CITY OF VICTORIA
ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING MINUTES
November 26, 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; Nicholas Standeven; Tamar Bonnemaison; Mark Hornell; Kristina Zalite; Joseph Gowid
ABSENT:	Priscilla Samuel
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
APPLICANTIONS: ATTENDEES:	**A) Rezoning Application No. 00867 for 900 & 912 Vancouver Street, 911 Quadra Street, and 930 & 990 Burdett Avenue** Paul Rigby (Architect AIBC, Faulkner Browns), Katie Cummer (Cummer Heritage Consulting), Brendon Neilson (Anglican Diocese), Kaeley Wiseman (MCP RPP, Wiser Projects), Sarah Murray (Wiser Projects) **B) Development Permit with Variances Application No.000294 for 1908 Foul Bay Road** Maria Pawluczuk (Ledcor Property Investments), Greg Voute (Architect AIBC, RLA), Chris Windjack (Landscape Architect MBCSLA, 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 Dwji (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 (Architect AIBC, Cascadia Architects), D'Arcy Hutton (PWL Partnership Landscape Architects), Derek Lee (Landscape Architect MBCSLA, PWL Partnership Landscape Architects), Donald Luxton (Donald Luxton & Associates)

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

Updates need to be made to the October 8, 2025 Meeting Minutes:

- Typo page 6 - Priscilla name.
- Julie did in fact attend the entire length of the meeting
- 2501 Blanshard Street – Architect who presented needs to be updated.
- 2501 Blanshard Street - Remove the note stating that the project "significantly exceeds the parking requirements," as the panel requested that this be deleted.

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.

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. Announcements/ Questions

- Mark's comments and discussion were deferred to the next meeting, with appreciation expressed for bringing them forward. He noted that he would like additional information, even if it requires a second meeting.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

5. Applications

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

Miko Betanzo, Senior Planner - Urban Design, provided an overview of the application.

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

The Panel asked the following questions of clarification:

- Concerns about how the new building heights affect views of the Cathedral façade from Courtney, Douglas, and Blanshard Streets. Noted that the tallest massing seems tight against the southern tower?
    - View impact and alignment with the Cathedral have been major design considerations. Initial concept aligned the tower with the Cathedral's original tower axis for harmony. After working with the City, the current configuration was chosen as less disruptive to the Cathedral's gable silhouette. Multiple massing options were explored; impacts depend on perspective, depth of field, and street conditions.
- Clarification on the pedestrian connectivity and massing strategy. The proposed north-south pedestrian route, east-west connections, lack of podium massing for tall buildings, and location of non-residential uses?
    - North-south route is intentional, creating a strong public connection between Pioneer Square and Cathedral Commons. East-west route would introduce meandering pedestrian movement typical of cathedral precincts, offering quiet spaces and contemplative areas. Building lengths are broken up through articulation to maintain scale and rhythm. Above level 2 in the western block is entirely residential, support use(s) for the Cathedral are also included onsite.
- Wondering if on-grade soil zones will include shrubs or only trees/lawn?
    - Shrubs will be used where soil depth is limited (on slabs) to maintain low, permeable landscaping. Trees will be planted where adequate soil depth is achievable.
- Clarification on tree species/types for large protection zones on Cathedral Walk?
    - Existing trees are based on the arborist report. Final species selection will follow best practice and City bylaw standards (Schedule E) during later design phases. Applicant acknowledges preference for more than just small-species trees.

- Concerns that the envisioned plaza-like space may be lost if final paving uses asphalt instead of pavers
    - Applicant will coordinate closely with the City to deliver consistent, high-quality surface treatments.
- Clarification on whether the space is a shared "woonerf," sidewalk widths, and spatial relationship to the Cathedral?
    - The surface is shared and can accommodate vehicles. East-west alignment is determined by placement of development between Memorial Hall and the Cathedral to facilitate long-intended connections between the two buildings.
- Reasoning behind reducing tower separation from the typical 20 m to 15 m?
    - Intentional choice to create a more intimate, human-scaled urban environment. Applicant believes 15 m still allows acceptable window-to-window relationships given the corner-to-corner building orientation, subject to detailed design review.
- How were these specific heights determined 8 and 18 storeys?
    - Heights were suggested by City staff during massing studies. Six stories aligns with lightweight construction logic, while 18 storeys provides efficiency for taller blocks. Applicant originally proposed 24 storeys but adapted to staff guidance.
- Concern that buildings appear internally oriented with limited street-facing entrances?
    - Intent is to animate the street with front doors and windows, similar to traditional mansion blocks. Future detailed design may include duplexes with direct street access. Design guidelines require active residential frontage.
- How do the buildings relate to Rockland's interface?
    - Rockland benefits from existing heritage elements including Memorial Hall and its Gothic Revival façade. New building frontage will continue the animated ground-level treatment shown in renderings and will tie into Memorial Hall.

