## F.1.a.c Council Member Motion - Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00106 for 1700 Blanshard Street

Moved By Mayor Helps
Seconded By Councillor Alto
That Council waive the standard practice of holding an opportunity for public comment for this application but direct staff to continue other standard practices related to sign posting and public notification, including a request for written commentary to come back to Council for consideration prior to issuing the Development Permit with Variances.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

## L. 2 Council Member Motion - Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00106 for 1700 Blanshard Street

Committee received a report dated May 7, 2020 from the Mayor requesting Council waive the Opportunity for Public Comment for the application while continuing other notification practices to allow for correspondence and other communication.

## Moved By Mayor Helps

Seconded By Councillor Alto

1. That Council waive the standard practice of holding an opportunity for public comment for this application but direct staff to continue other standard practices related to sign posting and public notification, including a request for written commentary to come back to Council for consideration prior to issuing the Development Permit with Variances.
2. That Council, subject to the preparation and execution of legal agreements to the satisfaction of the City Staff, and subject to the required notification and advertising that Council authorize the issuance of Development Permit with Variance Application No. 000106 for 1700 Blanshard Street, in accordance with:
a. Plans date stamped November 7, 2019.
b. Development meeting all Zoning Regulation Bylaw requirements, except for the following variances:
i. Reduce the building setback above 10 m from 12.35 to 4.8 metres, measured at the highest building elevation on Blanshard Street
ii. Reduce the building setback above 10 m from 2.26 to 0.5 metres, measured at the highest building elevation on Fisgard Street
iii. Reduce the number of on-site short term bicycle stalls from thirty-one to sixteen.
c. Registration of a statutory right-of-way on Blanshard Street to secure passage over the fronting sidewalk.
d. Registration of an encroachment agreement for building canopies.
e. The development permit lapsing two years from the date of this resolution.

Committee discussed the following:

- Specific wording in the proposed motion
- CMHC funding to be secured upon approval

Motion to postpone:
Moved By Mayor Helps
Seconded By Councillor Alto
That consideration of this item be postponed for staff to confer.

## CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Committee recessed at 1:29 p.m. and reconvened at 2:02 p.m.

## L. 2 Council Member Motion - Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00106 for 1700 Blanshard Street <br> Moved By Councillor Alto <br> Seconded By Councillor Young <br> That the motion be lifted from the table. <br> CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY <br> Moved By Mayor Helps <br> Seconded By Councillor Alto

1. That Council waive the standard practice of holding an opportunity for public comment for this application but direct staff to continue other standard practices related to sign posting and public notification, including a request for written commentary to come back to Council for consideration prior to issuing the Development Permit with Variances.
2. That Council, subject to the preparation and execution of legal agreements to the satisfaction of the City Staff, and subject to the required notification and advertising that Council authorize the issuance of Development Permit with Variance Application No. 000106 for 1700 Blanshard Street, in accordance with:
a. Plans date stamped November 7, 2019.
b. Development meeting all Zoning Regulation Bylaw requirements, except for the following variances:
i. Reduce the building setback above 10 m from 12.35 to 4.8 metres, measured at the highest building elevation on Blanshard Street
ii. Reduce the building setback above 10 m from 2.26 to 0.5 metres, measured at the highest building elevation on Fisgard Street
iii. Reduce the number of on-site short term bicycle stalls from thirty-one to sixteen.
c. Registration of a statutory right-of-way on Blanshard Street to secure passage over the fronting sidewalk.
d. Registration of an encroachment agreement for building canopies.
e. The development permit lapsing two years from the date of this resolution.

## Amendment:

Moved By Mayor Helps
Seconded By Councillor Alto

1. That Council waive the standard practice of holding an opportunity for public comment for this application but direct staff to continue other standard practices related to sign posting and public notification, including a request for written commentary to come back to Council for consideration prior to issuing the Development Permit with Variances.
2. That Council, subject to the preparation and execution of legal agreements to the satisfaction of the City Staff, and subject to the
required notification and advertising that Council authorize the issuance of Development Permit with Variance Application No.000106 for 1700 Blanshard Street, in accordance with:
a. Plans date stamped November 7, 2019.
b. Development meeting all Zoning Regulation Bylaw requirements, except for the following variances:
i. Reduce the building setback above 10 m from 12.35 to 4.8 metres, measured at the highest building elevation on Blanshard Street
ii. Reduce the building setback above 10 m from 2.26 to 0.5 metres, measured at the highest building elevation on Fisgard Street
iii. Reduce the number of on-site short term bicycle stalls from thirtyone to sixteen.
c. Registration of a statutory right-of-way on Blanshard Street to secure passage over the fronting sidewalk.
d. Registration of an encroachment agreement for building canopies.
e. The development permit lapsing two years from the date of this resolution.

## CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

On the main motion as amended:
That Council waive the standard practice of holding an opportunity for public comment for this application but direct staff to continue other standard practices related to sign posting and public notification, including a request for written commentary to come back to Council for consideration prior to issuing the Development Permit with Variances.

## CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Motion arising:
Moved By Mayor Helps
Seconded By Councillor Alto
That this item be forwarded to today's Council meeting.
CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY
To: Committee of the Whole Date: May 72020

From: Mayor Helps
Subject:
Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00106 for 1700
Blanshard Street

## BACKGROUND

At a January $9^{\text {th }}$ Council meeting, Council forwarded an application for a Development Permit with Variances at 1700 Blanshard Street to an opportunity for public comment. It is not a rezoning application and does not require a public hearing. Please see attached Committee of the Whole report and minutes.

The attached letter was sent to myself and Council from Townline requesting that we waive the opportunity for public comment for their rental building. They are seeking financing from CMHC to secure 237 of the 245 units as below market units and affordable as defined by CMHC. In his letter, Mr. Illich outlines the time sensitivity of this application going forward for Council's consideration. The CMHC financing is a key element of the below-market rentals and CMHC will not confirm financing until a building permit is issued. The CMHC program is a national program with competition for limited financing across the country.

The recommendation below reflects the same process and language as that which Council supported for the Temporary Use Permit at 630 Speed Street. There will be an opportunity for people to comment in written form and for Council to consider this input before making a final decision.

## RECOMMENDATION

1. That Council waive the standard practice of holding an opportunity for public comment for this application but direct staff to continue other standard practices related to sign posting and public notification, including a request for written commentary to come back to Council for consideration prior to issuing the Development Permit with Variances.
2. That Council, subject to the preparation and execution of legal agreements to the satisfaction of the City Staff, and subject to the required notification and advertising that Council authorize the issuance of Development Permit with Variance Application No. 000106 for 1700 Blanshard Street, in accordance with:
a. Plans date stamped November 7, 2019.
b. Development meeting all Zoning Regulation Bylaw requirements, except for the following variances:
i. Reduce the building setback above 10 m from 12.35 to 4.8 metres, measured at the highest building elevation on Blanshard Street
ii. Reduce the building setback above 10 m from 2.26 to 0.5 metres, measured at the highest building elevation on Fisgard Street
iii. Reduce the number of on-site short term bicycle stalls from thirty-one to sixteen.
c. Registration of a statutory right-of-way on Blanshard Street to secure passage over the fronting sidewalk.
d. Registration of an encroachment agreement for building canopies.
e. The development permit lapsing two years from the date of this resolution.

