



CITY OF VICTORIA
ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING MINUTES
November 26, 2025

HYBIRD MEETING VIA MICROSOFT TEAMS & XWSEPSUM NATIONS ROOM
1 CENTENNIAL SQUARE

The City of Victoria is located on the homelands of the Songhees Nation and Xwsepsum Nation

PANEL MEMBERS	Marc Showers (Chair); Julie Brown; Nicholas Standeven;
PRESENT:	Tamar Bonnemaison; Mark Hornell; Kristina Zalite; Joseph Gowid
ABSENT:	Priscilla Smauel
STAFF PRESENT:	Miko Betanzo – Senior Planner, Urban Design Caner Oktem – Senior Planner, Urban Design Patrick Carroll – Senior Planner Geordie Gordon – Senior Planner Kamryn Allen – Recording Secretary
APPLICATIONS:	A) Rezoning Application No. 00867 for 900 & 912 Vancouver Street, 911 Quadra Street, and 930 & 990 Burdett Avenue
ATTENDEES:	Paul Rigby (Principal Architect of record, Faulkner Browns), Aidan Carruthers (Associate Designer, Faulkner Browns), Katie Cummer (Principal, Cummer Heritage Consulting), Brendon Neilson (Executive Director, Anglican Diocese), Kaeley Wiseman (Principal, Wiser Projects), Sarah Murry (Project Coordinator, Wiser Projects)
	B) Development Permit with Variances Application No.000294 for 1908 Foul Bay Road
	Maria Pawluczuk (Development Manager/Applicant, Ledcor Property Investments), Greg Voute (Architect, RLA), Chris Windjack (Landscape Architect, LADR)
	C) Rezoning Application No. 00876 for 731, 735, 781 Richmond Avenue - 728, 729, 733 Laurentian Place - 724, 730, 736 Maddison Street (Glenlyon-Norfolk School)
	Ally Dewji (Randwick Consulting), Brayden Borle (Arborist, Talmack), Mathew Goddard (Glenlyon Norfolk School), Mong Xuan Ha (Glenlyon Norfolk School), Tamara Slobogean (Glenlyon Norfolk School), Chad Holtum (Glenlyon Norfolk School), Greg Damant (Cascadian Architects), Andy Guiry (Cascadian Architects), D'Arcy Hutton (PWL Partnership

Landscape Architects), Derek Lee (PWL Partnership Landscape Architects), Donald Luxton (Donald Luxton & Associates [Heritage])

1. Call to Order

The Chair called the meeting to order at 12:00 p.m.

Panel Members and staff provided introductions.

2. Minutes

Minutes from the meeting held:

1. August 27, 2025
2. September 24, 2025
3. October 8, 2025

Typo page 6 priscillas name October 8th meeting minutes
October 8the minutes: I was there, Julie was there.

2501 Blanshard Street, Update on the architect.

2501 Blanshard, panel asked, the project significantly exceeds the parking requirements – delete that.

Balmoral, Update architect.

Moved By: M. Showers

Seconded By: M. Hornell

That the Minutes from the meeting held:

1. August 27, 2025
2. September 24, 2025
3. October 8, 2025

be approved as circulated.

Comments from Mark

- Mark comments/conversation bumped to next meeting. Acknowledgment of appreciation on bringing the comments to the panel.
- Wanting to know more, even if it means a second meeting

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

3. Approval of Agenda

Moved By: M.Showers

Seconded By: M.Hornell

That the November 26, 2025 Advisory Design Panel Agenda be approved as circulated.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

4. Applications

A) Rezoning Application No. 00867 for 900 & 912 Vancouver Street, 911 Quadra Street, and 930 & 990 Burdett Avenue

Miko Betanzo Senior Planner, provided an overview of the application and highlighted the areas that staff are seeking feedback on the proposed updated GUD Guidelines

Dave Jawl provided an overview of the project and Peter Johannknecht provided a presentation.

The Panel asked the following questions of clarification:

- The height in relation to the cathedral facade when viewed down Catherine as far as Douglas, pleased to see that the proposed building going in behind is reduced to 12 storeys. Is there a view from Blanshard street it appeared to show the new building appear to creep at the top, on the Douglas further to the west does the shortening of the facade show that building too? And then the tallest building, to my eye it looks like the envelope really crowds the southernly tower, it looks pretty tight from the view on Blanshard street in terms of the massing?
 - I think they're well made observations and there's no doubt that it's been a big consideration as the designs evolved. I think we would be not shy in saying that our starting point was to work with the geometry of the cathedral and try and avoid the building on its composition where things to the shoulders conflicted with the towers. So we did deliberately place in our interim massing model one of the tallest buildings directly on the axis of the cathedral where the original tower would have sat. In the original design, because we felt that that was a more harmonious location for the mass than maybe some of the other options. That said, when we've worked with the city, because you get the depth of fields and serial vision and trees and things going on in the street. The view was taken that this composition was less disruptive to that Gable silhouette than if the tower sat directly at the end of the nave. And that is a point of opinion. And you know, there's lots of good public buildings that have been located. Two options with the mass behind the cathedral, it wouldn't effect the silhouette and equally in this scenario as long as it's adjusted in an appropriate way it should not effect it.
- Proposal for cathedral walk, and what seems to be a new north south pedestrian road, looking for how and if the pedestrian route through the site would be integrated

north to west? And around the taller buildings and the mid rise buildings typically formal development for a taller building would include some sculpting for a podium building, and rarely we see a point tower come to grade without that podium so would like to hear more around the decision making here and if there has been further exploration around this and combining it into more of a singular structure rather than separate. We also saw from the presentation material shared in advance that there are a range of uses proposed, including support uses for the cathedral, which are I think more clear, but I'm curious at this stage in terms of a zoning approval. Are the other uses beyond residential located within the site, whether on a specific story or in a specific location? I'm not sure if that's a question for the applicant team or for staff.

