## Wednesday, January 8, 2020

Charlotte Wain Area Planner City of Victoria #1 Centennial Square Victoria BC V8W 1P6 250.361.0340

## DPV 00051 - 937 View Street - Letter of DP Revisions

Dear Charlotte;

We are submitting these DP revisions in response to comments received in the Application Review Summary dated 19/10/29.

The project submission has been adjusted to address city comments and this written letter and accompanying list is intended to summarize the major points of revisions and to aid in their location in our drawing submission.

We look forward to your review and comments. Please call me directly if you have any questions or concerns.

Sincerely Yours,

dHKarchitects Inc. Alex McCumber, Architect AIBC, LEED AP Project Architect



dHKarchitects

#### Letter response to City Comments

Note: The comments in italics below are taken directly from the DPV #00051 Application Review Summary dated Tuesday October 29, 2019. Response to comments are noted below in green text.

#### **Development Services Division Comments:**

Conditions to be met prior to the Committee of the Whole:

General Comments

• A significant height variance is being requested. At present, all the variances and inconsistencies with the design guidelines are at the detriment to the public realm and will not be supported by staff. The application should exceed the DCAP requirements to justify the variances.

Height variance - a height variance is up to 45m is requested to provide the maximum number of rental units possible while respecting the R-48 Harris Green District Base FSR. Site constraints such as the existing legal easement and geotechnical conditions make it impossible to realize the FSR potential without this variance. The design team has endeavored to respect the intent of OCP and DCAP guidelines and exceed where possible.

• The application in its current form does not address previous staff comments and inconsistencies with the design guidelines. Staff will therefore not be recommending referral of the application to Advisory Design Panel (ADP) prior to significant design revisions that address podium design, building separation, upper storey setbacks and floorplates as detailed this Application Review.

The design team has made significant revisions to the submission including revised podium design, increased building separation at the East property line, increased step back and reduction of floorplate at the upper most storey.

• Please consider providing a Housing Agreement to secure the offer of rental units in perpetuity.

The applicant is amenable to a Housing agreement which would be discussed with the city after a successful DP application.

• Please provide an updated letter to Mayor and Council providing more details on the proposal, especially a justification for the variance requests.

An updated letter is being prepared by the Architect of Record and will be provided before committee of the whole.

• NOTE: The Plan Check for the proposal has significant outstanding issues/ missing/ or incorrect information. Please ensure that your resubmission addresses these items.

These items were previously resolved through discussions with the planning department and subsequent addenda and are also addressed in the current application.

Use and Density



dHKarchitects

• It appears that the current density calculations are based on the current zoning as well as the design guidelines. Please revise the "theoretical" density calculations to only include the R-48 requirements (based on 27m and 9 storeys, with 3.5m setbacks for the front property line). A rezoning application will be required should the proposed density exceed the theoretical density in the R-48 zone.

This item was previously resolved through discussions with the planning department and subsequent addenda and is also addressed in the current application on Sheet A001 – Base FSR Calculation.

• The proposal is consistent with the Core Residential Urban Place Designation in terms of use. Although the property is zoned R-48 Harris Green District, which has no maximum density, the proposed density does exceed the maximum density envisioned for this area in the OCP (5.5:1 FSR).

Noted, the density and use proposed for this project has significant benefit to the public as it would provide 253 rental units and the size range of suites is within the housing affordability goals of the DCAP (30-40 m2, 9.2 page 102).

Site Plan

• Policy 6.8 in the OCP encourages the logical assembly of development sites that enable the best realization of permitted development potential for the area. It would be beneficial if the property could be assembled with 1124 Vancouver Street.

This had been considered by the applicant but is not possible as the adjacent site has an alternate proposal already in progress.

• Consider removing some/all of the vehicle parking spaces (since these are surplus to the zoning requirements) and replacing these with a more functional bike room that accommodates a bike stall for each residential unit and adequate visitor bike parking stalls.

The current application has reduced the vehicle parking to accommodate a larger visitor bicycle parking area as site constraints do not allow for the placement of the required 26 stalls at the street frontage.

• If formally offered as part of this application, the car share stalls referenced in the letter to Mayor and Council will need to be secured through a legal agreement prior to an Opportunity for Public Comment.

The applicant is amenable to a car share agreement which would be further discussed with the city and provided prior to the Opportunity for Public Comment.

