pre- and post-development.	RESPONSE: Volumes for current and future (0% growth rate) are included in the TIA. Speed study is outside the scope of a TIA, and the area is signed 30km/h.
53.	Please provide a warrant calculation for the all-way stops proposed at the intersections of Chatham Street and Discovery Street at Store Street.	RESPONSE: Refer to TIA Section 8.1 'Vehicle Mitigations'
54.	Within the TIA, please illustrate all turning movements, AM/PM peaks and future volumes with background traffic added at intersections and proposed access points.	RESPONSE: Refer to TIA Appendix B
55.	Please include Synchro reports in an appendix to the TIA.	RESPONSE: Refer to TIA Appendix C
Underground Utilities Review:		Applicant Response/Drawing Reference
Contact: Anhad Jolly, Utility Planning Technologist, at 250.361.0263 or ajolly@victoria.ca		
Condition to be met prior to Committee of the Whole:		
56.	City Staff will set up a meeting with the applicant to review the Underground Utilities with the applicant's engineering consultant to discuss the proposal, the City's current system, and needed future upgrades to mains and sewer pump stations. As noted in comment no. 21, utility upgrades may be required and would be secured within the MDA.	RESPONSE: A meeting was held on Jan 31, 2022. More information regarding City requests is required. The pump station upgrade was discussed. City staff were provided with complete demand information for water, sewer and storm drain, and the potential location for new mains. It is anticipated that City of Victoria staff will confirm requirements and provide further feedback on the conceptual design of the underground utilities as part of the DP Application process.
Stormwater Management Review:		Applicant Response/Drawing Reference
Contact: Brianne Czypyha, Stormwater Management Specialist, at 250.361.0443 or bczypyha@victoria.ca		
Recommendations prior to Committee of the Whole:		
57.	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 plaza areas, pathways and other hard surfaces, green roofs, rain gardens and the preservation of as much green/open space as possible. The property owner may be eligible for financial incentives if the designs meet requirements as per the City's Rainwater Management Standards. Please visit www.victoria.ca/stormwater for more information.	Noted.
58.	The proposed use of green infrastructure to manage on-site stormwater runoff is supported. Demonstration of how the designs will meet the City's Rainwater Management Standards will be required prior to DP approval.	RESPONSE: Additional details regarding the stormwater system will be provided at the DP Application stage. Diagrams and sections, and other required documentation will be provided. Coordination protocols are in place between disciplines aimed at mitigating conflicts with underground infrastructure as well as between utility ROW zones and pedestrian circulation.
59.	Staff strongly encourage the applicant to consider incorporating stormwater treatment for the roadway water for all frontages in the design, such as integration with a tree soil cell system through collection pipes.	DRAWING REFERENCE: Rezoning Application Book, pg 32-36, 50 RESPONSE: Section 5.5 - On the Street speaks to the incorporation of stormwater infrastructure along Chatham Street and Government Street. This opportunity will be further explored at the DP stage for the other streets (Discovery, Store) but it is anticipated that there may be conflicts with the underground utilities.
60.	Transport Canada will not approve any new developments to discharge to the Harbour (between Ogden Point and the Selkirk Trestle). The proposed storm drain main realignment to the harbour, per Figure 4 in Associated Engineering's Technical Memorandum may require Transport Canada approval.	RESPONSE: A meeting was held on March 4, 2022 between Civil Engineer, Ann Stephenson, and Adam Steele of the City of Victoria to discuss this issue. The proposed drain main realignment was reviewed. Discussions determined discharge locations are not changing, instead, all proposed changes occur upstream. Either green source control or mechanical stormwater treatment may be required upstream depending on the ultimate design. Discussions with the Mr. Steele indicate this will not require Transport Canada approval.
Parks Division Comments:		Applicant Response/Drawing Reference
Contact: Tanya Soroka, Telephone: 250-361-0739		
Condition to be met prior to Committee of the Whole:		
Open space and Landscape Plans:		
61.	This Development is covered under Tree Protection Bylaw #21-035.	RESPONSE: Noted. This will be incorporated at the Development Permit stage.
62.	It was noted that trees along Chatham and Discovery Street appear to be on private property (13) so the applicant must confirm which are private and which are municipal and have the Arborist report updated depending on outcome of increase in private trees.	RESPONSE: During the January 26, 2022 meeting that was attended by many of the stakeholders in the project, Parks (Brooke Stark) brought this question forward, and D. Clark Arboriculture (Darryl Clark) responded that the survey had been reviewed twice with inputs from DCA, Hapa and the surveyor and was considered accurate. The trees have been plotted correctly and ownership is considered established. This answer was acknowledged by Parks.
63.	All municipal trees are protected trees and should be retained where feasible. This is particularly important for areas with low tree canopy such as this.	RESPONSE: Every effort is being made to retain trees and where retention is not feasible provide replacement solutions with a high level of success.

64.	Trees along Government should have protective fencing installed to ensure no damage is done and protective root zones should be identified on the tree preservation site plan.	RESPONSE: Protective fencing will be installed during construction and will be noted on the DP submission. The tree preservation site plan includes the protective root zones areas. For clarity, the legend on plan L0-02 is duplicated on L0-03. An approximate protected tree zone is included on page 24 of the Rezoning Application booklet. DRAWING REFERENCE: L0-02, L0-03 Tree Management Plan Rezoning Application Book, page as noted above.