- The North-south connector, very deliberately a very positive connection between Pioneer Square and Cathedral comments. So that's that was one of the primary Objectives when we sat down, the city urban design team was to connect Pioneer Square with the dead St. to give that full block connection so you could walk around the cathedral in the round, especially in the western quadrant. The east-west connector is something that we've debated heavily, but we felt quite strongly that. It's beneficial because people can already walk along the edge of cathedral commons, but then to extend that through the site to create a meandering that you usually get in this type of development in other cities. Most cathedral precincts you can walk around and meander through the buildings, often through footpaths and not roads. And I think the tranquility that that offers in terms of places to sit, reflect and take a moment because people go to the church or this place for many different reasons, often, often for just to sit and think. We just think that that route to the middle of the site could be quite useful and powerful in terms of making the site accessible to all, but providing a variety of spaces for people to enjoy. So I think that was first question, I think the second question. When your walking around your recognizing the length of the building. A bit like the legislator it takes a while to walk around it, once thing we tried to do with each of the blocks is make it similar in scale. the notches and articulation on the South side of the street. So the positive and negatives that create a rhythm in the building elevation we've included here within our development footprint to bring that cadence. The location of the Cathedral house and its relationship to the public realm, everything above the western quadrant, level 2 is residential.
- Landscape, looking at page 63 the soil zone plan, will the trees on grade also include shrub material or we looking at lawn and trees in that area?
 - In the areas where we have noticed shrub on slabs, we are just suggesting we would place shrubs there due to soil, it would keep the landscaping nice and low which is permeable and then we can mount up to where we can get the trees on slab
- On page 61 in terms of the tree canopy and how it's performing, wondering the species that were identified for retention, the retained trees, noticed on the north south cathedral walk, the tree protection zone is quite large, are these small trees expected to grow out or these a special type of tree for the large zone, what's the size?
 - The existing trees have been pulled from the arborist report which is based off the [plan, we will use best practice in terms of if we use medium or large, coming from]

mschedule E part 2 of the city bylaws, we are not sure what species wed actually select as of now, when it comes to that stage we will have more accuracy.

- Would be great to see more then just small trees going in.
- On the open space slide, one thing I noticed is that the cathedrael court and Rockland Ave, its working really well on land to look like a European plaza coming out of the cathedreal. For rezoning there will be minimal input on how those roads are paved, what happens if all those areas shownen with nicep vaers are jus tashphalt? Will we lose all that image around the open space?
 - We will look into this and hopefully the city and applicant can harmonically delvier this as said, it will take some work to delvier both city and applicant.
- The city of Victoria has some tacticle work on Rockalnd with benches, so that spaces already ebnefits from jujst being a space for cars, street tres on quada would go a long way. Around the cathd Spatial dimensions of that. Is it like a woon or for vehicles and people cohabit in the same zone? Is it, you know, wide enough for separate sidewalks and defined zones for vehicles? What's setting it out relative to the existing cathedral structure in terms?
 - It's a shed. It's a shed surface that can accommodate vehicles.
- And what's determining its location? Obviously the north-south axis makes perfect sense, but what's determining its east-west location?
 - We really were keen to fit some development between Memorial Hall and the cathedral and because there was always the intent to have a building in this location and it was always the intent actually for the cathedral to connect to Memorial Hall and. Seamless movement between that as a cathedral school and the church. So we felt that this was an appropriate development location and when you start to look at the dimensions of it, it starts to work quite well as a as a development footprint. What's clear though in this whole proposition is that the idea is to make. Historic asset, accessible in the public realm to everyone. So there's a democratic ability here to walk around all four sides of the cathedral, understand it in its whole context. And at the moment the back of the church, if you've been there, is a is a leased car parking space that's blacktop and not very inviting. And it's a little bit torturous to you can walk around, but it's not something that you're invited to do. In this scenario, the the cathedral sits within what I'd like to visualise as a wider landscape. So it's the centrepiece of a bigger park that's not Pioneer Square and Cathedral Commons, but a combination of the two that has those.
- Tall building comment, building separation, noting that it was 15 meters. Policy guideline seeks 20 meters. Could you please talk about the reason for the reduction, whether it was modeled with a greater separation to achieve the 20 meters and what the potential impacts may be?
 - The impacts of a more human scaled urban environment and something that's more intimate and something that's more that's got a tighter grain that accentuates the scale of the cathedral. So it's deliberate. I don't feel worried about it most. The 20 metre off window to window scenario can be well managed at 15. It's still quite a distance and so I I'm not concerned about that as long as it's

paid cognizance to and and it's it's already been noted in the design guideline that. That window to window relationship between neighbors would need to be managed as detailed designs come forward. So I I don't feel like it's a it's a problem. I do feel actually like it's a benefit to the scheme to create something that's quite special and slightly more tight knit in this part of the city.