• The publicly accessible bike racks are not located in a highly visible area and may not be functional due to the proximity to the drive aisle. Consider relocating these adjacent to the residential entrances.

The current application has relocated the visitor bicycle parking area as site constraints do not allow for the placement of the required 26 stalls at the street frontage. The proposed location off the easement has sight lines direct to the street and sidewalk and is adjacent to an alternate visitor entry.

Massing, Form and Character



dHKarchitects

• Please provide the sketch-up model to the City to assist in our evaluation.

Provided in the digital submission.

• It is important to achieve good building separation, particularly in light of the significant height variance. It is recommended that the proposal exceeds other aspects of DCAP, particularly in relation to building separation and livability for residential units. This is something currently under review by Community Planning staff with the aim of increasing the distances.

The current application exceeds the tower separation requirements at the east and west property lines. Separation at the East property line is 3453mm and tower separation at the West property line is 7620mm.

• DCAP policy 6.175 speaks to providing step backs on buildings to avoid the visual presence of a bulky upper building mass. While staff appreciate the need for efficient floorplates for the intended use of pre-fabricated components, please employ step backs at the upper storeys to better meet this guideline. The variations in the elevation details do not adequately address this guideline.

A step back has been introduced at the uppermost storey. Additional step backs would adversely impact the ability to deliver the project through the prefabricated modules as intended and would limit the applicants ability in providing the 253 rental suites proposed.

• Similarly, DCAP policy 6.176. Encourages varied heights and massing to avoid uniformity in building design. Please consider a greater variation in both massing and architectural detail to better address this guideline.

The design team has endeavored to respect the intent of OCP and DCAP guidelines and exceed where possible. The design team has made significant revisions to the submission including revised podium design, increased building separation at the East property line, increased step back and reduction of the floorplate at the upper most storey. In addition, the design team has introduced detailing to help minimize the perceived massing such as, deep and varied window arrangement, alternating floor corner cuts and material treatments to visually break massing down. Please refer to the additional renderings provided on sheets A108 thru A112 for additional information and evaluation of massing.

• Please ensure that all portions of the building, excluding parapets, cornices, guardrails and other architectural elements are contained within a 1:5 building setback ratio established at 15 metres above grade from the property line parallel to the street. Please reinstate the 1:5 setback overlay onto the sections as previously demonstrated on the February 14, 2018 submission.

The step back ratio line has been reintroduced to drawing 1/A401.

• The proposal exceeds the floorplate limitations for portions of the building above 30m. Please revise the proposal to meet this guideline.

The current application respects and is below the floor plate limitations below 30m. Above 30m; (Levels 11 to 14) exceed the floor plate limitation by 204 s.m. and level 15 exceeds by 85 s.m. We request this variance for the project.



dHKarchitects

• Given the high concentration of tall buildings in this location, a wind study should be submitted to ensure the cumulative effect on this area is not detrimental to the public realm.

The architect and applicant note that this has not previously been a requirement at DP and has no precedent that we are aware of within the City of Victoria. In addition our proposal at 15 storeys is 5 storeys less than the neighbouring 20 storey View Towers building and significantly less (more than half the height) than the proposed Harris Green development across View Street which is seeking rezoning at 32 storeys.

• Staff have concerns that insufficient amenity space is provided for residents. Please consider additional features on the roof and additional function rooms to enhance the livability of the proposed building. Balconies may not be appropriate in this location due to the proximity issues mentioned previously.

#### Podium and Streetscape

• DCAP encourages the stepping of buildings to distinguish the building podium from upper floors. Although there is no commercial use on the ground floor, a defined podium base can still be beneficial to breaking up the massing and to provide a more human scale at the street level. Please consider revisions to include a podium in the design.

#### A defined podium has been introduced in the current submission.

• View Street is identified as a Local Street in DCAP, with building bases ranging from 10-15m. Please consider the guidelines to introduce an appropriately scaled base to the building.

# A podium base has been introduced in the current submission which is scaled appropriately to DCAP guidelines.

• Please provide more detail on the ground floor patios and interface with the street. Consider elevating the patios slightly from the street to enhance privacy and increase security for these units.

Additional landscaping and trees have been provided which enhance privacy and security to these suites, Refer to Landscape drawings.

• Consider additional landscaping both at the street level and on the roof to enhance the proposal.

Landscaping features have been expanded throughout the project, at the street interface, at the side easement, at Level 2 patios and on the roof patios. Refer to landscape drawings for planting details.

