



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

August 27, 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: Marc Showers (Chair); Julie Brown; Kavita Srinivasan; Nicholas Standeven; Katie McEvoy (HAPL-ADP Cross-Appointee); Tamara Bonnemaïson, Priscilla Samuel; Joseph Gowid; Mark Hornell

ABSENT Kristina Zalite

STAFF PRESENT: Miko Betanzo – Senior Planner, Urban Design
Caner Oktem – Senior Planner, Urban Design
Chloe Tunis – Senior Planner
Kasha Janota-Bzowska – Planner
Kamryn Allen – Administrative Assistant

APPLICANT ATTENDEES: **A) Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00284 for 2839 and 2845 Cedar Hill Road Concurrent with Rezoning Application No. 00885.**

Wil Peereboom (Victoria Design Group – Designer), Erin Renwick (Greenspace Design – Landscape Designer), Deane Strongitharm (Applicant - Strongitharm Consulting), Hayley Yeo (Strongitharm Consulting)

B) Development Permit with Variances Application No. 000285 for 2931 and 2937 Shelbourne Street Concurrent with Rezoning application No. 00878

Mathew Gustavson (President Gustavson Capital Corporation), Melissa Yon (Owner)

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 August 13, 2025

Moved By: M. Showers
Seconded By: M. Hornell

That the Minutes from the meeting held August 13, 2025 be approved as circulated.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

3. Approval of Agenda

Moved By: M. Showers
Seconded By: J. Brown

That the August 27, 2025 Advisory Design Panel Agenda be approved as circulated.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

4. Applications

**A) Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00284 for 2839 and 2845
Concurrent with Rezoning Application No. 00885.**

Kasha Janota-Bzowska, Planner, provided an overview of the application.

Areas of Interest:

1. Building orientation
2. Setback and privacy
3. Open site space and lot coverage
4. Shared space and green space
5. Design of block 2 and 3 townhouse buildings specifically inward facing

Deane Strongitharm and Erin Renwick presentation provided an overview of the project

Tamara Bonnemaision Joined the meeting at 12:22pm

The Panel asked the following questions of clarification:

- It was noted that the target was to provide parking for each home; however, Building 1 features a carport layout. Could you provide more detail on the rationale for choosing a carport design?
 - The applicant explained that Building 1 fronts onto Cedar Hill Road and incorporating carports rather than enclosed garages was considered more practical. The goal was to provide one parking stall per unit, and the open carport design was viewed as more attractive to homeowners while offering additional space. Levels 2 and 3 overhang above the carports, integrating the structure well into the overall design. The two end units (103 and 104) accommodate four parking stalls, while units 101 and 103, which will be accessible units, do not have direct parking stalls beneath them. The second floor of Building 1 includes an

east-facing balcony overlooking the north side parking area, allowing residents to maintain visibility of outdoor spaces, such as where children might be playing.

- A question was raised regarding the public walkway shown in one of the slides and whether space has been created to accommodate trees. Further clarification was requested.
 - The fencing design is being revised to add more architectural interest and to give Building 3 more of a frontage appearance adjacent to the townhouse rear yards.
- Is the public walkway up against the property line?
 - It was confirmed that the three trees along Cedar Hill Road have been incorporated to allow for boulevard tree planting. The SRW and property line provide sufficient space for these boulevard trees to be located before the curb, creating separation from the roadway.
- Regarding the pedestrian entrance sequence for Blocks 2 and 3 and how has safety has been addressed in the design?
 - The main entrance design focuses on improving visibility and enhancing the pedestrian experience. As vehicles enter via the driveway and garages, additional landscaping will be added between the garage doors and entryways to soften the appearance. The design also incorporates colour accents on doorways (such as red, green, or blue) and dormer elements, fenestration, and porch lighting to create a more defined and welcoming entrance, particularly for areas facing the lane. The intent is to make these entrances feel like front entrances rather than rear access points. Building 3, which fronts the public access, will include similar treatments to strengthen its frontage appearance. A shared gate at the far end of the property will provide access for residents of Blocks 2 and 3, along with individual gates along Block 3 to connect directly to the pedestrian pathway, offering convenient access for both visitors and residents.
- Is the eastern property line pathway intended to replace the northern pathway for Block 2 that has been removed?
 - It was noted that shifting the building block southward, away from the northern property line, was important to allow for larger trees to be planted, enhancing landscaping, buffering, privacy, and reducing overlook. This adjustment also provides greater convenience and more usable space for residents and families.
- Has access to Block 2 has been considered from Cedar Hill Road at the northwest corner, to provide an alternative entry point and reduce the need for access along the driveway.
 - It was noted that access from Cedar Hill Road had been discussed; however, existing tree roots present potential challenges. Introducing a pathway in that location would reduce the amount of designated landscaping, as pathways are not considered part of landscaped areas. Maintaining contiguous landscaping was prioritized, and the presence of a retaining wall and fencing between buildings further influenced this decision. The design team consulted with the neighboring property owner regarding the existing tree, but they preferred to retain it, which supported maintaining the current layout. Although there is no direct

access from Cedar Hill Road, the distance is minimal, and the proposed design was determined to be the most suitable overall.