- I'm just wondering about the the 8 story, 18 and then eight story relationship. Is there any magic to those? Numbers, I'm just you know once you go beyond six you're into non combustible construction. So I see that's that's a leap, but I'm just wondering what was 18 a staff kind of cap suggestion or how did you get to to that relationship?
 - Both the 8 and the 18 were caps and suggested massing from the city. There's a lot more. There's some common sense, as you suggested, methods of construction and OCP of 6 storeys for lightweight construction, which worked to six. And there's an efficiency to go slightly taller than 18 on some of the taller, taller blocks, which is why we were at 24. So yes and yes, it was. And we felt that eight is slightly taller on the street as well. And yes, it can be managed, but six and 18. Felt like a more appropriate solution because that's what we see well in other cities.
- I'm just wondering if you could speak to how the newer buildings relate to the streets at the street level in particular. I'm just wondering if you know if the the block looks a little bit internally focused and I'm wondering how how the buildings will face out? Rendering that yet, but it does look like there's one pathway to each building and that's that's kind of it, so.
 - Yeah. So I mean the Baudette Blvd. is a really generous setback. So the idea is like as a Victor Victoria mansion block would have in London is that it's got a front yard or that's part of the landscape Blvd. So there is a natural setback between. The living space and the street, but these windows are well proportioned and I think this image here, which was a slightly earlier iteration when we had the massing on the corner, we did a really this is this is indicative of what it might be like at six stories, but the idea here was that there could be duplexes with. Front doors that had direct access from the street. We're not at DP stage, so that's all up for grabs. I think the intent is that that street is animated with front doors like a residential St. and it's a celebration of everyday life. It scales to be an everyday life St. everyday life streets have windows and doors and that's what we like to see and. That's the intent. We have not declared the detailed design for DP, but the design guide calls for all of those elements to be located on the debt to bring that animation.
- How about Rockland?
 - Rockland, we've got the the base of this building here. And then we have Memorial Hall, which is a school currently. You know, the school might not be there forever. It might be there forever. The school animates the street as it does. It's a heritage facade that's got great texture. It's Newcastle stone. It's really quite a nice finish to it. It's got a Gothic revivalist architecture, which is quite unique in this context. I think it does its own job. So it's really only the building that we see here, which you don't see that much of in this render, but that animation that you see. Behind the lady on the bike would continue across the length of the facade, which would finish right adjacent to and touching Memorial Hall.

Panel members discussed:

- I do think it's quite ambitious as a plan and really appreciate the the heritage retention components. You know, you have the very small kind of delightful Yarrow Chapel, you have the the Memorial Hall, you have the cathedral, all elements that are, you know, quite substantial, I think in in this part of the city, in downtown, in Fairfield and how they contribute already in a meaningful way. And it's exciting to see a future where those elements. And the communities that make them what they are stay in place. I think that you know staff is that have asked us about building locations, building heights and greater design, urban design interface questions and and I think there's a lot of merit to the application. I find that the initial tall building on axis with the cathedral to me does seem appropriate. I do worry about the ground plane conditions, how it interfaces with Cathedral Walk Memorial use use as it threads east to West through the site. I think spaces like those can, unless very carefully designed, can tend to convert into a more private realm. And so I I I think it'd be a disappointment to see those become, you know, sort of private property signs everywhere with gates and and restricted access. As it is, it's really generous gesture to have all of this through connection and integration. I just would hope that beyond zoning stage that those are are protected in a meaningful way. I do think that the the spacing between the cathedral on the South side. And the future future Cathedral House. That to me does feel like a pinch point. And I wonder if you know there'd be an opportunity to see the Cathedral House shift S open up that that threshold condition. I don't know that the small frontage facing Burdett would, you know, be negatively impacted by being drawn closer to the public rooms, closer to the sidewalk. You have a very large Blvd. there. I do think that the separate buildings, I understand the concept, but I I do think. It sets up a all or nothing conversation with the second tall building, where the second tall building now has to be exactly where it is. Whereas if if it were, you know, integral with a with more of a traditional podium condition, that tower could. Be right, right size, right located left to right on the page or east, east to West. But overall I do think it is a, you know, a strong proposal and I think it has a lot of merits to it.
- Yeah, I I I agree with Nicholas. I think this is a really strong proposal. I quite like the the whole analysis around how the site has been divvied up into these proposed development zones and the general notion of how they're trying to express a kind of a perimeter courtyard kind of idea. Particularly on the eastern side of the site I think is really well expressed. You know my my primary question is I get well not question but concern I guess has to do with building height. My gut feel as I would prefer to see buildings you know eight stories and lower on the back of that site to do a better transition back to. Fairfield and not to compete so much with the cathedral, but I imagine there's a financial analysis that we're not Privy to that's been shared with the city looking at the kind of cash and flow need that they would have to have in order to do the seismic upgrades to the cathedral and everything else, so. I suspect that is driving some of the density ask that's included in this application. I think a lot of the success of this proposal is really going to depend on the execution, particularly the off-site amenities along, you know, with the creation of the square. Front of the cathedral facade and the connections through to the adjacent open spaces. All those things are achievable, but there's some tricky work on a master development agreement of some kind that's going to have to lock the city and the applicant into some kind of partnership

with. Long term financing and everything else to make sure that that's delivered. But yeah, I mean, I think generally I like the proposal. I have some concerns about height, but I'm not sure if they're the sorts of concerns that would necessarily be. You know, deal breakers for me.