Panel members discussed:

- The proposal is ambitious, and the heritage integration is appreciated, particularly the retention of Yarrow Chapel, Memorial Hall, and the Cathedral, which are all significant to the area. The original concept aligning the tall building with the Cathedral axis feels appropriate with the exception of the previously proposed building height. Primary concern is the ground-level public realm, especially along Cathedral Walk and the east-west connection. Without careful design and protections, these spaces risk becoming private areas, even if intended as public connections. Clear commitments will be needed beyond rezoning to ensure long-term public access. The spacing between the Cathedral (south side) and the new Cathedral House reads as a pinch point. Shifting Cathedral House slightly south could improve this threshold without negatively impacting the Burdett frontage. The choice to separate the tall buildings into distinct volumes is understood, but it forces the second tower to remain fixed in its current position. A more traditional podium-and-tower approach might allow better flexibility in tower placement while maintaining massing intent. Overall, the proposal is strong and has merit.

- Strongly support the overall structure and logic behind dividing the site into distinct development zones, especially the perimeter-courtyard approach on the eastern side. Main concern relates to building height at the rear of the site, preferring heights of 8 storeys or less to provide a gentler transition to Fairfield and reduce competition with the Cathedral's prominence. Recognize that the height and density may be tied to financial feasibility, particularly the funding required for the Cathedral's seismic upgrades and other heritage work. Success of the proposal will depend heavily on execution and delivery of off-site amenities, including the cathedral forecourt and connections to surrounding open spaces. These will likely require a master development agreement securing long-term obligations between the City and the applicant. Generally supportive of the proposal, height concerns are noted but not necessarily deal-breaking.
- The key design moves are strong, though there are some height considerations. The 18-storey tower could be taller, so it does not appear to visually compete with or mirror the Cathedral height when viewed from Blanshard. A clearer height distinction may better support the Cathedral's architectural presence. Supports a 6-storey scale along the street as a more appropriate urban relationship. No concerns regarding tower separation, the small tower footprints and corner-to-corner separation mean many units will have dual-aspect windows, mitigating privacy issues.

Motion: 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: T. Bonnemaison

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

J. Gowid 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, based on the updated General Urban Design (GUD) Guidelines that apply to the project.

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

The Panel asked the following questions of clarification:

- Are the ground-floor residential units along Bourchier depressed below grade?
    - No. The building sits about 6-8 inches above the sidewalk, and the planters are elevated on the structural slab, which makes them appear raised.
- Why wasn't the building pulled closer to the Foul Bay sidewalk, and why wasn't commercial space added along that frontage?
    - The applicant prioritized landscaped residential setbacks for patios and greenery, needed to dedicate three metres of the site for frontage improvements, and required more space for street trees. They explained that adding isolated retail would not activate the street, would conflict with nearby single-family homes, and would displace needed rental units. Instead, they chose to provide a public plaza.
- Have the six trees shown over the storm tank been confirmed with civil engineers, and were rain gardens explored?
    - Yes, civil staff confirmed the tree placement is acceptable. Rain gardens were explored but could not meet the required stormwater retention volume. The tank will be wrapped and covered with sufficient soil depth to protect the roots.
- What is the intent for the corridor between Bourchier and the commercial plaza, and could rooftop amenity space be considered?
    - The applicant said rooftop amenity space was avoided due to noise concerns for neighbours, cost impacts on a wood-frame building, and a focus on affordability. They noted that the project already provides ample outdoor amenity space at grade and is close to nearby services. The onsite path only leads to the amenity area and bike parking because the adjacent Save-On-Foods pedestrian path will remain and be improved with fencing, landscaping, and residential overlook for safety.
- What will be the height and type of fencing and plantings along that edge?
    - The applicant said the area will include native and adaptive shrubs and tall, narrow conifers, along with a typical five- to six-foot wood fence instead of chain link.
- Are the planters larger to accommodate the number of trees, and are the patios slightly smaller?
    - Yes. The outdoor amenity area was redesigned with much larger planters and deeper soil volumes to meet bylaw requirements, including mandatory setbacks from walls.
- Was an extensive green roof considered?
    - No. A green roof would add major structural and cost burdens to a six-storey wood-frame building, create long-term maintenance and leak risks, and provide little visual benefit. The applicant chose instead to focus on significant ground-level landscaping.
- Did the applicant consult Save-On-Foods about improving the shared pathway?

