



**CITY OF VICTORIA
ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING MINUTES**

October 22, 2025

**HYBRID 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 PRESENT: Julie Brown; Nicholas Standeven; Katie McEvoy (HAPL-ADP Cross-Appointee); Tamara Bonnemaïson, Mark Hornell (Acting Chair) ; Kristina Zalite; Joseph Gowid

OTHERS PRESENT: N/A
PANEL MEMBERS

ABSENT: Prscilla Samuel; Marc Showers (Chair); Julie Brown (Present as applicant attendee for 1101 Yates Street); Tamara Bonnemaïson (Present as applicant attendee for 2612, 2616, 2620 & 2628 Richmond Road)

STAFF PRESENT:

Miko Betanzo – Senior Planner, Urban Design
Caner Oktem – Senior Planner, Urban Design
Kamryn Allen – Recording Secretary
Geordie Gordon – Senior Planner
Aishwarya – Planner

APPLICANT ATTENDEES:

A) Rezoning Application No. 00904 for 1101 Yates Street.

Jessica Krushkowski (Executive Director - Affordable BC Housing Society), Robert Jawl (Managing Director - Jawl Development Corporation), Tamara Bonnemaïson (Landscape Architect - MDI Landscape Architects), Erica Sangster (Principal - DAU Studio), Josh Harvey (Project Architect - DAU Studio)

B) Delegated Development Permit Application No. 01090 for 2612, 2616, 2620 & 2628 Richmond Road Concurrent with Rezoning Application No.00900.

Chris Quigley (Director of Development – Aryze), Dan Kwak (Development Management – Aryze), Mariam Ibrahim (Development Coordinator – Aryze), Paul rigby (Architect – FaulknerBrowns), Heather Norcott (Architect – FaulknerBrowns), Stephen Vincent (Landscape Architect - Durante Kreuk Ltd, DKL)

**C) Development Permit Application No. 000652 for
1551 & 1545 Bay Street.**

Colin Harper (Architect – Charch), John C (Owner), Bryne Alyssa A (Owner), Dave Stephens (Developer – Lida Homes)

1. Call to Order

The Chair called the meeting to order at 12:04 p.m.

Panel Members and staff provided introductions.

2. Approval of Agenda

That the October 22, 2025 Advisory Design Panel Agenda be approved as circulated.

Moved By: M. Showers

Seconded By: Unanimously

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

3. Applications

A) Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00301 for 1101 Yates Street.

Geordie Gordon Senior Planner provided an overview of the application and highlighted the areas that staff are seeking feedback on .

Erica Sangster and Tamara Bonnemaïson provided an overview of the project and Peter Johannknecht provided a presentation.

T. Bonnemaïson rescued from panel duties for this application

The Panel asked the following questions of clarification:

- The Yates Street frontage requires further clarification, as the View Street and Cook Street frontages are clearly shown in the renderings. Panel members requested more detail and insight into the design approach for the Yates Street side.
 - Direct access to the meeting facility is necessary. To prevent a blank wall, a buffered area was introduced to separate public activity from the internal meetings and operations. At the lower level, a sidewalk planter and vertical louvers offer additional screening. The entrance lobby will experience busy periods during events, as well as quieter intervals.
- The project includes several strong value-adding features, such as the stormwater management plan, the Level 4 west-side amenity, and the well-integrated deck and

planters. The design was also recognized for its family-friendly qualities, including ample seating and thoughtful use of space.

- Definitely see the lack of visible amenities for the East building and asked why none were shown. They also inquired about potential biodiversity features and amenities for residents of the smaller building.
 - Residents of both buildings will share the west building's amenity space, which was intentionally designed as a single, high-quality area that encourages use. For the east building, additional amenity space could only be located on the rooftop, as the rest of the building is dedicated to childcare. However, its six-storey height, upper-level setback, and seismic and structural constraints prevent the addition of rooftop amenities. Operational limitations with the sedum roof further restrict possibilities. The east building is comprised mainly of one- and two-bedroom units, and there is no plan to subdivide the parcel. Centralizing amenities in the west building supports efficient management and ensures convenient access for all residents.
- How will the resident of the East building access the rooftop of the West building? Is there a direct indoor connection?
 - Through the parkade they can go directly, otherwise they would go to the sidewalk and to the other buildings entrance.
- Have you explored connecting the buildings above ground?
 - No, we haven't. this approach has not been attempted before, as the two buildings are constructed differently, one wood-frame, the other concrete. They noted that the sidewalk environment has been designed to be inviting, easily accessible, and function as a semi-public space.
- Staff describe the site as the edge of downtown, the approach along Yates Street feels more like a gateway to the downtown core. The building was praised for contributing a strong sense of arrival and for its overall aesthetic appeal.
- Building is a bit long on the North/ South access
 - based on the modeling materials, the building does not appear to cast significantly more shadows than those already created by the surrounding context. A request was made for further clarification or elaboration on this point. The slender tower's orientation, width, and positioning minimize shadow impact, and the additional six meters of length has only a very minor effect.
- They have not quantified the difference compared to a shorter building, shadow analysis for the public realm meets design guideline requirements. The design balances efficiency, economics, and unit count without allowing the small increase in shadowing to drive the project's form.