- I think the the key moves here are really strong. So again, there's a lot going on. So I do have some minor concerns about height. I I would actually prefer to see the 18 Storey building being taller so that it sticks out quite above the cathedral when seen from Blanchard that that. One image that they had, they looked almost the same and it just it just seemed like it would more clearly, yeah, allow the cathedral to stand on its own without another building hovering behind it at the same height. And I think 6 stories is kind of a better relationship to the street, but I I I. Not sure how strongly I I would, I feel that in terms of the building separation, I'm I'm not concerned with that at all. It is there are small footprint buildings and the building separation is at the corner. So most of those units are going to have windows on both sides so that the privacy I think it's going to be medicated. Mitigated just just fine. Um.

Option Two

That the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council that Rezoning Application No. 00867 for 930 Burdette Avenue be approved with the following changes:

- That council provide direction to staff to give consideration to implement the offsite public realm improvements to ensure they are implemented through eventual development, In particular cathedral court and Rockland green way.
- Applicant to consider shifting height from 8 storey buildings (B2 and B4) to the 18 storey building to provide a height contrast between the cathedral and the 18 storey building and improve the relationship to the street.
- Applicant to consider adjusting the Future Cathedral House (A) to provide more space for the walkway between the cathedral and amenity building which may require a setback reduction.

Moved By: M>Showers

Seconded By: Tamara

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Joseph left the meeting at 1:59

B) Development Permit with Variances Application No.000294 for 1908 Foul Bay Road

Geordie Gordon Senior Planner, provided an overview of the application and highlighted the areas that staff are seeking feedback on the proposed updated GUD Guidelines

Dave Jawl provided an overview of the project and Peter Johannknecht provided a presentation.

The Panel asked the following questions of clarification:

- I'm looking at the illustration that's a little difficult to tell, but it looks like the ground floor residential along the Bourchier side of the project are somewhat depressed below grade. Is that true or are they actually at grade?
- No, they're they're actually the building is about 6 to 8 inches above the sidewalk level. So Yep, that because because those those planters are being built on structure, it's slightly though they they're elevated and they're built on top of the structure. So that's why they may appear to come up above.
- What your rationale was for not pulling the building closer to the sidewalk on the foul Bay side and maybe putting a band of commercial on that frontage just to recognize that it's an arterial Rd. It's adjacent to the. To the mall and whatnot. And that would maybe give you a bit more space in the back for the amenity space. Could just describe your thinking on that a bit, please?
- that an ideal residential frontage would have some landscaped areas that could be lush and big enough to support good green growth but also provide some outdoor patios that were. Uh, usable. And so, to start off with, our typical idea was to provide like a long oche, if I'm pronouncing that right, this kind of a setback, which is is quite typical for this type of building. But along here we started out with a much smaller setback, but we were we had to dedicate 3 meters of the site for the these improvements. So that basically this second red line that's here, I can see my arrow that would. Represent the edge of the new property line after dedication. Then is the there was some discussion with the city about providing a set back for the more trees along foul Bay. So there what we have been getting. Some feedback and they they really wanted to have more space there. So we actually pulled back our parkade. So the blue dotted line is a parkade so that we'd have free land lands without buildings to provide a storm detention tank to provide. there's no retail frontage along that road other than that BC liquor store. So introducing an isolated commercial space would not really create meaningful activation of that space. And would break up the residential character of the street, like even that BC liquor store does not have glazing or an active frontage on that side. So reinforcing that quarter, it didn't feel like it was designed for retail engagement on that side and then. And we're also facing single-family homes. So adding retail would we feel would create a sense of exposure and reduced privacy. Meanwhile, keeping residential units there on that frontage maintains that neighborly commercial feel. And then aside from those reasons, at-grade commercial would also displace the retail, the rental units that we have there. So our goal is to deliver EV3 purpose-built rental homes. And given the housing shortage, I think we also tried to prioritize that. And then instead of retail, what we proposed was that public Plaza. Again, there's so many good. A public plaza would make more sense for people on there way to the area.
- The updated landscape changes look great, curious to know that the ocp has included the parkade footprint matching building footprints, 6 trees shown on the

west side are shown on top of the storm tanks, have you confirmed this is ok with civil? Or have you explored rain gardens

- Yes we have looked into this, we could not get the volume retention we needed with a rain garden, trees over the tank were recommended by city staff essentially the tank will be wrapped and then an appropriate depth over top of the tank to make sure that the roots aren't impeding it. Usually we don't try to do that.
- there is a space through Bouchier to the commercial Plaza. It was described as sort of a corridor. I'm just curious what the intent for the interface will be along that edge. In addition, staff have asked the panel to comment on whether the amenity offering is appropriate and suggested maybe a further opportunity for a rooftop amenity space, and I'm curious from the applicant's perspective. You know, what are the sort of pros and cons and thoughts? We didn't see it included in the ADP package, but is this something that could be considered?
- We are concerned with roof top amenity making noise concerns for neighbors also the cost of it on a wood frame building, we are trying to make this an affordable project as we can and we feel like there is a lot of outdoor amenity out the back, a landscape that could be enjoyed. But also site location, is close to near by amenities. on site the path that we're providing is only goes to the rear amenity area and the bike parking spaces, the the pedestrian path that is already existing on the Save on Foods property is being retained. It's essentially just a sidewalk, if you're familiar with it. Currently it has the very overgrown hedge that's right up close to the property line and a chain link fence. So what we are proposing is on right on the property line for there to be a new fence incorporated and then there's a landscaping. On the onsite side of that, so we are not providing a pedestrian path on our site in particular because there is already a very well used pedestrian path directly adjacent to the site. the because of the orientation of those two residential units on that end, there are some opportunities for overlook and that's a that's a major sub text principle. And so I believe that the safety will be increased just by the presence of those units and residential overlook.
- could you clarify with like the height of the fencing along there and what what sort of type of plantings are proposed?
- So it's a mix of native and adaptive shrubs and then we have columnar conifers in there. So we've got the five coniferous trees that will get fairly tall, but will stay skinny. So that level of screening will be significantly reduced from what is currently there, but we won't be implementing a Chain link fence, so it'll be like a wood panel fence, five or six feet tall. Maria could confirm that, but that would be typical for a side yard.
- rooftop and about the Um replacement trees, but most of the questions have been answered. Yeah, I'm also I was just catching up cause our package didn't have the 25 trees, it only had seven. So I'm I'm really happy to see Um. The trees and I I'm assuming I I'm sort of looking between the plan and then the package that we got. So Chris, is the are the planters larger to accommodate the trees? Are the patios are a little bit smaller, right? Yeah.
- So the outdoor, the whole outdoor amenity space has been rejigged pretty significantly. So you can see that now the planters are much larger so that we have the shared soil volume to meet the bylaw. So it's quite a bit deeper. We also have the for the bylaw trees, the requirement of a 1 meter set back off of a wall. So it needs to