Respectfully submitted,


Mayor Helps

City of Victoria
May 1, 2020
1 Centennial Square
Victoria, BC V8W, 1P6

Dear Mayor Helps and Council,

| RE: | Hudson Place Two - 1700 Blanshard Street |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00106 |
|  | WAIVER REQUEST - Opportunity for Public Comment |

## Dear Mayor Helps and Council,

In light of the current and ongoing COVID pandemic, I am writing to respectfully request a waiver from the development permit requirement for an Opportunity for Public Comment by way of Public Hearing, to maintain the viability of this rental project. This request is not made lightly but rather a response to the possibility of approval delays resulting in, losing our CHMC financing. As a reminder, to the best of my knowledge, the land that this application is intended, is already zoned, and has no requirement for rental, nor affordability measures. The decision to build rental, and to work through CHMC to accommodate housing below typical market rates, has been made by Townline in an effort to best respond to the concerns that council have been trying to address, that being a critical shortage of rental housing, and most particular, below market rents.

We have received conditional approval for CHMC funding under their RCFI program, and one of their funding requirement's is to have a Building Permit. To attain a Building Permit, we require a Development Permit. If we cannot present our project at an Opportunity for Public Comment, our application is stalled and our project will stop. In this instance, even a month delay can be critical. The RCFI Program has proven very popular across Canada, and CHMCs mandate is to get the money out as soon as feasible. If we can not satisfy the financing condition of receiving a Building Permit in a timely manner, this funding could be redirected to another project else where in Canada.

We intend to build 245 rental suites, 227 of which are defined as affordable under the CMHC RCFI Program. Given the challenging environment caused by the COVID 19 crisis and that this project is an affordable rental application, we feel the waiver is a reasonable deviation from the standard public process. Deputy Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, Kaye Kirshna has opened the door for Cities and Municipalities to forfeit the public input requirement in some conditions, and we interpret our project application fits into that framework. That said, we are confident that by continuing to working closely with City of Victoria Planning, Engineering and Legal departments we can achieve a high-quality rental building and fulfill a very important objective of Victoria City Council.


## I.1.b.f 1700 Blanshard Street: Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00106 (Downtown)

Moved By Councillor Young
Seconded By Councillor Alto
That Council, subject to the preparation and execution of legal agreements to the satisfaction of the City Staff, and subject to the applicant meeting with the Downtown Residents Association Land Use Committee and after giving notice and allowing an opportunity for public comment at a meeting of Council, consider the following motion:
"That Council authorize the issuance of Development Permit with Variance Application No. 000106 for 1700 Blanshard Street, in accordance with:

1. Plans date stamped November 7, 2019.
2. Development meeting all Zoning Regulation Bylaw requirements, except for the following variances:
i. reduce the building setback above 10 m from 12.35 to 4.8 metres, measured at the highest building elevation on Blanshard Street
ii. reduce the building setback above 10 m from 2.26 to 0.5 metres, measured at the highest building elevation on Fisgard Street
iii. reduce the number of on-site short-term bicycle stalls from thirty-one to sixteen.
3. Registration of a Statutory Right-of-Way on Blanshard Street to secure passage over the fronting sidewalk.
4. Registration of an Encroachment agreement for building canopies.
5. The Development Permit lapsing two years from the date of this resolution."

That Council request that the applicant considers locking in the rental units under a rental agreement.

FOR (5): Mayor Helps, Councillor Alto, Councillor Loveday, Councillor Thornton-Joe, and Councillor Young
OPPOSED (2): Councillor Dubow, and Councillor Isitt
CARRIED (5 to 2)

## Committee of the Whole Report <br> For the Meeting of January 23, 2020

To: Committee of the Whole Date: January 9, 2020
From: Karen Hoese, Director, Sustainable Planning and Community Development
Subject: Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00106 for 1700 Blanshard Street

## RECOMMENDATION

That Council, subject to the preparation and execution of legal agreements to the satisfaction of the City Staff, and after giving notice and allowing an opportunity for public comment at a meeting of Council, consider the following motion:
"That Council authorize the issuance of Development Permit with Variance Application No. 000106 for 1700 Blanshard Street, in accordance with:

1. Plans date stamped November 7, 2019.
2. Development meeting all Zoning Regulation Bylaw requirements, except for the following variances:
i. reduce the building setback above 10 m from 12.35 to 4.8 metres, measured at the highest building elevation on Blanshard Street
ii. reduce the building setback above 10 m from 2.26 to 0.5 metres, measured at the highest building elevation on Fisgard Street
iii. reduce the number of on-site short term bicycle stalls from thirty-one to sixteen.
3. Registration of a Statutory Right-of-Way on Blanshard Street to secure passage over the fronting sidewalk.
4. Registration of an Encroachment agreement for building canopies.
5. The Development Permit lapsing two years from the date of this resolution."

## LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY

In accordance with Section 489 of the Local Government Act, Council may issue a Development Permit in accordance with the applicable guidelines specified in the Community Plan. A Development Permit may vary or supplement the Zoning Regulation Bylaw but may not vary the use or density of the land from that specified in the Bylaw.

Pursuant to Section 491 of the Local Government Act, where the purpose of the designation is the revitalization of an area in which a commercial use is permitted, a Development Permit may include requirements respecting the character of the development, including landscaping, and the siting, form, exterior design and finish of buildings and other structures.

In accordance with Section 498 of the Local Government Act, Council may issue a Development Variance Permit that varies a Zoning Regulation Bylaw provided the permit does not vary the use or density of land from that specified in the Zoning Regulation Bylaw.

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is to present Council with information, analysis and recommendations for a Development Permit with Variances Application for the property located at 1700 Blanshard Street. The proposal is to construct a twenty-three storey, mixed-use building containing approximately 245 residential units above ground-floor commercial units. The variances are related to reducing the building massing setback plane and reducing the on-site short term bicycle parking requirements.

The following points were considered in assessing this application:

- consistency with the Official Community Plan in terms of providing rental housing to achieve a greater range of housing options in the City
- general consistency with The Bay Site Design Guidelines (2006) in terms of form and character, podium level landscaping and animation
- consistency with the Downtown Core Area Plan with regard to building heights, views, and the urban amphitheatre concept
- consistency with the associated Master Development Agreement (MDA)
- the variance to reduce the massing setback is recommended as being supportable as the proposed setback improves the building separation and improves unit liveability by increasing the distance between units in adjacent buildings and results in a minimal impact to the public realm
- the variance to reduce the on-site short terms bicycle parking is supportable given that the applicant is proposing additional short term bicycle parking in suitable locations on City property.


## BACKGROUND

## Description of Proposal

The proposal is to construct a twenty-three storey, mixed use building containing 245 residential units with ground floor commercial. Variances associated with the application are related to offsite short term bicycle parking and encroachments into the 1:5 massing setback on two street frontages.

Specific details include:

- a four- and six-level podium, at the north and south elevations respectively, separated by the building's main entrance off Blanshard Street
- a nineteen-storey tower above the four level podium with a top floor amenity area
- a single loaded perimeter six-storey podium at the south east corner, surrounding a second storey amenity courtyard
- a mid-block service connection road between Fisgard and Herald Streets for loading, recycling and garbage collection
- rooftop amenity areas, including a dog run and a playground feature
- a green roof with multi-coloured plantings on the six-storey podium roof
- five levels of underground parking.