    - The applicant said they plan to enhance landscaping and safety along that edge and noted that the existing path already has lighting. They suggested Save-On-Foods could add signage and additional lighting.
- Would the applicant consider not installing the fence at the property line to better contribute to the neighbourhood pathway?
    - Yes. They said they are open to exploring that option.
- Was Transportation Demand Management considered to reduce parking?
    - Yes. The applicant has already requested a variance and is providing 0.62 parking spaces per unit, which is below a 1:1 ratio.
- Will the north courtyard be fully in shadow?
    - It will receive minimal sunlight, but this layout best suits the building's massing. Landscaping and outdoor programming were designed for shade, including features like a fireplace for comfort.
- What materials and colour palette were chosen for the building?
    - Because the building is wood-frame, all exterior materials must be non-combustible, so the applicant selected various fibre-cement panels, including wood-look finishes for soffits and siding. The colour scheme places deep red panels at the corners, neutral tones in the middle, and a richer mix around the entrance to create depth and highlight the entry.

J. Gowid joined at 3:00pm

Panel members discussed:

- The rear pathway behind the site has long felt underused, sheltered, and unsafe. We'd encouraged the applicant to open it up as much as possible from their side. Also observed that the Foul Bay frontage seemed to have limited engagement with the street and that the patios on that side appeared small, though this may reflect the lower desirability of spending time along a busy arterial.
- Initially unsure about whether the patios along Foul Bay should have more direct access to the sidewalk but ultimately felt the proposed landscape interface strikes a reasonable balance. The existing edge is currently harsh and unsafe, with many potential conflicts between pedestrians, cyclists, and vehicles, and we felt the land dedication would meaningfully improve future conditions. The design has evolved significantly, particularly with the relocation of the parkade ramp, and that this iterative process has addressed many earlier concerns. It is agreed that further consideration of the west-side pedestrian path would be valuable, noting that the area feels poorly surveyed and unsafe today.
- After discussing the staff comment regarding balconies being more "integral" to the building. They acknowledged that inset balconies provide better weather protection and meet guideline intent but questioned whether embedding balconies would reduce interior living space. It is agreed that the current balcony sizes appear functional and meet minimum standards.
- concern that the colour and material palette feels overly busy, giving the impression of a larger building, and suggested a more cohesive approach. The varied colours help

break up the massing into vertical bays and that reducing contrast could make the building appear even wider. The surrounding context, including the nearby care facility, also features multiple cladding types, and felt that while there may be opportunities to simplify the palette, the project would not succeed or fail based on colour choices alone. Also did not feel that adding commercial space was necessary given the proximity to existing commercial uses and the expectation of future redevelopment on the Save-On-Foods site.

- The City should develop a broader urban design vision for the entire Foul Bay corridor between Fort Street and Oak Bay Avenue, given the changes happening at both ends of the street and the need to clarify expectations for ground-floor uses along the corridor.
- The south façade appears to have reasonable entries and outdoor space but suggested the applicant consider increasing the ceiling height of the first floor to give the ground level a stronger sense of prominence, rather than maintaining uniform eight-foot floor heights throughout

Motion: 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: N. Standeven

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)

Patrick Carroll, Senior Planner, provided an overview of the application and highlighted the areas that staff are seeking feedback on, based on the updated General Urban Design (GUD) Guidelines that apply to the project.

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

N. Standeven recused from application and left at 3:33pm

The Panel asked the following questions of clarification:

- Can you clarify the pedestrian pathways around the site, including fence lines and which areas are public versus secured?
    - The blue line marks the secure perimeter, with varying fence heights depending on

the area. Lower fencing is used where only a visual cue is needed, while slightly higher fencing contains soccer balls near the field, which is sunken and doesn't require tall fencing. Pedestrians use the dotted pink paths, providing access on both sides of the townhouses and the right-of-way between Bank and Madison. Cyclists use the purple path, and both modes are separated from vehicle circulation.