Panel members discussed:

- The project is very well-conceived. They highlighted the significance of the Yates Street approach as a key entry to the city centre, praising the project for enhancing the intersection of Cook and Government Street. Overall, the speaker expressed support for the project and willingness to put forward a motion and engage in further

discussion.

- Like to see the applicant's approach to the additional six meters of floor plate on the tower. They noted that the north-south orientation, tapered lozenge floor plate, and careful design help mitigate shadow impacts, primarily along Yates Street. The thoughtful treatment of the Yates Street interface was highlighted as a positive feature, and there were no concerns regarding the tower's floor plate or overall size.
- The panel member noted that shadow impacts are primarily confined to the Yates Street right-of-way, and praised the thoughtful design along the Yates Street interface. They described the approach along the sidewalk to the main residential building on Cook Street as a "lovely promenade," with amenities such as seating, rain gardens, trees, and sun-filled south-facing areas. The experience of moving through this landscaped space, including exploring rain gardens and using planter walls, enhances the overall amenity and makes access to the roof deck feel special. The materiality and design of the tower's top were also highlighted positively.

Motion: That the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council that Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00301 for 1101 Yates Street be approved as presented.

Moved By: N. Standeven

Seconded By: J. Gowid

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

B) Development Permit Application No. 01090 for 2612, 2616, 2620 & 2628 Richmond Road Concurrent with Rezoning Application No.00900.

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

Application team provided an overview of the project and a provided a presentation.

- A question was raised seeking clarification from staff regarding the report, specifically referencing page 4 and the rationale for considering a project within the priority growth area under the Official Community Plan. It was noted that the report references the consideration of intensive forms of development when certain conditions are met, such as larger sites. However, the report does not provide an explanation or rationale from staff outlining how this project is determined to meet that condition. Are you able to comment on that at this point? It's a bit of an ambiguous thing in your report.
 - Staff clarified that detailed rationale was not included in the report because rezoning considerations fall outside the Advisory Design Panel's mandate, and the focus was placed on design-related elements. Staff further noted that projects located within the priority growth area may be eligible for additional density when secured rental housing is provided through a housing agreement. In this case, the proposed scale and increased density are considered appropriate given the anticipated housing agreement, which would likely be finalized prior to issuance of the Development Permit. This

reflects the report's reference to the conditions that must be met to support higher-density development.

The Panel asked the following questions of clarification:

- Regarding the commercial retail unit (CRU) located on the corner, asking whether there is a specific type of tenant anticipated for the space. Clarification was also sought on how the surrounding open space is allocated between residential and commercial use, and what the implications would be if the space is not formally divided.
 - the corner commercial retail unit (CRU) has been designed with flexibility in mind, allowing it to adapt to various uses depending on tenant availability and community needs. While it could function as a café, the intent is to create a community-oriented space that could also serve as a small neighborhood shop or gathering place, an amenity accessible to both residents and the broader community. It was noted that a specific tenant has not yet been secured; however, the design approach prioritizes versatility to ensure the space can operate successfully regardless of future tenancy. The associated outdoor area has similarly been conceived as a shared community asset, featuring terrace space with seating and furnishings that encourage interaction among residents and neighbors. The retail unit, approximately 600 to 800 square feet in size, is envisioned as a modest neighborhood-oriented space that enhances the corner's character and contributes to local vibrancy.
- Noting that the project site is located within the Bowker Creek Blueway area and that the Bowker Creek Blueprint is a widely supported regional initiative aimed at restoring the ecological health and function of Bowker Creek. The document was recognized as an important vision for enhancing community amenities and addressing stormwater management at the neighborhood scale. Clarification was requested regarding whether staff had considered incorporating rain gardens within the boulevard space and how permeable paving is being addressed in the design. It was noted that there appear to be multiple versions of the landscape plan, one showing continuous permeable paving and another showing it in select areas, and a more comprehensive discussion around stormwater management in relation to Bowker Creek was suggested, including the potential integration of rain gardens.
 - The stormwater management was a key consideration in the project's design, particularly given the site's location within the Bowker Creek Blueway. While rain gardens were explored as an option, the site's slope made their implementation less practical. Instead, the design focuses on maximizing natural infiltration, allowing most of the water to be absorbed and filtered through the ground. It was noted that the project includes substantial on-site water control measures, addressing runoff from both the building and surrounding surfaces. The applicant emphasized that the absence of underground parking allows for a continuous connection between surface and soil, supporting permeability and natural filtration. The majority of surface areas will feature permeable pavers, which contribute to effective stormwater management and align with the project's goal of reducing impermeable surfaces while promoting sustainable site design.
- A follow-up question was raised regarding whether the inclusion of rain gardens had been further explored as part of the project's stormwater management strategy.
 - Off-site rain gardens were not pursued due to the presence of existing trees that