• Staff have concerns that the current design creates opportunities for crime, including at the street level, and in the basement level bike storage area. Please submit a CPTED analysis of the proposal.

The current application and design revisions address these concerns. If required, an additional CPTED analysis will be provided prior to committee of the whole.

#### Materials



dHKarchitects

• Please provide a material board for all materials and examples of other applications of the laminate rainscreen panels.

Refer to A107 for material information. A physical material board will be provided at ADP.

• Please provide a greater level of detail on the perspective renderings.

See additional drawings A108 thru A112.

• Please provide a nighttime lit rendering.

See additional drawings A108 thru A112.

#### **Engineering and Public Works Department Comments:**

Condition to be met prior to Committee of the Whole:

• The development site falls under the scope of the City's Downtown Public Realm Plan and Streetscape Standards (specifically, 'New Town District'). Therefore, the standards in this character precinct applies for the frontage improvements on View Street. A conceptual design adhering to the latest 'New Town District' standard for the frontage is required on the plan submission for the Committee of the Whole.

Noted. Please refer to Landscape and Civil drawings for these items outside of our property line.

• Please include two benches (Type H) at the boulevard bulbs facing the sidewalk and one trash bin.

Included in current submission, refer to Landscape drawings.

• The cluster globe pedestrian light in the frontage will be required to be repainted black to match the 'New Town District' theme.

Noted on Civil and Landscape drawings.

• Please revise the driveway crossing so that the flares stop at the front of the sidewalk.

Revised on current submission, refer to Landscape and Civil drawings.

#### **Transportation Review:**

Conditions to be met prior to Committee of the Whole:

• The requested 111 stall long term bicycle parking variance is not supported. The plan check dated October 2019 indicates 262 long term stalls are required while only 151 are provided.

Current application includes 265 Class 1 long term bike parking stalls refer to sheet A201.



dHKarchitects

dHKa

dHKarchitects

Victoria 977 Fort Street V8V 3K3 T +1 250-658-3367 Nanaimo 102-5190 Dublin Way V9T 0H2 T +1 250-585-5810 mail@dhk.ca www.dhk.ca • To improve bicycle security, limiting the capacity of common bicycle rooms to 40 stalls is required. Please revise the next plan resubmission accordingly.

This was noted as not a formal requirement as the long term bicycle parking guidelines have not been adopted by council. However the design team has included bicycle rooms as part of the current application, refer to A201.

• The requested 20 stall short term bicycle parking variance is not supported. The plan check dated October 2019 indicates 26 short term stalls are required while only 6 are provided.

26 short term bicycle parking stalls have been included in the current submission, refer to A102.

• The proposed bicycle racks adjacent the driveway are not functional. An incorrect rack type (serpentine) and insufficient stall depth (1.5 metres) have been illustrated. Please revise the next plan resubmission accordingly.

26 short term bicycle parking stalls have been included in the current submission, refer to A102. The current application has relocated the visitor bicycle parking area as site constraints do not allow for the placement of the required 26 stalls at the street frontage. The proposed location off the easement has sight lines direct to the street and sidewalk and is adjacent to an alternate visitor entry.

• Please describe how garbage, recycling and organics will be collected from the site.

Garbage will be collected by a private service and will not be located in any public ROW.

• Staff will recommend to Council, that as a condition of DPV, a covenant be registered on the property securing the proposed Level 2 energized outlets capable of powering J1772 SAE connectors.

No change to current application.

#### **Underground Utilities Review:**

Condition to be met prior to Committee of the Whole:

• The proposed development may result in increased sewage flow rates. The City's sanitary sewer system may not, at present, be sufficient to accommodate the increased flow rates. If the anticipated peak flow rate produced by the new development is greater than the estimated peak flow rate of sewage that the existing City sewer system can handle, the applicant may be required to upgrade the City's sewer system infrastructure. Therefore, a signed and sealed report prepared by the applicant's qualified professional engineer outlining the impact of the development on the existing sewer system, including the projected flow rates (Average Dry Weather Flow, Peak Dry Weather Flow and Peak Wet Weather Flow) must be submitted to the Engineering Department (attention: Deb Becelaere at dbecelaere@victoria.ca) by the next plan re-submission.

5094-001\_Sewage Attenuation Letter\_2020-01-07\_JR attached to current submission.

