

DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE
MINUTES

March 8, 2012

PRESENT: Terry Smith-Lamothe, Chair
Anne Sinclair
Sue Sirrs
Cesar Saleh
Suzanne Saul
Roy McBride
Kevin Conley
Jeff Pinhey
Mary Black
Ramzi Kawar

REGRETS: William Hyde, Vice Chair
Nick Pryce

STAFF: Kurt Pyle, Supervisor, Planning Applications
Richard Harvey, Senior Planner
Sherryl Murphy, Deputy Clerk

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	CALL TO ORDER.....	3
2.	APPROVAL OF MINUTES – February 9, 2012.....	3
3.	APPROVAL OF THE ORDER OF BUSINESS AND APPROVAL OF ADDITIONS AND DELETIONS.....	3
4.	BUSINESS ARISING OUT OF THE MINUTES - None.....	3
5.	CONSIDERATION OF DEFERRED BUSINESS – None.....	3
6.	CORRESPONDENCE, PETITIONS & DELEGATIONS.....	3
6.1	Correspondence dated March 1, 2012 from Mr. Phil Pacey, HRM Committee of Heritage Trust Nova Scotia (Tabled).....	3
6.2	Presentation of Design Review Guidelines – Andy Fillmore.....	4
7.	REPORTS/DISCUSSION.....	4
7.1	Case 17534, Substantive Site Plan Approval – 1592 Barrington Street Chair, note not have advice of HAC. Did approve demolition.....	4 5
8.	ADDED ITEMS.....	7
9.	NEXT MEETING DATE – April 12, 2012.....	7
10.	ADJOURNMENT.....	7

1. CALL TO ORDER

The Chair called the meeting to order at 6:08 p.m. in Halifax Hall, City Hall

The Chair introduced Mary Black, the new citizen representative appointed to the Committee. Ms. Black provided a brief personal background following which roundtable introductions were made.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – February 9, 2012

Referring to a change made to the January minutes as found on page 3 of the February 9, 2012 minutes, Ms. Sirrs indicated that the reference to landscaping plan should be 'planting plan'.

MOVED by Ms. Saul, seconded by Mr. Saleh that the minutes of February 9, 2012 be approved, as amended. MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

The reference to landscaping plan in both the January 19, 2012 and the February 9, 2012 minutes will be changed to planting plan.

3. APPROVAL OF THE ORDER OF BUSINESS AND APPROVAL OF ADDITIONS AND DELETIONS

MOVED by Mr. Saleh, seconded by Mr. McBride, that the agenda, as distributed, be approved. MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

4. BUSINESS ARISING OUT OF THE MINUTES - None

5. CONSIDERATION OF DEFERRED BUSINESS – None

6. CORRESPONDENCE, PETITIONS & DELEGATIONS

6.1 Correspondence dated March 1, 2012 from Mr. Phil Pacey, HRM Committee of Heritage Trust Nova Scotia (Tabled)

Correspondence dated March 2, 2012 from Mr. Phil Pacey, HRM Committee of Heritage Trust Nova Scotia regarding Case 17534 was tabled with the Committee. The Chair noted that this correspondence was included in the package and e-mailed to all members.

6.2 Presentation of Design Review Guidelines – Andy Fillmore

Mr. Andy Fillmore, Project Manager, Urban Design Planning Services, Community Development gave a presentation which provided the context of the Halifax Plan and reviewed with members the administration of the Design Review Guidelines. A copy of the presentation is on file and was distributed electronically to members following the meeting.

Mr. Fillmore responded to various questions regarding the role of the Design Review Committee. Mr. Fillmore noted that at present a residential growth is being tracked as significantly lower than envisioned in HRM by Design. HRM by Design was intended to increase residential growth; however, the trend continues to show a decrease. The five year review of the Regional Plan will address this concern with a view to protecting existing neighbourhoods. An unprecedented number of development applications (140) have been received by HRM over the past year and efforts are being made to map development hotspots.

Mr. Pinhey noted that one of his concerns was the limited time the Committee has to review the proposals under HRM by Design. He went on to indicate that he believed this was a great weakness in the process and suggested that the Committee would benefit in reviewing the iterations of the proposal as reviewed by staff.

Mr. Lamothe-Smith suggested that the Committee provide the developer an opportunity to receive input from the Committee prior to the design being reviewed by staff.

In response to a question from Ms. Sirrs regarding the process should a developer change a key feature of the development following approval by this Committee, Mr. Harvey indicated that the application would be brought back to this Committee for further review and decision.