- Is there an accessible route for a student in a wheelchair to reach the field without entering the building and using the elevator?
    - Yes. A wheelchair user can follow the exterior sidewalk that slopes down toward the field. Grades vary across the site, but at the southwest corner there is a gentle slope under 5% that connects directly to the field. This allows access without going through the building.
- Have you explored the option of a long ramp on the north side to improve north–south accessible connectivity?
    - A ramp was studied, but its required length created awkward, unusable spaces along the field edge. Since this area sees little traffic and the school prioritized space for activity zones, the ramp was removed from the design.
- What about adding a ramp that wraps around the gym building on the north side?
    - This was also considered, but the ramp's length and depth would still create awkward spaces with little benefit. The team concluded it was not a functional solution.
- Are you providing the amount of parking the school needs or what the neighborhood wants?
    - Based on current use, the school requires 160–170 stalls. The proposed 181 spaces address both school needs and long-standing neighborhood concerns about traffic and parking, especially given Madison's role as a greenway. This count accommodates current and future operations, including daytime users and evening campus activity. If Schedule C regulations change, parking allocation can be revisited.
- How many students currently attend the school?
    - There are about 550 middle and high school students and approximately 100 staff. Independent schools have higher administrative needs, especially with the junior school's admin located on the senior campus. The rezoning anticipates a modest increase to about 650 students, reflecting typical annual growth.
- Is there no pedestrian connection from Laurentian Place to the new east–west SRW?
    - There is a connection. Pedestrians cross the street at Laurentian to access the shared pedestrian and cycling route. This alignment was chosen to manage vehicle access points and to maintain appropriate landscaping buffers for neighbors. From the crosswalk, users can travel in both directions along the path.
- There wasn't much detail in the materials about phasing. Can you describe how the phased construction will look?
    - The first phase will be the new high school building on the current soccer field near

Richmond. Additional phases depend on financing and opportunity and may occur in several stages. The school will continue operating throughout. Each development permit will show how the phase fits into the overall campus plan so future panels can review context clearly. The rezoning sets the framework for the final build-out while allowing phased flexibility.

- Parking has been a long-standing neighborhood issue, so it's good that primary school access is shifting to Richardson. The campus plan seems positive for the neighborhood.
- How will parking work for the 16 townhouse units? There appear to be only about 44 spaces nearby, and residents will likely have cars.
    - Parking for the townhouses is included in the overall site count rather than assigned separately. Six stalls are located near the townhomes, with additional parking available in the main surface lot. The 16 units include a mix of one-bedroom and larger homes, so parking needs will vary. The design intentionally provides flexibility across the site.
- The design is very clear and well considered.
- Can you explain your approach to heritage retention and how existing heritage elements will be incorporated?
    - Although none of the buildings are formally registered as heritage, the school intends to retain and document as much as possible. The existing main building will be part of the final phase and elements such as photographs, documentation, and physical features will be incorporated into the new administration building. As the school is the original owner continuing the original use, there is a strong desire to preserve and share its history. Each future development permit will address heritage integration, and alumni input has guided decisions about what can and cannot be preserved.

Panel members discussed:

- Want to acknowledge how well the vehicle circulation and parking system has been designed. I can imagine it functioning smoothly during busy drop-off times. I also appreciate that the limited underground parking allows for significant landscaping at grade, which will support mature trees over time. I do still have concerns about the lack of north-south permeability. Even if it's not a major desire line, the urban grid suggests some people will want to move through the site, and asking a wheelchair user in the north field corner to travel all the way around feels inequitable. I believe an accessible north-south connection, possibly a long ramp, is still worth exploring. On the heritage side, I am convinced that a documentation approach makes sense. From what I can see in Street View, the heritage character is probably better expressed through photography and interpretation than through retaining the buildings themselves.
- Appreciate the comments around accessibility and share the concern. I am wondering, though, whether this is something that needs to be resolved now at the rezoning stage or whether it is better addressed during the development permit process when the design is more detailed.

- Think we could address this by including an accessibility principle in the development permit guidelines. That way, consideration for a north-side accessible route, whether a ramp or other solution, is clearly carried forward into the next stage of design.
- This is a fabulous proposal. If the team can execute this vision over time, the campus will be significantly elevated, architecturally, in landscape quality, and in community accessibility. Shifting primary access to Richmond will go a long way in improving longstanding neighborhood concerns about traffic and parent drop-offs. Overall, I think the proposal is superb.
- I understand the parking explanation, and it makes sense to me, but I would still like to see more trees incorporated into the parking area. I also feel there is an opportunity for stronger heritage acknowledgment. Even if the buildings are not being retained, more explicit recognition of the school's history within the design would be valuable.

Motion: 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 4:55pm

6. Adjournment

The November 26, 2025, Advisory Design Panel meeting was adjourned at 4:57 p.m.