The proposed variances are related to:

- building mass encroaching into the $1: 5$ setback plane above 10 m on Blanshard Street (the maximum projection into setback plane is 7.42 m )
- building mass encroaching within the $1: 5$ setback plane above 10 m on Fisgard Street (the maximum projection into setback plane is 2.3 m )
- reducing the short term bicycle parking requirements on-site from thirty-one to sixteen.


## Affordable Housing Impacts

The applicant proposes the creation of 245 new residential units which would increase the overall supply of housing in the area. Under the existing zoning and because this Application is for a Development Permit only, the Applicant could propose strata-titled condominiums. However, all 245 units are proposed as rental. The applicant has indicated that they do not wish to secure the units as rental via a housing agreement with the City because this is not a requirement nor consideration with a Development Permit application nor required through the Master Development Agreement (MDA). The applicant is working with the Canadian Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC) to secure the project as Market Rental with CMHC Conditions, which secure a percentage of suites below market rates for sixteen years, after which the units will return to market rental rates. Staff understand that a total of forty-nine units ( $20 \%$ ) will be provided at a rental rate discounted $10 \%$ from a market rate as part of the agreement with CMHC.

## Sustainability Features

The applicant has not identified any sustainability features associated with this proposal beyond those required under existing City policy. However, a number of sustainability provisions are required in the MDA, including electric vehicle charging stations, car share memberships, efficient appliances and water use reduction measures.

## Active Transportation

The applicant has not incorporated any active transportation features with this application beyond those required by City policy and regulations.

## Public Realm Improvements

Public realm improvements are consistent with the MDA and City policy and the Applicant has offered to provide a statutory right of way (SRW) over a portion of sidewalk on Blanshard Street that falls within the Applicant's site. Appropriate wording has been provided in the motion to secure this SRW.

## Accessibility Impact Statement

The British Columbia Building Code regulates accessibility as it pertains to buildings. The associated MDA specifies a number of adaptable housing requirements which the proposal has achieved. Thirty-six adaptable units are proposed, which exceeds the requirement for twentyfive as specified in the MDA.

## Existing Site Development and Development Potential

The site is presently vacant. The existing CBD-2 Zone, Central Business District, permits uses such as offices, residences, drinking establishments and retail with building heights up to 72.0 metres. Permitted densities range from 5.1:1 to 7.47:1 floor space ratio (FSR).

## Data Table

The following data table compares the proposal with the existing CBD-2 Zone, Central Business District. An asterisk is used to identify where the proposal differs from the existing zone.

| Zoning Criteria | Proposal | Zone Standard <br> CBD-2 Zone, Central <br> Business District |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Density (Floor Space Ratio) - maximum | $7.46: 1$ | $7.47: 1$ |
| Height (m) - maximum | 72.00 | 72.0 |
| Storeys - minimum | 23 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |
| Setbacks (m) - minimum | $\mathbf{4 . 8}$ * |  |
| 1:5 setback from Blanshard Street | $\mathbf{0 . 5}$ | 0 |
| $1: 5$ setback from Fisgard Street | 283 | 0 |
| Parking - minimum | 25 | 25 |
| Visitor parking- minimum | 288 | 288 |
| Bicycle parking stalls - minimum | $16 *$ | 31 |
| Long Term |  | 0 |
| Short Term |  |  |

## Relevant History

Prior to the adoption of the current OCP, the subject property was rezoned on March 1, 2007 to create the CA-59 Zone, Hudson Bay District. This new zone envisioned three phases of residential mixed-use buildings at this location which have subsequently been developed with the exception of the final half of the third phase associated with the current Application. Following the 2007 rezoning for the site, the City's Official Community Plan (OCP, 2012) was updated which shifted the vision for this area to be primarily business-oriented. Despite being inconsistent with the OCP, the application is consistent with the use and density in the Zoning Bylaw. As such, the form and character of the building, as well as the appropriateness of the variances, are the focus of Council's consideration with this application.

## Community Consultation

This application proposes variances; therefore, in accordance with the City's Land Use Procedures Bylaw, it requires notice, sign posting and a meeting of Council to consider the variances. Notification to the Downtown Residents Association (DRA) was sent on January 14, 2019, and subsequent minor plan revisions resulted in additional notifications to the DRA in May and July of 2019. At the time of writing this report, a response has not been provided by the CALUC.

## ANALYSIS

The Official Community Plan (OCP) identifies this property in Development Permit Area 2 (HC): Core Business. The objectives of this designation are to revitalize the central business district through high-rise commercial buildings and low to medium-rise residential, mixed-use buildings. Additional objectives aim to enhance the area with high-quality architecture, landscape and urban design that reflect the function of a central business district in scale, massing and character. Design guidelines that apply to Development Permit Area 2 are the Downtown Core Area Plan (DCAP, 2012), Bay Site Design Guidelines (2006), Advisory Design Guidelines for Buildings, Signs and Awnings (2006) and Guidelines for Fences, Gates and Shutters (2010).

## Design Guidelines

The form and character aspects of the proposal are consistent with the key polices within the relevant Design Guidelines. This namely relates to building height and massing, creating a distinctive base body and top, activity at grade level, building orientation, minimum building separation distances, high quality materials and an overall urban design approach that has a positive impact on the public realm.

## Setback Plane

The proposal is inconsistent with the zoning and the design guidelines for the building setback plane. The Zoning Bylaw specifies a $1: 5$ building setback plane, starting at 10 m from average grade. Plans A310 and A311 of the applicant's submission illustrate this inconsistency (see Figure 1 below). The proposed building infringes on this setback by 7.42 m at the twenty third storey on Blanshard Street and by 2.3 m on Fisgard Street, at the $6^{\text {th }}$ Storey.


Figure 1: Blanshard Street


Fisgard Street

The intent of the building setback above ten metres is to ensure light access to the pedestrian realm, to reduce the impact large buildings have at street level and to mitigate downdrafts. Variances to this requirement are considered in the design guidelines when an application can demonstrate that the intent of the guidelines is achieved. Design features within the proposal, such as building setbacks, articulation and a definitive and distinctive podium level, are intended to address this criteria. Similarly, shadowing studies provided by the applicant and the increased building separation to the Hudson Place One tower ( 18 m instead of 12 m ) improve livability over and above what adhering to the building setback above ten metres would achieve. A supporting wind study provided by the applicant also confirms that appropriate wind conditions are expected along the surrounding sidewalks, which together with the aforementioned design aspects provides a sufficient rationale to support this proposed variance.

## Overall Massing (Floor Plate Sizes and Building Separation)

The proposal includes floor plate sizes that exceed the maximum of $650 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ recommended in the Design Guidelines by 343 square feet ( $32 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ ) above the tenth storey. The intent of floor plate limitations is to reduce the bulkiness of taller buildings and to contribute to a more graceful skyline. Architectural features and the building composition have been designed to meet this intent. The tower portion of the building is divided into two distinct masses, one lower than the other with a contrasting cladding. The two tower elements are further articulated with a vertical setback between each tower, again to reduce the overall sense of scale. This approach helps to reduce the apparent mass of the building and its perceived bulkiness. Additionally, the increased building separation to the Hudson Place One tower and the relatively minor floor plate exceedance both lend to a rationale to support this inconsistency with the design guidelines.

