



**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 Smauel; 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. Minutes**

~~Minutes from the meeting~~

~~Moved By:~~

~~Seconded By:~~

~~CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY~~

**3. 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**

**4. 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 .

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

Tamara 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**