the team aimed to preserve. However, there was some discussion about a potential rain garden at the corner of Carrick and Richmond that could serve as an off-site stormwater feature. On-site rain gardens were explored but ultimately deemed challenging to implement effectively due to space limitations around the property perimeter. While integration remains possible, the design team prioritized other stormwater management features to ensure they were executed successfully.

- Trees are talked about so much but the importance of trees within the project design. Rather than using structural soil, the use of real soil supported by soil cells could be considered as a more beneficial approach. This method could also be integrated into the site's rainwater management system to provide additional water treatment benefits.
 - I think there is advantages both and can be considered.
- Are there small car stalls on the site?
 - All the stalls are the same size the only difference is the disabled spots at the entrance.
- Recap of the various ground-floor patio areas, including their depths, particularly those along Carrick Street, Richmond Road, and to the west of the parking area. Clarification regarding the façade recesses on the north elevation and how these relate to the adjacent interior spaces.
 - Each residential unit includes a front patio accessed by a small set of steps. Due to the site's natural grade change, falling from the corner along the frontage, the patios vary slightly in elevation. The patio areas are approximately two metres deep, with an additional generous landscaped buffer between the patios and the street. The total setback from the property line to the front of the building measures approximately 4.5 metres.
- 4.5 meters from the property line?
 - The setback from the original property line is approximately 5.5 metres, consisting of about 2 metres to the patio enclosure and an additional 3.5 metres to the building façade. Along this frontage, three private terraces are provided for the adjacent residential units, complemented by a public patio that wraps around the corner at Carrick Street and Richmond Road. At the rear of the building, the terrace spaces are smaller, with a layout that includes surface parking, a hedge, and ground-floor terraces approximately 1.5 metres in depth.
- Deep recesses on the Carrick frontage?
 - The design incorporates slightly permeable screening to allow light penetration. Given that corridor-based apartment layouts can limit access to natural light and exterior views, the inclusion of mesh panels was intended to provide some daylight and outward visibility from these interior corridor spaces.
- From the perspective of neighboring properties, expressing concern about the existing cedar hedges along the south and west sides, as they are not performing well. It was asked whether there had been consideration of adding additional trees or alternative plantings to enhance screening and maintain privacy for adjacent neighbors.
 - Agreed, the importance of the relationship with neighboring properties and that there is already dense vegetation on the adjacent lot. The design aims to balance appropriate setbacks with the housing density envisioned under the

Official Community Plan for this growth area. While the project does not attempt to conceal the building massing, additional planting and screening have been incorporated to provide privacy and complement existing vegetation. The neighboring property currently features limited windows and a heavily planted boundary, which influenced the design response. The proposed planting strategy along the south and west elevations reflects typical neighborhood screening patterns and maintains sensitivity to both current and future development context.

- Would like to see some more articulation in the paving and a more “living street” approach to the parking area. It was noted that further reduction of parking could be considered, such as limiting spaces to encourage car-sharing, given the building’s rental focus. The commenter expressed a desire to see more genuine open space on the ground floor and opportunities to enhance the urban forest, noting that existing trees along Richmond Road are small relative to the scale of the building. Additional, larger trees and increased green space were recommended to better balance the massing and improve the site’s overall livability.
 - I think the way that the parking strategy seeks to balance current market needs with future transportation trends. A decision was made to avoid constructing an underground parking garage, which allows greater flexibility as transportation modalities evolve. On-site parking has been provided to accommodate residents who may still require vehicles, while also promoting car-sharing and multimodal transport, given the site’s proximity to bus and bike lanes. The approach also responds to neighborhood feedback, which emphasized concerns about insufficient parking impacting surrounding streets. Overall, the strategy aims to balance the Official Community Plan’s direction toward reduced car dependence with practical considerations for residents.
- Regarding the basement, which is dedicated to bicycle storage, and clarification was requested on the circulation sequence for cyclists accessing and exiting the basement. Additional clarification was also sought on the pedestrian flow from the building to the rear entrance.
 - The building provides extensive bicycle storage on the ground floor, including double lockers designed to accommodate a large number of bikes. Cyclists access the storage area through a designated space, which also houses mechanical rooms. In total, the property includes 114 bike storage spaces, distributed across several large locker rooms of varying sizes.
- Just a bit concerned about the blind corner coming out of the room with limited visibility.
 - That’s a fair point, as a shared service, users are expected to move at an appropriate pace for the area. The team confirmed that they will consult with a transportation engineer to ensure all necessary safety measures are implemented.