be minimum of two meters in all cases where we have trees. So yeah, it's just a much bigger planter back there to make the trees work. Yes, correct. Yeah. So big, bigger all around,

- Any consideration to just being an extensive green roof? Not necessarily amenty. The overlook is not there we do not have a lot of high tower in the area so no one would see it also some mechanical areas on the roof. We did not provide any greener up there. Also green roof require require additional structural reinforcement which increases the cost for a six-story wood frame building and also long long-term maintenance costs associated with that and potential leaks and and repairs plus again we feel strongly. that we're providing a lot of landscape and greenery on the ground plane, especially compared to what is on the site right now, which is a utility building with a parking lot.
- Did you talk to save on about making more of that path, combining the little side yard that you have there to kind of enhance this neighborhood pathway that is like very popular and very useful and very ugly right now?
- The idea was to enhance the landscape along that edge. There is quite a bit of lighting already on that area. In fact, if you look at the existing. Save on should add signage and lighting to improve this access. On our part we can make it better by enhancing the landscape, safety and ovr look.
- You guys are putting a fence on the property line to separate landscaping and pathway; would you consider not having that fence and having a security line at the back to contribute to the neighborhood more?
- No issue with that and will look into further.
- Parking, wondering if you looked into providing TDM to reduce parking provided
- Yes we have requested a variance for a reduction in the parking, we are at 0.62 cars per unit which is already below 1 for 1 proportion, but we have already gone there.
- Did not see a shadow study, is the courtyard on the north side going to be entirely shadowed?
- Your right, it will get minimal sun but worked better for the overall building form. All the landscape has been designed to be shade tolerate. Even the programming incorporates that with a fire place to be comfortable.
- Can you speak to the materials and colour palatte you chose?
- I know that some of the design guidelines want to have natural wood and natural materials. This is a wood frame building. I'm restricted by the type of materials I can use. It has to be non combustible. So all this, all these panels, the Gray panels and the board and batten, the white and then the horizontal rust red color are all different forms of fibre cement panel. The even the soffit is made of fibre cement board, but it they have new colors and the way they stain the wood. They can maintain the grain of the wood to to make it look like wood and from a distance you don't see. The soffit and it will look like wood, even though it's not just like the horizontal panels. And the good thing about it, it's quite, you know, maintenance free and it would be it's a good choice for a rental. Building. We basically just distributed the colors so that the corners would have that deep red color and the middle is a background. And then at

the entrance we created a bit of richness with the combination of the two. With the dark panels and then the red in between and then we also pop those out a bit so that you get some depth to those window frames which will be that will really make that that entry pop.

Joseph joined at 3:00pm

Panel members discussed:

- One thing I I think that I did like there, Julie was, yeah, that was kind of touching on it with my question about the fence and the path along the back there. I know that I spent a lot of time. I went to high school right at Oak Bay, so I spent a lot of time there and. Like that path was very underutilized, I think, and it's just very. Very kind of sheltered and I think it would be great if they could open it up a little bit more, at least from their side. You know, you can't, you can't ask anyone else to do anything, but get anyone else to do anything necessarily. And we didn't really touch on it, but I was also wondering about this, the foul Bay side. It seemed to me like the there wasn't a lot of engagement with the street along there. The patios were and and I suppose people. Won't necessarily want to spend as much time along there, so maybe that's maybe that's the reason, but the patios looked quite small.
- to build on that, I was torn with, you know, the potential to have more access from the patio homes on Falve down to the sidewalk. I do think it's a pretty good balance as it is. The corner homes have access South and N, although the north is a bit of a long way to go.I I think that that does actually work quite well as a as a landscape interface. Right now the existing building does have a bit of a mean facade there and that edge without the expanded right of way without the dedications also. Seems like there's a lot of pedestrian cyclist vehicle potential conflict in that area. Like it's it's not a, it's not a, it's not a very effective section of Rd. It's really it's a bit scary actually. So I think the dedication goes a long way to. Correcting that it's in a it's a precursor obviously to something larger happening on the Save on Food site and it would be it's not the applicants responsibility to do this, but it would be nice to know what the City of Victoria is anticipating along that edge. In terms of cycling infrastructure, I do also think there's been a great evolution of the design I shared to the Calic and previous pre application iterations. Moving the ramp to the South side obviously makes a ton of sense.Extending the frontage on Val Bay, I think it's really positive. So I I think overall you know we've seen a lot of the stuff that would be maybe potentially looking for here has has been addressed through that iterative process and I would definitely definitely also second.Some additional consideration on the West side with that pedestrian path. My my daughter goes to school nearby there and refuses to go down there 'cause it's a bit. It's a bit dodgy right now. It seems like it's not well surveyed.
- I could maybe because I'm not an architect, I'm just curious about staff's question on that where they talk about balconies. I'm more integral to the building. I'm assuming that means embedded within the facade more than proud of the facade. Just looking at the renderings, I mean to me they they actually look reasonably generous per unit and quite usable. So I'm not sure what particular concern is there that staff is addressing.I don't know, maybe somebody's gonna enlighten me on that. Yeah, I'm happy to provide a bit more, bit more context on that. Um. Yeah, so the design guidelines do call for balconies to be integral to the design. So that would mean like inset balconies as opposed to the sort of like stuck on for lack of a better word. And then that allows for weather protection as well among other. Among other objectives