Mr. Fillmore suggested that the issue brought forward by Mr. Pinhey could be dealt with in a workshop on an upcoming agenda, to which the Committee agreed.

7. REPORTS/DISCUSSION

7.1 Case 17534, Substantive Site Plan Approval – 1592 Barrington Street

A staff report dated February 24, 2012, with the following attachments, was before the Committee:

- Map 1 Location and Zoning
- Attachment A – Site Plan Approval Plans
- Attachment B – Supporting Information
- Attachment C – Design Manual Checklist

The Chair noted that the Heritage Advisory Committee had met and approved the demolition of the existing building. Mr. Lamothe-Smith asked how the Committee could move forward without a report from the Heritage Advisory Committee.

Bill Plaskett, Heritage Planner, advised that he had attended the Heritage Advisory Committee and that they had a full package of information before them when considering the demolition, including plans of the proposal.

Mr. Harvey noted that the authority relating to granting the demolition lies with Regional Council. He went on to suggest that embodied with the recommendation to demolish, is the understanding that the Committee finds the building to be suitable. This Committee's primary responsibility is for the appropriateness of design of a replacement building.

Following a further short discussion, the Committee agreed to move forward with considering the application.

Mr. Harvey suggested that more than in any other case considered by the Committee, the Committee's discussion should focus on how well this building fits on the site and in the surroundings.

The Committee reviewed the Design Manual Checklist as follows:

Section 2.5d

Mr. Kavar indicated that he did not believe that the proposal fully responds to Section 2.5d as the texture of Barrington Street is essentially layered. He suggested that the proposal did not continue the heritage 'language' of Barrington Street and suggested the proposal could more appropriately address the heritage of the street.

Mr. Saleh responded indicating that the proponent had the right to choose to develop a modernistic building. He noted that the building constructed in 1951 was a modernistic building located between two heritage building and this was a similar situation. Mr. Saleh suggested that a good quality modernistic building will enhance what exists. He went on to note that from an economic perspective, it is difficult to develop these small lots economically and he commended the applicant for making this effort.

Ms. Saul read comment #1 from an e-mail dated March 8, 2012 forwarded by Mr. Nick Pryce to members of the Committee which supports the applicant's approach with regard to the adjacent heritage buildings. A copy of Mr. Pryce's e-mail forms a part of the public record of this meeting.

Mr. Smith-Lamothe agreed that the façade needs enrichment and the proposal should respect and be a good neighbour to its surroundings.

Mr. Conley pointed out that the applicant has taken a decision to develop a contemporary building while making references to the historic nature of adjacent buildings.

The Committee clarified, upon request of the Chair, that the concerns expressed were not sufficient enough to deny the application.

Ms. Sinclair referred to Section 3.3.2 c, d and e with reference to the south side of the façade and suggested that the higher quality black anodized panels should replace the prefinished metal proposed. Following a further discussion regarding the appropriateness of the cladding, the Committee reached consensus that this aspect would form a condition of approval.

Mr. Smith-Lamothe then reviewed the two variances to be considered as set out in the February 24, 2012 staff report:

1. Variance to the height requirements for a rear stair enclosure that provides access to the upper roof.

MOVED by Mr. Pinhey, seconded by Mr. Saleh that the Design Review Committee approve the variance to the height requirements for a rear stair enclosure that provides access to the upper roof. MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

2. Variance to the maximum height and upper storey setback requirements, in order to permit a handrail for landscaped open space areas that re above the fourth storey and the top roof.

MOVED by Mr. McBride, seconded by Mr. Pinhey that the Design Review Committee approve the variance to the maximum height and upper storey setback requirements, in order to permit a handrail for landscaped open space areas that re above the fourth storey and the top roof. MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

MOVED by Mr. Ramzi that approval be conditional upon the design better respecting Section 2.5d

As there was no seconder to this motion, **the motion was lost.**

MOVED by Mr. Saleh, seconded by Ms. Saul that the Design Review Committee approve the qualitative elements of the substantive site plan approval application for the building proposed at 1592 Barrington Street, including the variances being sought, as shown on the plans identified as Attachment A of the February 24, 2012 staff report with the following condition:

- **that the prefinished metal siding be replaced with the black anodized panels on the south façade and on the north façade to the eastern edge of the lightwell.**

MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

- 8. ADDED ITEMS**
- 9. NEXT MEETING DATE – April 12, 2012**
- 10. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:10 p.m.

Sherryl Murphy
Deputy Clerk