

534 W. Pender Street Vancouver, BC V6B 1V3 telephone : 604.687.4457 www.shape-arch.ca

31 January, 2018
Alec Johnston, Area Planner
Development Services
City of Victoria
City Hall
1 Centennial Square
Victoria, BC V8W 1P6

Re: RHODO: 1712 + 1720 Fairfield Road (Rez. No. 00618 and DP No. 000519)

Dear Mr. Johnston,

This letter, together with the accompanying revised drawing set will serve to respond to the letter received from the City of Victoria regarding the above rezoning and development permit application. As requested in the City letter, this document will itemize revisions made to the application. As a general note, description of the three blocks of townhouses has been revised for clarity. The block on the south side of the site on Fairfield Road (previously Block 3) is now Block 1. The block on the west side of the site along Hollywood Park (previously Block 1) is now Block 2. The revised 2 story block on the north side of the site (previously Block 2) is now Block 3. Please accept our apologies for any confusion.

The conditions outlined in the City Letter are numerically listed below with numbers corresponding to the drawing set that accompanies this letter. Conditions from each City Department are listed in the sequence provided in the letter. Please see below:

A. DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DIVISION COMMENTS:

1. Housing Agreement

We understand the recommendation for a housing agreement to prevent restrictions on rentals.

2. Design Panel Review

We understand the requirement for Advisory Design Panel Review. We are planning to present to Advisory Design Panel on February 28th of this year.

3. Site Planning

The site planning of the project has been revised significantly to respond to Development Services comments and reflect discussions with Luke Mari at your meeting with him in December of last year. In particular, the following revisions have been made:

 Block 3 (previously Block 2), the block on the northern portion of the site, has been revised from a 3-story block to a 2-story block with finished floor elevations for each unit, on both the courtyard side and backyard side of the block, coordinated with existing grades such that units give on to adjacent exterior spaces very close to natural grade.

- Block 2 (previously Block 1) has been revised in a similar manner to Block 3 such that units meet adjacent grade for both front door and backyard conditions.
- As a result of the above strategy, and with a reconfiguration of the parking area, the overall building massing has been revised to reflect the sloping grades of the site. Rooflines now follow the grades as they slope to the northwest corner of the site. The end result, is a significant reduction in the apparent and actual volume of the development, particularly on the northern property line and northern portion of the western property line.
- Spacing between blocks has been increased as outlined below as item 4
 which has allowed for an increase in useable outdoor spaces particularly for
 Blocks 2 and 3 (Previously Blocks 1 and 2).
- As a result of the revisions outlined above, more consideration has gone into the resulting courtyard / lane spaces that separate each block with the semipublic void spaces forming the glue that holds the three blocks together.
- Lastly, a convenience stair has been added from the parking level to the
 centre of the courtyard such that residents will flow into the middle of the
 development and circulate out to their units from the centre.

Drawing Reference: A100, A101, and A102

Design Rationale Document Reference: 5.0 Site Planning Revisions, p. 13

4. Stacked Townhouse

The site planning and architectural language of the project has been significantly revised in response to the comments provided. In particular, the spacing between the three blocks has been increased. The spacing between blocks 1 and 2 has been increased from 4.175m to 5.41m. The spacing between blocks 2 and 3 has been increased from 4.79m to 6m. Lastly the proposed sideyard setback on the western property line has been increased from 2.695m to a minimum of 3m. The property line between the subject properties and Hollywood Park angles slightly such that the setback increases as one moves to the north.

Drawing References: A102, L1 and L2

Design Rationale Document Reference: 5.0 Site Planning Revisions, p. 13

5. CPTED Analysis

CPTED considerations were fundamental to the development of the project. Along the western property line, living spaces from the B2 units and the C2 unit look directly onto the adjacent park with finished floor levels such that sightlines to the park are unobstructed, providing "Eyes on the Park".

Useable outdoor space for these units are framed by fences that allow clear sightlines. Exterior lighting will be provided to ensure adequate illumination of these edge conditions along the eastern side of Hollywood Park. Access to the park is via one communal entrance that aligns with the lane / courtyard between Blocks 2 and 3 (previously Blocks 1 and 2).

The intention is that the development increases security in the park through passive surveillance, carefully considered planting and landscaping and through complimentary exterior lighting.

Drawing References: A102, L1 and A300

Design Rational Document Reference: 4.5 Urban Design Rationale, p. 11



6. Road Dedication

A road dedication is not proposed along Fairfield Road.

7. OCP Amendment (Building Height)

We understand the requirement for the OCP amendment due to the building height exceeding 2 stories. For reference there is a similar multi-family building with three stories across Fairfield Road opposite Hollywood Park (1669 Fairfield).

8. Architectural Elements

The architectural language of the project has been significantly redesigned since the initial application in response to the comments provided by Development Services. The proposed metal grate screen along the Fairfield Road elevation has been removed. The proportion, scale and materiality of the windows has been revised. The proposed exterior material palette has been revised as follows. The ground floor of Blocks 1 through 3 include a grey rock dash stucco cladding. The remainder of the cladding on all three blocks is cedar shingles with vertical cedar accents. All cedar cladding is stained to a pale grey and allowed to weather. Roof finishes are metal standing seam.