Panel members discussed:

- Based on the staff report and issues analysis, the applicants have addressed residential setbacks in their revised plans. The discussion regarding open space and surface parking is closely related, and since the city has accepted the rationale for not providing underground parking, the focus shifts to exploring how the surface parking

- area can be designed to be more open-space friendly.
- It was suggested that improvements to the parking area have been made to the extent possible, though the amount provided may still be insufficient. The question was raised as to why, if parking can be reduced to allow for a larger building, it cannot similarly be reduced to create additional open space.
 - The landscape plans are still evolving, and adding more landscaping appears to address many site concerns. The southern setback is measured at the narrowest point, approximately seven metres, which combined with the surface parking, suggests that creating a private access, potentially for residents to reach a secluded garden, would be beneficial. The success of the project was said to rely heavily on the commitment to the materials and detailing as shown, particularly the extensive aluminum glazing depicted in delicate, refined volumes. A caution was raised that any value engineering during construction that compromises this level of sophistication would be detrimental to the project's overall design integrity.
 - The corner CRU patio represents a significant open space. While there was some initial ambiguity regarding whether it is intended for retail or community use, it was emphasized that the space should be accessible to all, with a design that relates to the lobby so residents feel comfortable using it without needing to purchase items. Support was expressed for additional tree planting where possible and for the over-height first floor, which provides a dignified presence along Richmond Road. The elevation steps and townhouse patios were highlighted positively, as were the proposed materials, with confidence expressed in the proponent's ability to execute the design as intended based on past projects. However, reservations were noted regarding further reductions in parking, as the current supply is already limited. Concerns were raised about practical considerations such as deliveries, limited on-street parking along Richmond, and uncertain curbside availability on Carrick.

Motion: That the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council that Development Permit Application Delegated Development Permit with Variance(s) Application No. 01090 for 2612, 2616, 2620 and 2628 Richmond Road be approved with the following changes:

- That the applicant considers soil cells rather than structural soil, including using soil cells for storm water management, and incorporating more large canopied trees
- That the applicant explores more ways of creating open space potentially through the use of small car stalls or reduce parking stalls
- That the applicant provides a more gracious route for bicycles at the rear of the building and addresses the potential visibility issues around the garbage room.
- That the applicant considers increasing the size of the private outdoor space on the West side of the ground floor adjacent the surface parking.
- That the applicant ensures that the exterior space is available for residents to use and is not fully commercialized at the corner of Carrick and Richmond.

Moved By: M. Hornell

Seconded By: N. Standeven

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

C) Development Permit Application No. 000652 for 1551 & 1545 Bay Street.

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

Application team provided an overview of the project and provided a presentation.

The Panel asked the following questions of clarification:

- Regarding the location of the rooftop amenity space, asking why it was not provided on the lower level (Level 6). It was noted that building shape may be a factor, and a comparison was made to similar residential projects, such as The Grow in Calgary, where lower-level amenity spaces are provided.
 - The applicant explained that the amenity space was set back from the neighboring property to address privacy concerns and minimize potential overlooking into adjacent residences.
- It was noted that the expanded public realm is a positive feature and helps compensate for the relatively tight private outdoor spaces. Questions were raised regarding the possibility of locating the two accessible parking spaces together and whether the westerly bike room could have direct exterior access. Additionally, consideration was requested for relocating the electrical room closer to the PMT.
 - It was noted that the city indicated support for locating a single accessible stall and a car-share stall side by side on-site. Achieving this layout would require maintaining or slightly extending the existing bump-out to ensure adequate clearance. Coordination with transportation and engineering is necessary to confirm that maneuvering into the stalls is feasible, given the narrow driveway crossing. If confirmed, this arrangement would be preferable, as it reduces drivable surface and frees up additional space along the south side for landscaping.
- Regarding the underbuilding parking area, specifically whether the vertical support nearest Victor Street could be clad in the same material as the volume above to maintain a consistent architectural expression?
 - The applicant confirmed that the cladding on the vertical support will continue around the corner of the building, consistent with the design logic applied to the rest of the façade.
- When people park their bikes will the bicycle parking near the lobby interfere with residents' use of the space and curious whether a separate external entrance for cyclists has been considered.
 - The applicant explained that residents do not need to pass through the lobby to access the bike storage, as an exit to the side yard is provided. While use of the lobby remains optional, this approach is common in multifamily buildings without direct exterior access. It was noted that locating the bike storage on the south side of the building preserves street-facing floor area for residential units. If the south side location is maintained, openings through the adjacent outdoor common space would be provided to facilitate access.
- The corner unit close to the parking spots it only has one entrance.
 - Correct.