#### Stormwater Management Review:

Condition to be met prior to Committee of the Whole:

• Drawings L1.01 and L1.02 and the Site Servicing Plan Drawing C200 do not match with regards to the on-site rain garden. Please confirm the locations of all rain gardens on-site and off-site and revise the next plan resubmission accordingly so all drawings match.

Current submission is coordinated.

#### Parks Division Comments:

Conditions to be met prior to the Committee of the Whole:

• Please add [2] new boulevard trees in grates, one 6m west of the cluster lamp and the other 5.5m east of the lamp. The center of the grate shall be 90cm from the edge of curb.

These have been included in the current submission, refer to Landscape drawings.

• Please add irrigation lines to connect to the proposed rain garden and [2] new trees in grates. Irrigation shall include a separate water meter, a double check valve and stub off at the property line at each end.

These have been included in the current submission, refer to Landscape drawings.

• Please add proposed 3rd party servicing such as Hydro-Telecommunications to the Site Servicing Plan. Proposed services must be located outside the landscaped boulevards and at least 3m from proposed trees in a grate.

These have been included in the current submission, refer to Civil drawings.

• Please shift the proposed water service as far east as possible. Proposed sanitary sewer and storm drain should be relocated as close as possible to the east side of the cluster lamp.

Water service is at the furthest east possible, refer to Civil drawings.

• Indicate on the Landscape Plan that species selection of boulevard trees will be determined by Parks and trees to be planted by the applicant.

These have been included in the current submission, refer to landscape drawings and notes.

• Indicate on Landscape Plan that species and quantities of proposed boulevard and rain garden landscaping plants will be determined by Parks and shall be planted by the applicant.

These have been included in the current submission, refer to landscape drawings and notes.

• Show the existing boulevard tree (size and species) on the Landscape Plan and identify it to be removed.



dHKarchitects

These have been included in the current submission, refer to landscape drawings and notes.

#### Permits and Inspections Division Comments:

Conditions to be met prior to the Committee of the Whole:

• Exit on the first floor east side appears to require protection of exits as per 3.2.3.13. Of the BCBC.

Noted, additional details will be provided at BP application for fire protection.

• Architect to review if manual pull stations are required when leaving the street level residential units.

Additional details will be provided at BP application for fire protection.

• Generic comment. Architect to review spatial separations to the centerline of the street as well as all other setbacks to be in compliance with limiting distances and unprotected openings under 3.2. Of the BCBC.

#### Current submission conforms to required separation.

• The parkade would require two exits as it is over 300 meters square. Ensure spacing and distance between exits is as per the BCBC.

Two exits have been provided in the current submission.

• Architect to review 3.1. Of the BCBC regarding the proposed wood soffits and combustible cladding.

Additional details will be provided at BP application for fire protection at this location.

• Level 1 basement plan is to have a minimum of half the diagonal distance of the building between exits.

Current submission conforms to required distances.

• Generic note FD connection when located at the front of buildings should be designed not to block the exiting when hoses are connected to the Siamese connection.

FDC has been relocated, refer to Civil drawings and A102 for revised location and distance from FH.

• The distance between exits on residential floors appear to be possibly less than half the diagonal distance of the building. Architect to review.

Current submission conforms to required distances.

• Generic note: All venting of exit stair shafts to comply with the BCBC.

Noted, no change.

• Clarify if the roof trellis is to be of non combustible construction.



dHKarchitects

Roof trellis and structure to be non-combustable.

• Clarify if the proposed high pressure laminate panels shown on elevation are non combustible cladding.

All proposed rainscreen cladding including HPL panels are of non-combustable construction and materials.

## **Fire Department Comments:**

• Two exits from the parkade are required.

Two exits have been provided in the current submission.

• Capital Region Emergency Service Telecommunications (CREST) would like to have an interior space of approximately 100 sq. ft. for a transmission facility as well as an exterior placement for a small antenna and micro-wave.

A communications room has been added to L1, refer to A202. This shall be further coordiunated at BP phase.

• FDC has to be within 45 meters of a fire hydrant and on the front of the building, not in the as shown on the wall in the entrance as this will be a trip hazard should there be an incident.

FDC has been relocated, refer to Civil drawings and A102 for revised location and distance from FH.