Drawing References: A401, A402 and A403

Design Rational Document Reference: 7.0 Revised Form + Character, p. 21

9. Design of Grate Screen

As outlined above (under item 8) the grate screen proposed along the Fairfield Road (southeast) elevation has been deleted and replaced with vertical cedar accents. Drawing References: A403

10. Materials Board

A materials board will be provided at the time of the Advisory Design Panel review. *Please refer to Digital Materials Board, Design Rational Document Reference: A0.3 Appendix 03, p. 37*

11. Bicycle Room Configuration

The bicycle parking area has been revised. Please see the response to item 19 below.

12. Sightlines at Parkade Entrance

Built in planters at the parkade entrance / building interface have been removed. Retaining walls for the parking ramp have been configured to taper down to allow clear sight lines from the parking ramp to the sidewalk. Sightlines are shown on the revised site plan.

Drawing References: A102

13. Details on Trellis System

This feature has been deleted as per Elevation drawing A403.

14. Townhouse Units: Useable Private Outdoor Space

The site plan has been revised to provide more generous useable outdoor space for townhouse units. As outlined in item 3 above, Blocks 2 and 3 have been revised such that rear yards are at or very near existing grade such that units access outdoor space without requiring regular retaining walls and associated planters. Fences between unit outdoor spaces extend to the property line fences on the west and north property lines.



Drawing References: A102

Design Rational Document Reference: 5.0 Site Planning + Massing, p. 13

15. Ramp to Underground Parking

The ramp to the underground parking has now been enclosed as requested.

Drawing References: A102 and A301.

Design Rationale Document Reference: 5.0 Site Planning Revisions, p. 13

16. Fence Height

Fence heights have been revised to comply with the Fence bylaw.

Drawing References: L4

17. Tree Legend Labelling

Labelling has been revised on the legend for drawing L2.

Design Rational Document Reference: 6.4 Tree Removal Plan, p. 19

18. Bylaw Replacement Trees

Trees required for bylaw replacement have been identified on the revised landscape plans.

Drawing References: L2

Design Rational Document Reference: 6.4 Tree Removal Plan, p. 19

B. ENGINEERING AND PUBLIC WORKS COMMENTS

(Transportation Review):

19. Bicycle Parking

The bicycle parking area has been completely redesigned such that all spaces are for horizontal bike parking with a depth of 1.8m. The aisle width is 1.5m. A window has been added from the main parking area into the bicycle parking area. 29 spaces are shown exceeding the requirements requested.

Drawing References: A200

Design Rational Document Reference: 8.2 Parking + Traffic Flow, p. 25

(Underground Utilities):

20. Sewage Flow Rates

We understand that the development could increase sewage flow rates to a peak flow that exceeds the anticipated flow. An engineer's report will be provided to confirm flow rates and identify the potential need for flow attenuation.

21. Covenant Requirement

We understand that if sewage attenuation is required that a covenant will be required.

C. PARKS DEPARTMENT COMMENTS:

22. Boulevard Tree Replacement

A replacement boulevard tree is shown on the revised landscape plans.

Drawing References: L2

Design Rational Document Reference: 6.4 Tree Removal Plan, p. 19

23. Tree Replacement

Replacement trees, to meet the 2:1 requirement, are shown on the revised landscape plans.

Drawing References: L2



Design Rational Document Reference: 6.4 Tree Removal Plan, p. 19

24. Arborist Report: Tree Removal

A revised arborist's report will be provided.

25. L2 Drawing Legend

Drawing legend on L2 has been revised to indicated bylaw protected trees and references to "Owned by Neighbour" have been removed.

26. Gate to Hollywood Park

Landscape plans and site plan have been revised to show single communal gate to Hollywood Park.

Drawing References: A102 Drawing References: L1 and L4

27. Boulevard Tree Removal Fee

We understand the requirement for the city boulevard tree removal non-refundable fee.

D. PERMITS AND INSPECTIONS DIVISION COMMENTS:

28. Code Classification

The project will be a Part 3 building.

29. Egress from 3rd Story

An alternative solution will be sought for egress from stacked townhouse units. This configuration is allowed under the Vancouver Building Bylaw. The applicant has successfully used this alternative solution with reference to the VBBL to address this egress requirement in another jurisdiction recently. The alternative solution will be submitted with the Building Permit application.

30. Decks on Western Block (Adjacent to Hollywood Park)

The western sideyard setback has been increased to a minimum of 3m. Ground treatment of unit outdoor space has been changed to address this issue.

31. Spatial Separation Calculations

The distance between Blocks 1 and 2 (formerly Blocks 1 and 3) has been increased to 5.4m. Spatial separation calculations will be provided with the Building Permit application.

We trust that the revisions outlined above and provided in the revised drawing set meets the City's requirements and look forward to the project progressing through the Rezoning / Development Permit process.

If you have any questions regarding this submission, please feel free to contact us.

Sincerely.

Alec Smith, Architect AIBC, Principal,



SHAPE Architecture Inc.

On behalf of **Luke Mari**, Director of Development Purdey Group / Aryze Developments Inc.