that are achieved. But yeah, I do believe that the there's no issue with the size of the balconies. Um, they do meet like the minimum requirements for for balcony guides. they don't necessarily contribute towards FSR. Um, if that's if that's sort of what you're getting at. I'm just taking a a specific unit, let's say it's 800 square feet and you put a I don't know, I don't know how big these balconies are, but if you're carving away from the interior living space to put a balcony that's inside the the facade of the building. You're losing living space, are you not? Interior living space.

- Just gonna say it, but don't personally feel too strongly about the the balconies I do. The material color choices in use trouble me a little bit. They don't. There's a lot going on and it makes it almost feel like a much bigger building. I think with with so many different, so much contrast and and different approaches. So I wouldn't mind seeing that. A little more cohesive?
- Isint that the applicants point ot break up the mass of thatfacade into a series of vertical bays that are differentiated by color? If you reduce the amount of different differentiation between those color bands, you'd end up with a building that looked even wider than it does currently.
- It is somewhat contextual with the care facility. I think it's Shannon Oaks across the way. There are quite a few cladding choices on that project as well. I would say, you know, I don't think that in much the same way we were debating public realm off-site improvements and whether they were. Required for the success of the project. I don't know that changes in color are required for the success of this project. Personally, I think that there could be an opportunity to streamline and and edit a little bit, but again, I I don't know that it. I don't think that the project is less successful one way or the other and maybe just to jump around a little bit further, there was a question from staff around a commercial component. I I also don't feel like that is required in this location, just given the proximity to the adjacent commercial. Center and likely that won't forever be a predominantly surface parked save on foods, grocery store and and and other associated services like I I would expect that that would be the primary. You know node in the future for potential higher density redevelopment, which would also bring with it a lot of these opportunities.
- if I could just add on to what Nicholas just said about that, I I think there's a real need for the city to give some urban design consideration to the whole stretch of Foul Bay between the junction with Fort and with Oak Bay Ave. There's change happening at both ends, and I don't know if there's a cohesive vision for what that street's supposed to look like in future. And that could include looking at what what the ground floor uses are going to be along there.
- When I look on the south façade those look like reasonable entrances to me wit reasonable open space, wondering if the applicant would make those first floor taller then the other ones ot make them 9 floor or something to give the first floor some more prominence, they look to all be 8 foot floors, I think It would look a bit better to see some depth on that first floor.
-

Option Two

That the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council that Development Permit Application No. 000294 for 1908 Foul Bay Road be approved with the following changes:

- The Applicant to consider Including the design features as presented to the Advisory Design Panel members at the meeting of November 26, 2025.
- The Applicant consider working with Save on Foods to create a good quality pedestrian pathway between Bourchier and the interior of the mall site.
- The Applicant consider enhancing the ground floor potentially through increasing the height of this storey.
- The Applicant consider commercial use along Foul Bay.

Moved By: M.Showers

Seconded By: Nicholas

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

C) Rezoning Application No. 00876 for 731, 735, 781 Richmond Avenue - 728, 729, 733 Laurentian Place - 724, 730, 736 Maddison Street (Glenlyon-Norfolk School)

Nicholas Stadeven – Recused

Patrick Carroll Senior Planner, provided an overview of the application and highlighted the areas that staff are seeking feedback on the proposed updated GUD Guidelines

Dave Jawl provided an overview of the project and Peter Johannknecht provided a presentation.

Nicholas left at 3:33pm

The Panel asked the following questions of clarification:

- Kind of clarify what the pedestrian pathways around the site and what is like if there's any fence line, what's sort of public that is sort of secure?