## END OF CITY COMMENTS



dHKarchitects

# List Summary of Revisions to Drawings - DPR2 (dated 20/01/08)

## **Architectural Drawings**

Sheet # / Title	Revision Bubble # & Description
A000 Cover	A1 - Drawing Lists Updated, Cover Image updated
A001 Project Data	A2 - Revised project data, added Base FSR calculation information
A100 Survey	No Changes
A101 Site Plan Existing	No Changes
A102 Site Plan Proposed	A3 - Revised boulevard landscaping, front setback, short term bike parking and project info table, added avg. grade calculations, added adjacent project plan info
A104 Site Context	A4 - Revised shadow study to reflect new massing
A105 Site Context	A5 - Revised street views to reflect massing
A106 Site Context	A6 - Revised street elevation to reflect massing, added outline of adjacent project massing, revised View St Towers image
A107 Site Context	A7 - Revised rendering and materials to reflect massing and podium development
A108 Site Context	A8 -Renderings revised to reflect massing and podium development
A109 Site Context	A9 - New renderings reflect massing and podium development, incl night renderings
A110 Site Context	A10 - New renderings reflect massing and podium development
A111 Site Context	A11 - New renderings of Amenity spaces and tower notched corners
A112 Site Context	A12 - New nighttime rendering
A201 Level B1 Plan	A13 - Revised Class 1 bike parking and bike parking summary, dashed planters and PMT locations above
A202 Level 1 Plan	A3 - Revised boulevard landscaping, front setback, short term bike parking, added adjacent project plan info



dHKarchitects

dHKa	A203 Level 2 Plan	A14 - Revised increased front setback, increased side tower setback and revised interior layout plans
	A204 Level 3 Plan	A14 - Revised increased front setback, increased side tower setback and revised interior layout plans
	A205 Level 4-14 (Even Plans)	A14 - Revised increased front setback, increased side tower setback and revised interior layout plans
	A206 Level 5-13 (Odd Plans)	A14 - Revised increased front setback, increased side tower setback and revised interior layout plans
dHKarchitects Pictoria 977 Fort Street V8V 3K3 T +1 250-658-3367 Nanaimo 102-5190 Dublin Way V9T 0H2 T +1 250-585-5810 mail@dhk.ca www.dhk.ca	A207 Level 15 Plan	A15 - Revised increased front setback, increased side tower setback and revised interior layout plans, deleted North corner units, added interior amenity space
	A208 Roof Plan	A16 - Revised increased front setback, increased side tower setback
	A301 Building Elevations	A17 - Revised rendering and materials to reflect massing and podium development
	A302 Building Elevations	A17 - Revised rendering and materials to reflect massing and podium development
	A401 Building Sections	A18 - Section revised to match massing and plan changes, OCP setback line added for information
	A402 Building Sections	A19 - Sections revised to match massing and plan changes
	A911 Area Plans	A20 - Area plans and schedule revised to reflect plan changes
	Landscape Drawings	
	L1.01 Landscape Materials	L1 - Added boulevard trees & benches
		L2 - Coordination of rain garden and curb to civil curb design
		L3 - Coordination of patio and planters to Arch design
		L4 - Coordination of planters to Arch design
		L5 - Coordination of planters to Arch design
		L6 - Added planters to L2 patios

		L7 - Coordination of planters to Arch design
	L1.02 Stormwater Mgt.	L2 – Coordination of rain garden and curb to civil curb design
HKarchitects dHKarchitects 977 Fort Street V8V 3K3 T +1 250-658-3367 Nanaimo 102-5190 Dublin Way V9T 0H2 T +1 250-585-5810 mail@dhk.ca www.dhk.ca	L3.01 Planting Plans	L1 - Added boulevard trees & benches
		L2 - Coordination of rain garden and curb to civil curb design
		L3 - Coordination of patio and planters to Arch design
		L4 - Coordination of planters to Arch design
		L5 - Coordination of planters to Arch design
	L3.02 Planting Plans	L6 - Added planters to L2 patios
		L7 - Coordination of planters to Arch design
	Civil Drawings	
	C100 General Notes	C1 - Drawing list revision, added C300 & C400
		C2 - Reduced unit count
	C200 Site Servicing Plan	C3 - Note revision
		C4 - Driveway crossing revision
		C5 - Distance revision
		C6 - Revised FDC location
		C7 - Catch basin revision
	C300 Grading Plan	New Drawing
	C400 BC Hydro	New Drawing
	C400 DC Hydro	New Drawing

End of Revision list.