## Master Development Agreement

A Master Development Agreement (MDA) is associated with this application which specifies criteria that have been met. This includes a public art contribution, 10\% adaptable units per phase, 3 spaces for electric vehicles and the purchase of two car shares with preferred parking spaces. Confirmation of the details regarding the public art is required at the building permit stage and security in the form of a certified cheque is required prior to the release of a building permit. The public art installation must be completed prior to the issuance of a final occupancy certificate.

## Advisory Design Panel Review

At the Advisory Design Panel (ADP) meeting of April 24, 2019, the Panel reviewed this application; minutes and the proposed motion from the panel are attached. In response to the motion at the ADP meeting, the applicant reduced the balcony sizes, removed an alternating balcony pattern and privacy screens from corner balconies, amended the cladding approach to be more consistent, deleted the open frame roof top feature, reduced the overall height of the building by one storey and reduced the overall floor plate sizes. In staff's opinion, the changes adequately respond to the ADP's commentary and motion.

## Tree Preservation Bylaw and Urban Forest Master Plan

There are no Tree Preservation Bylaw impacts with this application.

## Encroachment Agreement

With any project of this scale that has little to no setbacks, and requires significant excavation, construction methods often require a form of underpinning which can result in material being left in the Public Right-of-Way. The resulting material (typically rock anchors) presents no concerns to the public interest and does not impact any underground infrastructure; however, an Encroachment Agreement between the City and the developer is required. The staff recommendation provided for Council's consideration includes direction to allow staff to enter into such an agreement, if the application is approved by Council, and it is deemed necessary to facilitate the construction of the project.

A number of street-level canopies are also proposed along the street frontages, which project above the City Right-of-Way. These are encouraged in the Guidelines to provide pedestrian weather protection and welcoming streetscapes. In order to facilitate these canopies, the applicant is required to enter into an Encroachment Agreement with the City. Appropriate wording is included in the recommendation for Council's consideration.

## CONCLUSIONS

The proposal is for the last phase of the Hudson District area and completes the revitalization of the former Hudson's Bay Company department store and parking structure. A significant number of rental residential units are being provided in addition to the initial rezoning requirements for the revitalization of the Historic Hudson's Bay store and amenities as set out in the MDA. Through both staff and the Advisory Design Panel, the key considerations around massing, form and character, and context within the Hudson District have been evaluated. The application largely adheres to the design guidelines and, where it differs, offers either improvements or acceptable alternative approaches to meet guideline objectives. On this basis, staff recommend for Council's consideration that the application be supported.

## ALTERNATE MOTION

That Council decline Development Permit with Variance Application No. 00106 for 1700 Blanchard Street.

Respectfully submitted,


Miko Betanzo, Senior Planner - Urban Design
Sustainable Planning and Community Development Department


Karen Hoese, Director Sustainable Planning and Community Development Department

Report accepted and recommended by the City Manager
Date:



## List of Attachments

- Attachment A: Subject Map
- Attachment B: Aerial Map
- Attachment C: Plans date stamped November 7, 2019
- Attachment D: Letter from applicant to Mayor and Council dated January 7, 2020
- Attachment E: Wind study dated April 5, 2019
- Attachment F: Advisory Design Panel Minutes dated April 24, 2019.



1715 Government Street Victoria, BC V8W 1 Z4

Mayor Helps and Council City of Victoria No. 1 Centennial Square
Victoria, BC V8W 1P6
January $19^{\text {th }}, 2020$
Re: 1700 Blanshard: Development Permit with Variances No. 00106
Dear Mayor Helps and Council,
The applicant has not offered the DRA LUC an opportunity to review or receive any background information on this extremely large project. This is despite the fact that variances are being requested which gives the public an opportunity to make comment to Council.

The DRA LUC is concerned that this application is proceeding with little or no public consultation.

Sincerely,


Ian Sutherland
Chair Land Use Committee
Downtown Residents Association

MINUTES OF THE
ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING HELD WEDNESDAY APRIL 24, 2019

## 1. THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 12:05 PM

| Present: | Sorin Birliga, Jason Niles, Marilyn Palmer, Jessi-Anne <br> Reeves, Karen Sander, Stefan Schulson |
| :--- | :--- |
| Absent for a |  |
| Portion of the Meeting: | Roger Tinney |
| Absent: | Pamela Madoff, Carl-Jan Rupp |
| Staff Present: | Andrea Hudson - Acting Director, Sustainable Planning <br> \& Community Development Department |
| Miko Betanzo - Senior Planner, Urban Design |  |
| Joaquin Karakas - Senior Urban Designer |  |
| Jim Handy - Senior Planner, Development Agreements |  |
| Leanne Taylor - Senior Planner |  |
| Alec Johnson - Senior Planner |  |
| Katie Lauriston - Secretary |  |

## 2. MINUTES

Minutes from the Meeting held April 10, 2019

## Motion:

It was moved by Roger Tinney, seconded by Sorin Birliga, that the minutes from the meeting held April 10, 2019 be adopted.

Carried Unanimously

## 3. NEW BUSINESS

- Andrea Hudson and Joaquin Karakas provided an overview of upcoming municipal-led projects with a design component, to follow up from the Panel's December 19, 2018 motion. Items discussed include:
- neighbourhood planning for the Fairfield Neighbourhood and draft Cook Street design guidelines, as well as upcoming neighbourhood plans for North Park, Fernwood, North and South Jubilee and Rockland
- Council's request for a city-wide housing strategy
- public realm projects including Ship Point, Centennial Square and the implementation of the bicycle network master plan
- The Panel asked:
- how individuals could be involved in the engagement process for the bicycle network. Joaquin Karakas noted the upcoming public engagement opportunities for the Vancouver Street project
- whether core policy documents take their cues from Council policies. Joaquin Karakas explained that Ship Point was part of Council's latest strategic plan, and Centennial Square was a focused action plan from the Downtown Public Realm Plan adopted in 2017.


## 4. APPLICATIONS

### 4.1 Development Permit with Variance Application No. 00074 for 1301 Hillside Avenue

The City is considering a Rezoning and Development Permit with Variance Application to construct a six-storey mixed-use building with live-work units and long-term bicycle parking on the ground floor fronting Hillside Avenue and vehicle parking at-grade at the rear.

Applicant meeting attendees:

|  | STUART HOWARD ARCHITECTS INC. |
| :--- | :--- |
| MICHAEL BACON | ABSTRACT DEVELOPMENTS |
| ADAM COOPER | NVISION PROPERTIES |
| SCOTT MURDOCH | MURDOCH DE GREEF INC. |

Jim Handy provided the Panel with a brief introduction of the application and the areas that Council is seeking advice on, including the following:

- the proposal's massing and density
- the provision of green and open space
- the building's street relationship.

Michael Bacon provided the Panel with a detailed presentation of the site and context of the proposal, and Scott Murdoch provided details of the proposed landscape plan.