- The blue line that you see here is effectively the secure line. So this is a this is fencing of different sizes, you know, quite a low fence here, more of a visual cue. For in terms of security, slightly higher at the at the playing field, just, you know, in terms of containment of of soccer balls and things like that. But because of the fact that the playing field is sunken, you know, we don't need a high fence to do that. like GNS controlled space, the pedestrian accesses are these dotted pink lines, so access to both sides of the townhouses with the the right of way connection between Bank and Madison up here. And then the purple is the bike path, the pink is the the pedestrian way. So you can see here that you can move through the site as a bicyclist or a pedestrian along the multimodal here separated from the vehicle space.
- Would like to understand the grading, specifically accessible experience of, say, a student is. Is there any connection from the interior courtyard space to get out to the field that wouldn't require a student to go inside the building through the elevator down? Like is there? Is there any other way that you might Get to the field from a wheelchair without going the entire periphery of the site.
- If you were here and and you know, yeah, in a wheelchair or or challenged in terms of mobility, your path that doesn't go through this, the building would be down here. Along this this sidewalk which so there's there's a grade downwards here cause you're right there is there is a quite a lot of grade transition that happens on the site. So you are you are sloping downwards along here and by the time you get to this point you can there's a another subtle slope down here to get to the. To the the playing field, but it is possible from the outside to to get to the field. You you do also along here continue down to the point where this there's a subtle slope here, less than 5%. From sidewalk level down to the down to the playing field. So this is the low corner of the site and the playing field is just slightly recessed from this lowest corner and that that recess increases as you move north along Madison and then West.
- have explored the idea of putting a very long ramp at that north side, like what does it do to your site? And you know, it seems like there is some stair access there and perhaps at least including a ramp could. Address some of the north-south connectivity, or at least for students. And yeah, it would be a long ramp, but I'm just wondering if you've tried that. We did at one time have a a a ramp here, but like as you just alluded to Tamara, the the length of it creates kind of an awkward condition at this edge of the of the field. It that's sort of an unusable zone for the full. Length of that of that ramp. And so because we don't see a lot of use traffic coming from this end of the site, you know on balance given the school's program and the desire to have this variety of kind of activity centers down here. We we made the decision to to to not providyou know that that ramp access here.
- Or perhaps one that wraps the corner of the gym building on the north side.
- The length of that ramp and the depth to which it goes, I think it creates an awkward. It creates an awkwardness for for little return, yeah.
- Are you providing the amount of parking that he school needs ot that the neighborhood wants?
- The school, had a parking requirement in access of 150 stalls based on current parking usage, faculty and senior students. So you take that and struck it out to the increased school size would be 160-170 parking stalls, the reason to 181 has to do

with the difficult relationship with traffic and parking with neighbors which there has been extensive mitigation measures in place and how Madison has been advance as a green way, parking remains a key concern for the neighbors. The commitment for the school to accommodate the parking and pick up and drop off areas which is part of the long term plan. 181 through schedule C is the minimum, and we needed enough parking to accommodate both current and future needs, if schedule C changes in future then the opportunity arises to establish where the parking should go from there. Strong focus on policy and school operation on the 9-5 and also the 5-9 users on campus as well.

- How many students attend the school?
- The reference point Chad mentioned, so it's about 550 students, middle school, high school, 100 students, sorry, 100 staff. The thing about independent schools, just to keep in mind versus public schools, is that the admin requirements are quite high, like everything kind of operates on the Independent School here. So the school does have a junior school and so. all of the admin happens at the senior school and so that's the basis for the the parking requirement. So effectively the application is seeking a modest increase in student population about 6:50 and so we're just looking and reflecting the kind of two or 3% growth the city sees every year and just accommodating for that in the future.
- I missed this when I looked at this earlier, but from Laurentian Place, there's no pedestrian connection to the new SRW that's going east-west, is that correct?
- there is so the you have to cross the you cross the the street that the pedestrian and cycling connection moves from. This side of the the street and crosses the street at Laurentian to the other side of the street. This is a one way. It's I think it's just three meters wide. So it's it's very much slow traffic shared space and the reason for the sort of transversing the street with the pedestrian and cycling connection is in terms of alignments where where the vehicle traffic comes in and where we wanted it to come out at Richardson as opposed to Madison was a key was a key consideration. As well, when looking at the ability to create a proper landscape and put that adjacent to the neighbors, you know indicated that that along this end, the West End of the multimodal, it's better to have the it's better to have the pedestrian path. To the South and then adjacent to the playing field when you get to the East End, so you can use. So to answer your question directly coming from Laurentian, you would use that little crosswalk to be able to have access to both directions.
- It was mentioned a few times, but there's no information in our materials about how that looks. Is there anything you can kind of describe?
- The phase nature of it is, you know, it is subjective like. So basically the first thing you're gonna see is the first building happening on the existing soccer field, which is the high school here, just the closest to Richmond. Now how much we can develop over the course is. Function of financing. Basically at the end of the day it is multi phase. It could be a few phases, it could be many phases. It's really subjective on funding and also opportunity, but the one thing to keep in mind is the school will be operating. In perpetuity, it doesn't change. So the the idea is always to bring forward development permits, showcasing the phase and the nature of what it's doing, how it

fits in. So the generic approach here is really a zoning structure that allows for the end final development, but also captures opportunities for the phasing. So if there's some. Clarity around how it'll work. So when future ADPS receive the development permit, they kind of see the context of OK, new campus building, existing campus, how it all fits and and how we're trying to work with with that framework.