- Blocks 101 and 102, which have extra space without garages but larger recreational areas. Has consideration been given to allocating this space as additional open space rather than as extra living space, given the limited overall open space?
 - It was explained that, from a practical standpoint, Levels 2 and 3 are located above this area, so it is not open to the sky. Unit 2 is smaller than Unit 1 due to the inclusion of an electrical room and bike storage, and it was determined that designating Unit 2 as an accessible unit would be the most beneficial use of that space.
- Question about the interface between the public walkway and the vehicle drive aisle near Cedar Hill Road, specifically relating to grading, fencing, and material treatments.
 - It was noted that the design has been developed in consultation with the civil engineer and the engineering department. Fencing and a minor level of separation will be provided between the pedestrian pathway, which will feature a new surface treatment, and the driveway. Street lighting will also be included as part of the design. These elements were carefully considered
- A comment was made in support of Block 3's connection to the pathway, about whether the unit layouts could be modified to better reflect this connection as a primary entrance for those units.
 - It was noted that the garage will remain as such, and the lower-level flex space, which leads out to the front entrance, is expected to be actively used. Given that these are three-bedroom units, the space is anticipated to serve as a play area or recreational space for families with children. The design was recognized as providing strong practical utility, with the main floor accommodating the living, dining, and kitchen areas and the lower level offering additional functional space.
- Under the new GRD-1 zone are there any parking requirements? Specifically, visitor parking?
 - It was confirmed that visitor parking is currently required; however, these requirements are expected to change under the forthcoming draft zoning (GRD-1).
- It was noted that under the proposed new zoning, 13 parking spaces are provided in addition to the van and loading spaces. Under the current zoning, however, no visitor parking is required.
 - Under the draft GRD-1 zoning, the requirement is only 9 general residential stalls and one visitor stall.
 - The current plan provides one bicycle stall per unit plus one additional stall. Under the new proposal, a minimum of six Class B bicycle stalls per building is required, which would total 18 stalls across the three buildings. At present, six stalls are shown, but the team is exploring options to increase this number by adding a few more.
- Wondered if you have considered an accessible unit as one of the stalls?

- The 13th stall is a combination of an accessible stall and an advanced stall.

Panel members discussed:

- It was noted that Block 3 has shown significant improvement by treating the pedestrian pathway as a primary entrance. However, concerns remain regarding access for Block 2. Suggestions included modifying the paving design to create a more courtyard-like feel, making the space less vehicle-oriented and more pedestrian-friendly, particularly to enhance safety for children. Additional recommendations included widening the south edge of the driveway to a pedestrian width and improving the connection along the east property line to the paved area. Clarification was also requested regarding the corner unit of Block 3 and its interface with these areas.
The main concern is that Block 2 appears somewhat isolated from the rest of the site.
- The design has significantly improved with recent changes. A comment was made regarding building orientation, specifically that Blocks 2 and 3 face inward rather than toward the street. This was not viewed as a major concern, as similar configurations are seen along Shelbourne Street. It was also acknowledged that reorienting the buildings would likely require reducing the number of units. Suggestions included exploring paving or design treatments to further emphasize the shared-access nature of the internal space.
- That the “little village” concept, featuring three separate buildings organized around occasional vehicle access and shared courtyard spaces, is successful. The slight elevation between the first and main floors was highlighted as a distinctive and uncommon design feature in Victoria.
The design could take greater advantage of the pathway by enhancing the entry interface and strengthening the connection to it. It was noted that these elements should be included as part of a formal motion.
- The south elevation of Block 1 appears somewhat disjointed and, given its prominent corner location facing the pathway, would benefit from further architectural refinement to create a more cohesive frontage.

Motion: That the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council that Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00284 for 2839 and 2845 Cedar Hill Road be approved including the proposed amendments presented by the applicant at the Advisory Design Panel meeting with the following additional changes:

- Improve the entry sequence of block 2 through the use of pedestrian friendly material changes to the driveway area and the relationship and connectivity of block 2 and the West stall pathway.
- Improve the ability for pedestrians to use the driveway safely through the use of surface material treatments.

Moved By: M. Showers

Seconded By: J. Brown

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

B) Development Permit with Variances Application No. 000285 for 2931 and 2937 Shelbourne Street Concurrent with Rezoning application No. 00878

THE REVIEW OF THIS APPLICATION WAS DEFERRED TO A FUTURE MEETING DUE TO ARCHITECT NOT BEING AVAILABLE AT THIS MEETING.

The public portion of the meeting closed at 1:15pm.

5. Adjournment

The July 23, 2025, Advisory Design Panel meeting was adjourned at 1:17 p.m.