The Panel asked the following questions of clarification:

- has there been any reaction from the community in terms of the proposed increase in density?
o overall the reaction to this version of the project has been mixed, but the community seems happier with the current overall design
- there has been a positive reaction to seeing the height reduced
- there is some confusion in the community over the parking requirements and how affordable units affect these requirements
o there is no reaction to the proposed FSR per se, rather, the proposal is understood in terms of the overall unit count and parking provisions
- in what Large Urban Village is the site located?
- Jim Handy noted that the Official Community Plan (OCP) identifies the site within the Urban Place Designation, which contemplates densities up to $2: 1$ Floor Space Ratio (FSR). Affordable housing is not excluded from the FSR calculation, and so the application would require an OCP amendment to allow the proposed FSR. In terms of density, the application is a better fit within the Large Urban Village designation; therefore, the question is whether the Urban Place Designation is amended or whether the site would be assigned the Large Urban Village designation.
- given that the deciduous trees in the plaza will be bare in the winter months, were further features considered, such as trellises or a green strip, to further define the plaza edge?
- this can be considered
- what is proposed for the large white windowsill on the southern portion of the building long Burnside Road East?
o the metal sill will be raised and sloped, with a gutter and concealed rainwater leader
- the design defines this edge and builds on the building form
- an earlier iteration envisioned a planter at this location, but the viability of plants was problematic
- fritted or patterned glass is being considered to reduce the sunlight into the stairwell
- what is proposed for the roof next to the fifth floor units along Burnside Road East?
- a roof is proposed at this location, which will provide a better transition to the single-family dwellings across the street
- how are the materials assembled; what is proposed for the joints?
- the joints are shown in some plans, but are not included in the renderings because the joints come out far darker in renderings than they will be in reality
- the joints and fasteners will be painted the same colour as the panels, so that from a distance the reveals blend in and there are only hairline joints
- what material is proposed for the white panels?
- a metal hardie panel system will be used, which will be a similar product to a longboard.

Panel members discussed:

- appreciation for the thought process provided
- appreciation for the inclusion of a rain garden
- the proposal as elegantly executed, and a good combination of simplicity with expression
- appreciation for the process and level of community engagement
- understanding for the cost efficiency of hardie panel.


## Motion:

It was moved by Sorin Birliga, seconded by Stefan Schulson, that the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council that Development Permit Application No. 000542 for 3020 Douglas Street and 584 Burnside Road East be approved as presented.

## Carried Unanimously

Roger Tinney left the meeting at $2: 20 \mathrm{pm}$.

### 4.3 Development Permit with Variance Application No. 00106 for 1700 Blanshard Street

The City is considering a Rezoning and Development Permit Application to construct a twenty-three storey, mixed use building containing 235 market rental residential units with ground-floor commercial.

Applicant meeting attendees:

GERDA GELDENHUYS DAVE ENGLISH

## MUSSON CATTELL MACKEY PARTNERSHIP TOWNLINE

Miko Betanzo provided the Panel with a brief introduction of the application and the areas that Council is seeking advice on, including the following:

- the massing and interface with nearby properties
- the entryway and ground level relationship to the street
- the façade articulation and materials.

Gerda Geldenhuys provided the Panel with a detailed presentation of the site and context of the proposal.

The Panel asked the following questions of clarification:

- how will the Hudson Bay blanket landscaping feature be maintained?
- the multicoloured sedums only need weeding and fertilizing once or twice per year and will be irrigated
- this system has been successful on other projects that the applicants have completed
- how will residents get food to the rooftop harvest table?
- there is a kitchen on the roof and food can be brought up to this location
- the harvest table is intended as an indoor-outdoor space with a party table
- what features make the residential portion more homey?
- the entrance courtyard creates interest with a walkway and sense of discovery
- there is a very welcoming main entrance to both components with a lot of brick and warm materials
- the rooftop feature where the frame extends beyond the roofline draws attention to that area; is that rooftop area accessible?
- there is a double-height amenity space at the top level with large windows
- the area below the rooftop feature is not accessible, but there is outdoor rooftop amenity space
- the open frame feature continues the mass while visually fading into the sky and allowing glimpses of the sky through the frame
- is there anything else on the roof with the rooftop feature?
- there is a partially obscured mechanical room on this roof
- the adjacent rooftop is for the amenity space
- was it considered to align the volume of the tower facing Blanshard Street on an angle, in line with the street?
- this was not considered; the proposed design uses the angle to Blanshard Street to reduce the impact of the building height at the street level
- where does the pedestrian link lead?
- the link provides a circuitous route to wander through the site, from Blanshard Street to the interior laneway
- where is the waste management located for the commercial and residential units?
- these services are incorporated into the rear of the southeast tower, accessed through the internal laneway
- what variances are proposed?
- the upper corner of the podium facing Herald Street encroaches just over 2 m into the setback, and the upper portion of the building facing Blanshard Street also encroaches by just under 8 m
- the height of the open frame feature also extends beyond the height.

Panel members discussed:

- the full wraparound balconies as being excessive for the building, especially considering its height
- the proposal as being of a different typology than what is found in the rest of Victoria
- whether keeping the building square to Herald Street is beneficial, or whether it should be shifted to align with Blanshard Street
- desire for further design features that would counteract the additional massing caused by the setback variance
- the lack of a distinct middle of the building
- concern for the proposed height variance along Blanshard Street, with the building's significant massing and strong skeletal structure
- the building's significant presence and massing to the street
- the building as having the details of a smaller building (i.e. many projecting balconies)
- opportunity to simplify the building expression and make its elevations more sleek
- appreciation for the effort made in creating a sense of slenderness
- no concern with the overall height at this location; however, the Jack Davis plaza will be shadowed
- opportunity to further explore the Blanshard Street façade so that the top is less prominent and the tower is still well-articulated to the bottom, and so that all the components better articulate to each other
- appreciation for the design of the plaza, the corner of Fisgard and Blanshard Streets, and the material choices
- the materials as giving a rugged, formal appearance that is more commercial than residential
- concern that the rooftop mechanical room may be visible from Hudson Place I
- desire for further rationale for the extended frame building top feature, whether there is precedent elsewhere in Victoria, and what it is meant to draw attention to
- whether the concrete frame feature is necessary or should be removed.


## Motion:

It was moved by Jason Niles, seconded by Sorin Birliga, that the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council that Development Permit with Variance Application No. 00106 for 1700 Blanshard Street be approved with the following changes subject to:

- addressing the articulation and expression of the Blanshard Street façade
- reconsideration of the building top
- simplification and refinement of the building body, with particular attention to the volumetric expression towards the Blanshard Street elevation
- ensuring the overall aesthetic consistency of the building.

Carried Unanimously
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## 1. INTRODUCTION

Rowan Williams Davies \& Irwin Inc. (RWDI) was retained by Townline to assess the pedestrian wind conditions for the proposed Hudson Place 2 development in Victoria, BC (Image 1). This assessment was based on the following:

- a review of regional long-term meteorological data from nearby weather stations;
- design drawings received by RWDI in March 2019;
- wind-tunnel studies undertaken by RWDI for similar projects;
- our engineering judgement and knowledge of wind flows around buildings ${ }^{1-3}$; and,
- use of software developed by RWDI (Windestimator²) for estimating the potential wind conditions around generalized building forms.

This qualitative approach provides a screening-level estimation of potential wind conditions. Conceptual wind control measures to improve wind comfort are recommended, where necessary. In order to quantify these conditions or refine any conceptual mitigation measures, physical scale-model tests in a boundarylayer wind tunnel are typically required.

