

## **List of Bubbled Revisions**

### **Architecture**

A000 – updated areas to reflect Victoria area calculations, revised building code summary to Part 9 application to address code comments

A301-302 – Revised elevations for Part 9 exit requirements, increased window size at L3 for exiting

A900 – revised areas to conform to Victoria area calculations, added requested area information

### **Arborist**

Tree Management Plan- report updated to revised Landscape Plan drawings and details

### **Civil**

C200 – Added proposed Telus/Shaw conduit, revised shallow utilities note

### **Landscape**

Sheet 1 – Tree well adjusted to Arborist requirements; planting quantities revised.

Sheet 2 – Tree well detail

Sheet 3 – Tree Replacement Plan

#### **Additional Landscape Notes:**

1. There are 8 required Replacement Trees on the site, based on its area (approx. 1525m<sup>2</sup>). We are currently proposing 4 new trees which fall under Schedule E Part 2. Valued at 0.5 trees each, these 4 trees are worth a total of 2.0 Replacement Trees. We are also retaining one large specimen tree (the oak, located in the SRW). This retained Specimen Tree is worth 3.0 Replacement Trees. No offsite trees are proposed to be removed.  
  
Our tree calculation is as follows: 8 total required Replacement Trees (-2 for the 4 proposed Schedule E Part 2 Replacement Trees) (-3 for the retained Specimen Tree) = 3.0 Replacement Trees still required. There is no available space on the site with adequate soil volume to support these 3 Replacement Trees, It is our opinion that the primary reason we are unable to plant the required 8 Replacement Trees on the site is the City's requirement that no trees be planted within the large SRW along Shelbourne. There is ample space in the SRW to plant trees, but we have been directed to not do so.
2. We recognize that the raingarden previously located in the SRW has been removed from the design (following a comment from the Design Panel). In addition to the infiltration provided by the soft landscaped areas, we are currently showing permeable pavers for all unit patios on the site.
3. Additionally, as noted in the first response to CoV comments, this project site is not within the Bowker Creek Watershed area. As such, the guidelines do not apply, though the design has made best efforts to comply.

Please let me know if you have trouble accessing the linked files or there is any additional information required to complete your report.

Sincerely,

Alex McCumber, Architect AIBC, LEED AP  
[adm@dhk.ca](mailto:adm@dhk.ca)

**dHKarchitects**

**Victoria**

977 Fort Street V8V 3K3

**T** (250) 658.3367

**F** (250) 658.3397

**Nanaimo**

102-5190 Dublin Way

**T** (250) 585.5810

September 5, 2023

6020-001

Via email: hassan@frame.properties

Frame Properties  
541 Cornwall Street  
Victoria, BC  
V8V 4K9

Attn: Hassan Sayed

**Re: 2540/2542 Shelbourne Street  
Development Permit-4 Re-Submission**

Dear Hassan:

**Below is a summary of changes to the civil design drawings:**

Rev. #	Drawings	Description
1	C200	Added proposed Telus/Shaw Cable/Rogers conduit
2	C200	Revision to notes

Yours truly,

**HEROLD ENGINEERING LIMITED**



Sarah Campden, ASCT, RTMgr  
Associate

*Enclosure*