65.	A minimum of 30% of the required common landscaped areas should include a diverse combination of plants and vegetation that are native to southern Vancouver Island, food bearing (capable of being harvested for food and medicine) or that provide pollinator habitats.	RESPONSE: Noted. This will be incorporated at the Development Permit Application stage.
66.	Retain and protect the 3 pin oaks along Chatham Street	RESPONSE: These trees are adjacent to E1 along Chatham Street. Tree #7 is approx. 4 m from the lane. It's condition has been assessed as 'fair' in structure and health. Tree #8 has been assessed as 'good' in structure and health. Tree #9 has been assessed as 'good' in structure and 'fair' in health. All three trees are in conflict with the necessary excavation zones for future building foundations and underground parking and will likely be impacted by excavation for improvements and replacement of underground infrastructure and amenities upgrades (sidewalks etc.).
67.	On both Discovery and Store Street additional street trees should be planted in the ground area where bulb outs are proposed or existing.	RESPONSE: Where feasible, trees have been included on landscaped bulges and street edges, along with the on-street parking spaces and bicycle lanes. Both streets will accommodate underground and overground utilities, limiting the opportunity for more trees. During the DP application stage, efforts will be made to reduce the conflict and include more trees.
Replacement Trees, Tree Minimum, soil volumes:		Applicant Response/Drawing Reference
68.	The tree minimum for this development is 136 trees based on a total development area of approximately 26,871m ² . Tree minimums include any replacement trees that are required to be planted through the removal of bylaw protected trees.	Noted.
69.	Security for the replacement trees is \$2000/tree up to a maximum of \$50,000.	Noted.
70.	For any replacement trees that cannot be planted, a cash in lieu payment of \$2000/tree will be required.	Noted.
71.	The placement of municipal trees in the new boulevard proposed in the middle of Government Street requires suitable soil volumes to survive and must avoid any underground utilities.	RESPONSE: The new Government Street boulevard and trees, designed and constructed by the City, are beyond the scope and property of this proposal.
72.	Soil cells with adequate soil volumes/ soil cells (confirmed by the project arborist) will be required for all street, and boulevard trees.	RESPONSE: Noted. A revised description highlighting this requirement is included. DRAWING REFERENCE: Rezoning Application Book, pg. 51
73.	Adequate soil volumes must be met for replacement and private trees proposed over or on structures, secured via conditions within the MDA.	Noted.
Building Permit stage:		Applicant Response/Drawing Reference
74.	A landscape deposit will be required for reestablishment of municipal trees and boulevards (turf, landscaping, trees etc).	Noted. To be addressed at Building Permit Application stage.
75.	Each bylaw protected tree on the property will require a tree permit for either removal, working within the Protected Root Zone (PRZ), tree pruning and tree minimum. Submit a completed tree permit application form to treepermits@victoria.ca to apply for a tree permit for each tree requiring works.	
76.	The applicant will be required to pay the appraised value of all boulevard trees proposed for removal.	
77.	At the Building Permit stage, Parks will post a notice on the tree that it is to be cut down after 10 working days. The purpose of the notice is to keep local residents informed of tree removals. When the removal notification process has lapsed, the tree and stump must be removed by a private company contracted and paid for by the applicant.	
Permits and Inspections Division Comments:		Applicant Response/Drawing Reference
Contact: Ray Berkeley, Telephone: (250) 361-0344 Conditions to be met prior to the Committee of the Whole:		
78.	There is, at this time, not enough information of the preliminary plans to provide a preliminary review based on the BCBC.	RESPONSE: Noted. To be addressed at Development Permit/Building Permit Application stages. Preliminary structural design to comply with Building Code seismic design standards and will be coordinated for the proposed buildings at the Development Permit Application stage.
79.	Designer to ensure FD connections are within the required 45 m.	
80.	Designer and structural engineer to ensure buildings built at the PL do not sway over the PL in the case of seismic event.	

Fire Department Comments:		Applicant Response/Drawing Reference
Contact: Brad Sifert, Telephone: (250) 920-3365		
81.	Most comments will be dealt with at the BP process.	RESPONSE: Noted. To be addressed at Development Permit/Building Permit stage.
82.	Ensure that the FDC is no more than 45 meters from hydrant.	
83.	The FDC must face the street and not be located near the main doors as to block the access areas.	
84.	Fire safety plan required prior to occupancy.	
85.	Key Vault is also required.	
86.	The Fire Hydrant is to be located within 45 m of the proposed building.	
87.	Emergency Communications Requirements (supporting documentation to be presented at BP submittal):	
	» Radio amplification system or Bi-Directional Amplifier (BDA) required to ensure adequate radio coverage for emergency service responders in the underground levels. Provide documentation of either design or commitment to install by qualified electrical engineer.	
	» CREST would be required to occupy, at a minimum, an 8'x 10' secured equipment room on the roof level or close to the roof level to permit the construction of a new communication transmission site, to offset the radio shadowing of the new building in question. We could do roof top cabinets for the equipment, but we prefer a room space as described. All transmitting equipment will be provided by CREST. CREST will need input at the detailed design phase to outline their space needs near the top of the building (i.e., mechanical room), and CREST will also be provided with:	
	» 10kW emergency power 120V/240V in the occupied space	
	» 2/0 ground tied directly into the building ground grid (4" conduit duct for this from basement to roof top antennae)	
	» 2.5-ton HVAC	
	» Permission for mounting of external antennas	
	» Adequate cable path from equipment room to roof antennas	
	» Agreement where to place CREST antennae & microwave on the roof.	