Note that other wind issues, such as those related to cladding and structural wind loads, door operability, air quality, etc., are not considered in the scope of this assessment.
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Image 1: South view of the proposed Hudson Place 1 (left) and 2 (right)

1. H. Wu and F. Kriksic (2012). "Designing for Pedestrian Comfort in Response to Local Climate", Journal of Wind Engineering and Industrial Aerodynamics, vol.104-106, pp.397-407.
2. H. Wu, C.J. Williams, H.A. Baker and W.F. Waechter (2004), "Knowledgebased Desk-Top Analysis of Pedestrian Wind Conditions", ASCE Structure Congress 2004, Nashville, Tennessee.
3. C.J. Williams, H. Wu, W.F. Waechter and H.A. Baker (1999), "Experience with Remedial Solutions to Control Pedestrian Wind Problems", 10th International Conference on Wind Engineering, Copenhagen, Denmark.
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## 2. BUILDING AND SITE INFORMATION

The proposed development is to be located on the west side of Blanshard Street between Fisgard Street to the south and Herald Street to the north in Victoria, BC (Images 1 and 2). It consists of a 23 -storey tower with a 6 -storey podium to the south (Image 3).

On the same street block there are the existing 12-storey Hudson Mews to the southwest and the 24-storey Phase 1 tower to the northwest (Images 1 and 2). They will provide sheltering


Image 2: Context plan
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for the current development from winds of the westerly directions. Surroundings around the site are generally dense, low and medium-rise buildings. Open water bodies are located to the distant south and east.

Pedestrian areas on and around the development include public sidewalks, residential and retail entrances and outdoor terraces at Levels 2 and 23.


Image 3: East elevation

## 3. METEOROLOGICAL DATA

Wind data recorded at major airports are often used as reference for wind conditions in the area. However, both Victoria and Vancouver International Airports are located in distance from the site and have different topographic conditions. Data from the nearby Victoria Harbour Seaplane Airport (Image 4) are considered most representative. The distributions of wind frequency and directionality for the summer (May through October) and winter (November through April) seasons are shown in Image 5.

When all wind data are considered, winds are frequent from the southwesterly directions in the summer. In the winter, winds are frequent from the north, west and southeast directions. Strong winds of a mean speed greater than $30 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ occur more often in winter than in the summer. They are often from the west, southwest and southeast directions.


Image 4: Project site and three nearby weather stations (credit: Google ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ Earth)
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Image 5: Winds approaching Victoria Harbour Seaplane Airport (1994-2015)

## 3. METEOROLOGICAL DATA



For reference purposes, wind roses from the other two weather stations in the area are also analyzed (Image 6 for Esquimalt Harbour and Victoria Gonzales Heights Met Station). Although the wind directions vary with stations due to their relative locations to the coast lines, winds from southwest and northeast are most frequent, with the strong winds (yellow and red bands) from the west, southwest and southeast directions. These three directions could potentially be the source of uncomfortable wind conditions, depending upon the site exposure or development design. The analysis methods, however, have accounted for these and all winds directions.


Image 6: Esquimalt Harbour (2003-2015, left) and Gonzales Heights (1985-2015, right)

## 4. PEDESTRIAN WIND CRITERIA

The RWDI pedestrian wind criteria are used in the current study. These criteria have been developed by RWDI through research and consulting practice since 1974. They have also been widely accepted by municipal authorities as well as by the building design and city planning community. The criteria are as follows:

## Pedestrian Safety

Pedestrian safety is associated with excessive gust wind speeds that can adversely affect a pedestrian's balance and footing. If strong winds that can affect a person's balance ( $90 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ ) occur more than $0.1 \%$ of the time or 9 hours per year, the wind conditions are considered severe.

## Pedestrian Comfort

Wind comfort can be categorized by typical pedestrian activities:
Sitting ( $\leq \mathbf{1 0} \mathbf{~ k m} / \mathrm{h}$ ): Calm or light breezes desired for outdoor seating areas where one can read a paper without having it blown away.
Standing ( $\leq 14 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ ): Gentle breezes suitable for main building entrances and bus stops.
Strolling ( $\leq \mathbf{1 7} \mathbf{k m} / \mathbf{h}$ ): Moderate winds that would be appropriate for window shopping and strolling along a downtown street, plaza or park.
Walking ( $\mathbf{\leq} \mathbf{2 0} \mathbf{~ k m} / \mathrm{h}$ ): Relatively high speeds that can be tolerated if one's objective is to walk, run or cycle without lingering.
Uncomfortable: None of the comfort categories are met.

Wind conditions are considered suitable for sitting, standing, strolling or walking if the associate wind speeds are expected for at least four out of five days ( $80 \%$ of the time). Wind control measures are typically required at locations where winds are rated as uncomfortable or they exceed the wind safety criterion.

Note that these wind speeds are assessed at the pedestrian height (i.e., 1.5 m above grade or the concerned floor level), typically lower than those recorded in the airport ( 10 m height and open terrain).

These criteria for wind forces represent average wind tolerance. They are sometimes subjective and regional differences in wind climate and thermal conditions as well as variations in age, health, clothing, etc. can also affect people's perception of the wind climate.

For the current development, wind speeds comfortable for walking or strolling are appropriate for sidewalks; lower wind speeds comfortable for standing are required for building entrances, where pedestrians may linger; and calm wind speeds suitable for sitting are desired in areas where passive activities are anticipated, such as the outdoor amenity terraces, especially during the summer season when these areas are used more often.

## 5. PEDESTRIAN WIND CONDITIONS

## Background

Predicting wind speeds and occurrence frequencies is complicated. It involves building geometry, orientation, position and height of surrounding buildings, upstream terrain and the local wind climate. Over the years, RWDI has conducted thousands of wind-tunnel model studies regarding pedestrian wind conditions around buildings, yielding a broad knowledge base. This knowledge has been incorporated into RWDI's proprietary software that allows, in many situations, for a qualitative, screening-level numerical estimation of pedestrian wind conditions without wind tunnel testing.

The proposed Phase 2 tower is similar in height to the Phase 1 tower to the immediate northwest (Image 1), but taller than its surroundings in the remaining directions. Tall buildings tend to intercept the stronger winds at higher elevations and redirect them to the ground level. Such a downwashing flow is the main cause for increased wind activity around tall buildings at grade level. It increases the wind speeds around exposed building corners (Image 7a), along a gap between buildings (7b) and through an opening underneath the building (7c). If these building/wind combinations occur for prevailing winds, there is a greater potential for increased wind activity.

Building setbacks, podiums and stepped façades will reduce the direct impact of downwashing wind flows at grade (see Image
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7d); however, higher wind activities are expected on the podium itself where calm wind conditions are often desired for passive pedestrian activities.

Given the local wind climate and the size of the proposed tower, it is our opinion that the future wind conditions will meet the wind safety criterion on and around the development. Detailed discussions on the potential wind comfort at key pedestrian areas are provided below.


## 5. PEDESTRIAN WIND CONDITIONS

## Entrances and Sidewalks

Image 8 consists of a ground floor plan and three perspective views for the base of the proposed building.

Due to its location and orientation, the proposed tower will be sheltered by the Phase 1 tower from the westerly winds and the proposed podium to the south of the tower will reduce the impact of winds downwashing from the south façade. However,
the north and east façades of the tower are fully exposed to winds from the north and southeast.

The proposed steps on the north façade, the canopies along the east and south façades and recessed main entrances with vestibules are all positive design features for wind control. As a result, suitable wind conditions are predicted at the main entrances A1 and A2 (Image 8), and entrances at the north and south sides (A3 and A4, respectively).