- Certainly the questions around parking have been long standing issues in the neighborhood specifically the pick up and drop off. Its fantastic that the primary access point to the school is being changed to the Richardson side. The proposed campus plan is fantastic for the neighborhood
- have a question about parking with relation to the 16 townhouse units. I noticed there's I think at most 44 parking stalls up in. Area. I would imagine people living in townhouses would have cars as well. So do they have an opportunity to use some of the parking at the South end of the playing field or how have you thought about that?
- the parking, the count really establishes the housing is included. So there's no set property or site like it's inclusive of the entire site. So the idea is that there are four stalls and two stalls actually there's six stalls in in the vicinity of the actual. Townhomes and then the remainder of the parking would be on that surface location side. So that's a function of allowing for enough parking for that. So we're not, we just want to give the maximum flexibility. So in that 16 unit form there's 8 units that are two bedrooms or more, so most of them are three bedrooms. And then on those lower units, those are more one bedroom units. So we could see probably a mix of the parking needs for that particular unit, but we didn't want to kind of hold that back. So, so there is some flexibility within the design, yeah.
- Very clear well thoughtout design.
- Priority heritage retention buildings aswell as landscape, I would like to hear more about the ability to introduce heritage and also retain whats already onsite?
- Neither one of the buildings are on the heritage registry, so we will just try to retain what we can. So it's really a matter of what we can do to preserve what we have. So the intention as Grey was mentioning was to take those. So there's there's like a documentation process that will happen. It's the main building is the last building. That would be part of the phasing and that would go into the new administration building. So really it's a functional approach of trying to take as much as we can, both documentation, photography as well as physical assets and move them into the building. So I think it's important for the ADP just to keep in mind that typically applications are new developments happening on old buildings. Buildings and they be are repurposed for different things. This is actually the original owner with the original use, continuing the use and wanting to maintain a legacy and history to tell the new generation of students about the the actual school history. So in in our form it was really about do we. And this was very early on. It was about do we take the existing building and try to shift it to another part of the campus just to keep when we know that it's probably not in the best condition and also perhaps might not tell the same story. Or do we actually modernize and talk about the next generation of students to give them those opportunities, give them that and take those components and tell the story. So We wanted to take both the physical assets, but also take and story tell throughout the entire story. So with Derek's team at PWL, we really thought

hard about how much history do we want to share within the campus and where is it going to be meaningful and where will it actually be most impactful. And I think the outcome is really about that. Now this is rezoning, so this is just about like that idea. And I mean that is to development permits. But in the end of the day, every development permit you're going to see, you're going to see that spoken to in a way because what you're going to see is you're going to see the old building still there and you're going to see a new building being built and you'll be will be talking about it again. But at the end of the day when that final measure happens where that old building is now going to come down the actual. Implementation will be actually happening. So just just another aspect to keep in mind at this stage is just for ADP is that that's especially with the school, with the alumni and all of those components for people who've been at the school 50 years, they're the first to tell us about the history. And so that's been our number one goal and with the. Report with Donald's time on the site, he has come quite clear in terms of, you know, what we could do and what we can't do. So we've we've taken that and moved forward with it, yeah.

Panel members discussed:

- Designing a vehicle circulation and parking system that's going to work really functionally from the school for the school. I could, I could just imagine this just working well for those busy drop off times. I really appreciate that there's that the area of underground parking is limited and that's allowing for lots of treatment. Planting on the ground so that in 80 years will be beautiful trees on on this campus. So I I feel that yeah that staff comment I don't know but I would provide any further recommendation on it adjustments there. I do think that that that north-south permeability through the site, I understand that it's not a a huge driver and it's not a, you know, there's not a big desire line. However, when I look at the urban grid and I see these two streets kind of dead ending into the building, it does make me think that there are going to be some people who want to to cut through that way. And I also do feel that forcing someone in a wheelchair, if they're kind of in the top north corner field to like go all the way around and not if they're trying to go north, it seems really onerous and and something that, you know, we always try to provide. Some kind of equity of access for people who are disabled. So I I even though it would be a very long ramp, I think that there must be a way to include an accessible connection at that north side of the site. You know, redesign, but I I do think it's possible and I do think it's worthwhile, even if it's even if it takes up a lot of space. And then in terms of the heritage aspects, I I do feel that I'm convinced that the documentation approach makes sense when you look at Street View. I'm not as familiar with the site as many of you don't live in the neighborhood, but when I look at the Street View of the of the buildings, I think I'm convinced that perhaps the. Heritage qualities are best depicted through photography rather than retention of those buildings.
- With the the accessibility type of comment, I I definitely appreciate that. I was wondering if that's something that needs to be addressed as part of the rezoning application or if that's maybe something they could work on. Further, during the development permit, once like the actual design is more refined
- It it could, it could potentially be a principle in the in the DP guidelines, you know just that that consideration has to be given to providing access, wheelchair access or accessibility ramps on on the North side of the campus.

- Fabolous proposal, think the proposal that they've got if they can execute on this over time is is really going to elevate the level of the school both architecturally and in terms of landscape accessibility and. Ccommunity accessibility dimensions. I think the the way they've kind of shifted the the focus of access to Richmond is just going to go a huge distance towards modifying the the somewhat hostile neighborhood reaction that there has been over the decades to Glen Lyon. Parents in particular. And yeah, I think it's it's a superb proposal.
- Parking explanation makes sense but would love to see some trees be added to the parking area. I think that they are maybe missing putting something in there in regards to heritage acknowledgment not necessarily retention. They are clearly aware of it but we haven't seen as much heritage be discussed.

Option Two

That the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council that Rezoning Application No. 00876 for 731, 735, 781 Richmond Avenue - 728, 729, 733 Laurentian Place - 724, 730, 736 Maddison Street be approved with the following changes:

- The Applicant consider adding design objectives related to wheelchair/stroller accessible connection from the field to the North pathways.
- The Applicant consider adding design objectives related to honouring the site and building Heritage.
- The Applicant consider adding trees in the large surface parking lot.

Moved By: M.Hornell

Seconded By: M.Showers

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

The public portion of the meeting closed at

5. Adjournment

The July 23, 2025, Advisory Design Panel meeting was adjourned at 4:57 p.m.