- Bay Street and the adjacent sidewalk, noting that the area falls within the road dedication. Clarification was requested on whether there has been any discussion about providing additional frontage space for the units.
 - The frontage requirement was dictated by the City to accommodate a future Bay Street design, with the intent of preserving space for potential road widening.
- Unit B1 on the corner, specifically about the narrow patio wrapping around the corner and adjacent to the bedroom, and how that design decision was made.
 - The patio and window placement for Unit B1 was intended to activate and animate the elevation with as many openings as possible, including an additional bathroom window. They noted that flipping the layout to place the living room on the exterior is also a viable option and would not have significant adverse impacts. The design rationale considered both activation of the façade and functional flexibility for the unit.
- A concern was raised regarding the proximity of the Bay Street sidewalk to the patio, whether there might be potential to create a buffer, such as a one-metre setback or a back boulevard. Alternatives like a picket fence were noted as potentially intrusive, and the idea of a solid fence around the patio area was suggested as a possible solution.
 - The applicant noted that the road dedication and sidewalk width were determined by the City’s engineering requirements, leaving little flexibility to make changes. While a reduced dedication would be desirable, the current dimensions are fixed. Regarding fencing, the design currently matches the custom metal picket guardrails of the balconies, but the team could consider using solid fencing around the patio area while retaining picket style elsewhere.
- The rain garden and deck are attractive features, but there was some confusion regarding whether planting would be included beneath the deck. It was suggested that incorporating more custom furniture, rather than just two planters, could create a more engaging and visually interesting space.
 - The furniture selection is being considered and can be refined over time. Planters were included to engage residents and foster community interaction. There is no intention to plant shrubs under the deck, as the low-light conditions are unsuitable for growth; however, two trees will be planted at ground level, and camas will be used as part of the planting scheme.
- Love the apple trees on the roof, Is there going to be shade provided?
- Will look into this further

Panel members discussed:

- Well-conceived project with a lot of things that need to be balanced like road dedications. It was suggested that relocating the rooftop amenity to Level 6 could provide several benefits, including improved solar orientation, reduced building height, shorter elevator access, and the creation of attractive outdoor space along Richmond Street in place of parking.
- Consider improving the relationship of the ground floor patios to Bay street. I think the

design can be improved.

- It was noted that the patio's function more as walkways to the front doors rather than formal outdoor spaces, and from this perspective, they are effective. If they were intended as formal patios, the spaces would likely feel too tight.
- Tree M1 may need to be removed, but Victor Street is characterized by its beautiful, mature, and uniform street trees. Retaining this tree was considered a higher priority than relocating the parking stalls, and it was suggested that preserving the tree may be preferable even if it conflicts with other site elements.
- The project was considered overbuilt for the site, with agreement that a single-loaded layout may have been more appropriate. The staff report does not specify the lot size, which is estimated at roughly 10,000 square feet on a primary emergency route to Royal Jubilee Hospital. It was noted that Bay Street may eventually be widened, making the current boulevard a temporary condition. Concerns were raised that the first-floor units feel tight, with patio access limited to sliding doors and gates, providing minimal separation from the sidewalk. Panel members largely agreed with staff that additional measures are needed to raise patios or otherwise improve privacy and separation for the ground-floor units.

Motion That the Advisory Design Panel recommend to staff that the Delegated Development Permit with Variances Application No. 01081 for 1551 & 1545 Bay Street be approved with the following changes:

- The applicant considers moving the roof top amenity space to level 6
- The applicant improves the relationship between the ground floor units on Bay Street and the sidewalk for example revising the front doors to swing doors, raising the patio, refining the fencing and providing additional planting area
- The panel feels that tree retention on Victor Street is more important than adjusting parking stalls

Moved By: K. Zalite

Seconded By: N. Standeven

Opposed (J. Gowid, M. Hornell)

The public portion of the meeting closed at 3:35.

4. Adjournment

The October 22, 2025, Advisory Design Panel meeting was adjourned at 3:35 p.m.