$\qquad$

Image 8: Ground floor plan and perspective views of the tower base

## 5. PEDESTRIAN WIND CONDITIONS

## Entrances and Sidewalks (continued)

The gate underneath the proposed building (B1 in Image 9) may become a "wind tunnel" (Image 7c) when winds are from the west, southwest and southeast. The accelerating winds may affect the main entrances A1 and A2. If feasible, a solid and tall wall should be included at this location, or additional wind control measures should be considered for the main entrance areas, in the form of planters and screens at the location shown by green lines in Image 9.

Entrances along Blanshard Street (B2 in Image 9) will be affected by the north, northeast and southeast winds. Lower wind speeds can be achieved around these areas by recessing the entrances and/or installing screens/planters, if feasible. Examples of these wind control concepts are shown in Image 9. Pedestrians on sidewalks will be active and can tolerate slightly higher wind speeds. The future wind conditions along adjacent sidewalks are expected to be suitable throughout the year.


Image 9: Wind control examples and locations for exposed entrances

## 5. PEDESTRIAN WIND CONDITIONS

## Podium and Roof Terraces

There are three large outdoor terraces on the proposed development: C1 at Level 2, C2 at Level 23 and C3 between the Phase 1 and 2 towers (mid diagram in Image 10).

The outdoor amenity C1 is largely enclosed by the existing and proposed buildings from all directions, and suitable wind conditions are expected at C1 throughout the year.

Wind speeds increase with elevations. The rooftop terrace C2 will be windy due to its elevation and exposure. Windy conditions are also expected on the terrace at Level 2 between the existing and
proposed towers (C3) due to channeling winds (Image 7b) from the north and southwest directions. The proposed development includes several positive design features for wind control, such as the guardrails and canopy on the roof top (left diagram in Image 10) and two rows of trees along the north and south perimeters of C3 (right diagram). It is likely that additional wind control measures will be needed to further reduce the wind activity in these seating areas. Examples of landscaping, screens, trellises and so on are shown in Image 11 for reference.

If desired, wind tunnel testing can be conducted to quantify these wind conditions and, if necessary, to develop wind control solutions.


Image 10: Podium and roof terraces
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Image 11: Examples of wind control measures for amenity terraces

## 6. SUMMARY

Wind conditions on and around the proposed Hudson Place 2 development are discussed in this report, based on the local wind climate, the current building design, surrounding buildings and our past experience with wind-tunnel testing for similar building projects.

The proposed development has a number of positive design features such as the south podium, main entrance locations and landscaping over terraces. Appropriate wind conditions are expected along the surrounding sidewalks, at recessed main entrances and at the Level 2 amenity enclosed by the existing and proposed development.

Wind speeds may be higher than desired at the gate underneath the building, the east retail entrances, the rooftop terrace and at the outdoor amenity between the Phase 1 and 2 towers. Wind control features have been recommended which can be applied if more comfortable conditions at these areas are desired.

## 7. APPLICABILITY



The assessment presented in this report is for the proposed Hudson Place 2 development, based on the design drawings and documents received by RWDI in March 2019. In the event of any significant changes to the design, construction or operation of the building or addition of surroundings in the future, RWDI could provide an assessment of their impact on the pedestrian wind conditions discussed in this report. It is the responsibility of others to contact RWDI to initiate this process.

January 7, 2020
City of Victoria
1 Centennial Square
Victoria, BC V8W, 1P6

Dear Mayor Helps and Council;

RE: Development Permit Application - 1700 Blanshard Street (Hudson Place Two) Legal Description: Parcel Identifier: 000-059-897 LOT A, OF LOTS 699 TO 700 INCLUSIVE, AND OF LOTS 703 TO 707 INCLUSIVE, VICTORIA CITY, PLAN 13333, EXCEPT PART IN PLAN EPP3862

Townline Homes is pleased to submit for development permit application for Hudson Place Two at 1700 Blanshard Street.

Townline and its partners have been actively developing the Hudson District since 2007 and we have been very much focused on continuing to build a diverse and rewarding downtown community. To date, we have completed a number of milestones of this multi-phased project. This includes the renovation of The Hudson in 2010 with 152 market condos and the completion of three purpose-built rental buildings since 2014, bringing a total of 404 market rentals to Downtown Victoria. Most recently, we started construction of Hudson Place One- 176 market condo units - and are on track for completion in early 2020.

Townline's vision for the Hudson District has been since the beginning- and remains through each phase of development- to foster a community in the northern bookend of downtown Victoria, complete with diverse housing opportunities, vibrant retail, and essential services for our residents and the greater community. Keeping these values in mind, we curated and opened the Victoria Public Market in 2013 which has become an important community retail hub, providing support for independent businesses and merchants in the CRD. In 2016 we opened our Hudson Walk pocket park between Herald and Caledonia, featuring public amenities including a kid's playground, seating areas, and a dog run. This focus on providing inclusive community spaces will continue to drive our design of the Hudson District.

Along with these achievements, Townline and its dedicated non-market housing wing, TL Housing Solutions (TLHS), are committed to building affordable housing through our proven partnership model with the non-profit housing sector. To date, we have completed 314 affordable rental units in the CRD, with a further 328 units either in design development or close to starting construction. Of these total 642 units, $407(63 \%)$ of them are within the municipal boundaries of the City of Victoria.

## Approved Zoning and Master Development Agreement (MDA)

Townline's investment in the Hudson District stretches back almost 15 years with the original acquisition of the iconic Hudson's Bay Company (HBC) department store in 2004. Approval was granted in 2007 for Townline to restore the HBC building and build out the remainder of the block under a site-specific zone referred to as CA-59 Hudson District

Zoning．The associated Master Development Agreement（MDA）provides specific details created to guide development over three distinct areas within the Hudson District．Most salient to this application for Hudson Place 2，which is located in Development Area 3 within the MDA，was granted a conditional bonus density of 7.47 to 1 Floor Space Ratio（FSR）and a maximum height of 72 m ．

The density and height noted above were approved by the City of Victoria Council in recognition for the design intricacies undertaken by Townline to ensure the preservation and restoration of the iconic Hudson＇s Bay Company department store on Douglas Street，in addition to the required provision of the following community amenities at stipulated in the MDA：

国国A publicly accessible mid－block connection between Fisgard and Herald Streets，secured with a Statutory Right of Way（completed）；
［国Following the terms and conditions of a housing agreement executed in 2007；and
［102 public art contribution of $\$ 60,000$（minimum）．

## Project Overview－Hudson Place Two

The project is envisioned to be a mixed－use commercial and rental residential tower with a six－storey podium and dynamic ground level retail．We are thrilled to have selected MCM Architects as the design lead on the project to provide us with a style that compliments－but remains different from－the other buildings on the block．A design rationale provided by MCM is enclosed with this letter and outlines the integrated design approach our team has taken thus far in our process．

The residential entrance will be located mid－block at 1700 Blanshard Street with a walkway that connects through the building and provides an internal pedestrian connection to the other Hudson buildings located on the block．

The residential portion of the building will contain 245 residential units with a diverse mix of unit types and sizes including studio，one－bedroom and two－bedroom suites．We anticipate that the style and character of this building will continue to attract a range of professional singles，couples，and families，similar to the mix of residents we have attracted in the Hudson District＇s other rental and condo offerings．

Approximately 8,282 sf of commercial space will wrap around both Fisgard and Herald Streets and we anticipate attracting strong tenants seeking the exposure and vibrancy of the District that has emerged over the past five years． We are proposing considerable sidewalk，road and intersection improvements along Blanshard Street that will dramatically enhance the experience of pedestrians，cyclists，and vehicle users entering downtown along the Blanshard corridor．These improvements to the benefit of the community public will include widened sidewalks，the continuation of the dedicated bike lane along Blanshard，and a proposed layby for vehicle drop offs／pickups．

Other notable features and benefits（both for residents and the greater public）of our proposal include：
> A mid-block service connection road between Fisgard and Herald that will provide key service functions for the building including residential and commercial loading, garbage and recycling as well as courier and retail parking;
> Two secure outdoor amenity programming areas to appeal to all residents including a co-work style business centre, a guest suite, music/hobby rooms, fitness centre, dog run, and rooftop lounge designed for friends and family celebrations.
> A dedicated level of public commercial and retail parking that will be available at both hourly and daily rates on par with current street parking. This will connect with the commercial parking levels of the adjacent Hudson Place One and Hudson Mews buildings and when completed will provide over 100 public commercial stalls;

## CMHC Rental Construction Financing

Townline is pleased to announce a conditional partnership with CMHC through the CMHC Rental Construction Financing Initiative to fund the project as a rental building. This would secure a minimum of $20 \%$ of the units as Affordable Rental units for a term of 16 years. As a condition of the CMHC financing, Hudson Place Two will exceed the City of Victoria's standards on accessibility and energy efficiency performance of the building. Currently in place is a Conditional Commitment Letter from CMHC to Townline. Townline must meet a list of requirements in order to secure a Loan Agreement with CMHC, one of which the items required is a Building Permit.

## Parking Requirements

Townline recognizes the importance that public parking plays in fostering vibrant and accessible retail in downtown Victoria. As mentioned above, our proposal includes a surplus of public parking stalls (available at competitive hourly and daily rates) in an effort to ensure and maintain the viability of the Hudson District (and surrounding neighbourhood's) retail offerings. As such, our plans exceed the minimum vehicle and bicycle parking requirements as set out by Schedule $C$, with approximately 113 of the project's 308 vehicle stalls designated as commercial parking. A project data sheet is enclosed with this letter.

## Public Art Requirement

Townline has engaged Jan Ballard of Ballard Fine Art to act as the project art consultant. Townline's relationship with Jan is longstanding, and we are excited to have Jan assist us in providing a lasting artistic legacy in the Hudson District which will reflect not only the District's character, but Townline's vision for the community as well. As discussed above and shown on our application drawings, we have identified a few key locations on the Hudson Place 2 project site as a home for public art (satisfying the public art requirement) and Townline will be also contacting the art representative at the City of Victoria as designs progress.

## Relaxation of Street Wall Setback on Blanshard Street

As per part 5 of the site specific CBD-2 zoning, the only setbacks required is a setback from each of Herald, Blanshard and Fisgard streets of 1 cm for each 5 cm of building height above 10 m . As shown in accompanying
supporting documentation, these setbacks leave a very small footprint for siting a building of the allowed FSR. Considerable consideration was given to the placement of the tower, aiming to maintain reasonable separation and views from other buildings on the block while also respecting the setbacks. In its final proposed location the tower cuts into the required setback a maximum of 8 m at roof level.

## Sustainability

Townline is committed to ensuring its development efforts are as sustainable as possible. Our corporate policy mandates we seek to construct buildings that are durable, thoughtful and rewarding places to live. Hudson Place Two is being designed to satisfy a number of building performance measures encouraged by both LEED principals and the rolling adoption of the BC Energy Step Code. Hudson Place Two will align with the City of Victoria's Energy Step Code requirements, which will be verified and tested through Townline's engagement of a third-party energymodeller.

On behalf of Townline, I would like to express our excitement to be moving forward with Hudson Place Two. We see this project as not just another residential tower in the District, but also as a celebration of- and contribution towards- the civic evolution and diversification which has occurred in downtown Victoria over the past ten years. We feel that with each added project, the Hudson District continues to reaffirm its intent as a sincere, mixed-use community for Victorians to enjoy. And as part of this, we would like to thank all those who have worked with Townline and contributed to our projects, including our residents, partners, retail tenants, the hardworking and talented staff at the City, our design teams, our trades and suppliers, and the community at large who have come forward to express their shared appreciation for the Hudson District. We look forward to seeing our community completed.


$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { Encl: } & \text { Design Rationale - Gerda Geldenhuys - MCM Architects } \\
& \text { Upper Setback Variance Diagram - MCM Architects }
\end{array}
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| number of storeys | 23 Storevs |  |
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| A207 | Floor plan Li INT | $1 / 8^{2}=14.0$ |
| A288 | floor plan l2 | $1 / 8=10 \cdot 0^{\circ}$ |
| ${ }^{2} 229$ | Floor planl3 FOOR Planla |  |
| A210 | floor plan la | $1 / 8=1.00^{\circ}$ |
| A211 | floor plan lis | $1 / 8=1.0$ |
| A212 | FLOOR PLan L6 | $1 / 8^{\circ}=10.00^{\circ}$ |
| 2213 | Floor plan l7 |  |
| A214 | flocr plan la-z0 | 1/8= $=1.00^{\circ}$ |
| ${ }_{\text {A }}^{\text {A21, }}$ |  |  |
| A217 | Floor plan liz | $1 / 80^{\prime \prime}=1.00^{\circ}$ |
| A218 | FLOOR Plan l23 | $1 / 88^{\circ}=1.00^{4}$ |
| A219 | ROOF PLAN | $1 / 8.10$ |
| A300 | Elevation north south | 1/16 $6=1.000$ |
| ${ }^{2301}$ | E-EVATION EAST |  |
| A302 | E.EVATION WEST |  |
| ${ }_{\substack{2303 \\ 4304}}$ | EEEVATION POOIUM NORTH SOUTH |  |
| A305 | Elevation street North south | N.t.s |
| A306 | Elevaton street East |  |
| A310 | BULDING SECTION NORTH SOUTH |  |
| ${ }_{\text {A }}{ }_{\text {A }} \times 111$ | BULLDING SECTION EAST WEST SHADOW STUDIES | N.TT |
| A501 | CITY VIEW STUDIES | NTS |
| A502 | CITY VIEW STUDIES | N.T.S |
| A503 | CITY VIEW STUDIES | N.t.s |
| 4554 | CITr Vew stuiles | Nits |
| ${ }_{\text {A506 }}$ | 3 OVEW STUIES | N.TS |
| A507 | 3 CVIEW STUDIES | N.ts |
| A508 | 3 CV VEW STUDIES | N.T.S |

$\qquad$
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EQUINOX | MARCH 20 \& SEPT 22 | 10:00 A


EQUINOX | MARCH 20 \& SEPT $22 \mid$ 12:00 PM


EQUINOX | MARCH 20 \& SEPT 22 | 2:00 PM


SUMMER SOLSTICE | JUNE 21| 10:00 AM


SUMMER SOLSTICE | JUNE 21 | 12:00 PM


SUMMER SOLSTICE | JUNE 21| 2:00 PM


WINTER SOLSTICE | DECEMBER 21 | 10:00 AM


WINTER SOLSTICE | DECEMBER 21| 12:00 PM


WINTER SOLSTICE | DECEMBER 21| 2:00 PM










VIEW FROM BLANSHARD AND HERALD ST LOOKING SOUTH WEST
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