



**DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE  
MINUTES  
August 14, 2014**

PRESENT: Ramzi Kawar, Chair  
Kourosh Rad, Vice-Chair  
Mary Black  
Kevin Conley  
Andy Fillmore  
Noel Fowler  
Louis Lemoine  
Roy McBride  
Cesar Saleh  
Steven Murphy

REGRETS: Sue Sirrs  
Anne Sinclair

STAFF: Karen Brown, Solicitor  
Richard Harvey, Major Projects Planner  
Erin MacIntyre, Planner  
Sherryl Murphy, Deputy Clerk

*The following does not represent a verbatim record of the proceedings of this meeting.*

*The agenda, supporting documents, and information items circulated to Committee are available online: <http://www.halifax.ca/boardscom/drc/140814drc-agenda.php>*

*The meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m. and adjourned at 8:22 p.m.*

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

The Chair called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

**2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – June 12, 2014**

Changes to the minutes were noted.

**MOVED by Mr. Fillmore, seconded by Ms. Black that the minutes of the June 12, 2014 meeting of the Design Review Committee, as amended, be approved. MOTION PUT AND PASSED.**

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

**MOVED by Mr. McBride, seconded by Mr. Lemoine that items 7.1.1 and 7.1.2 be moved up on the agenda immediately following item 6.2 Petitions. MOTION PUT AND PASSED.**

Additions:

8.1 Five Year Review – Design Guidelines – Andy Fillmore

**MOVED by Mr. Lemoine, seconded by Ms. Black that the agenda be approved as amended.**

**4. BUSINESS ARISING OUT OF THE MINUTES - NONE**

**5. CONSIDERATION OF DEFERRED BUSINESS – NONE**

**6. CORRESPONDENCE, PETITIONS & DELEGATIONS**

**6.1 Correspondence - None**

**6.2 Petitions – None**

**7. REPORTS**

**7.1 STAFF**

Mr. Richard Harvey, Major Project Planner, introduced the two cases to be considered by the Committee noting that these were unique cases in that the modifications have been completed. Mr. Harvey stressed that the Committee should review the cases in the same manner as all others which have come before them and should they find that the modifications do not meet the guidelines; the Committee should act to address this deficit.

Members expressed concern that the modifications had been made without following proper process.

**7.1.1 Case 18967: Substantive Site Plan Approval – 1721 Brunswick Street, Halifax**

The following was before the Committee:

- *A staff recommendation report dated July 29, 2014*

Ms. Erin McIntyre, Planner, gave a presentation outlining the modifications made to the façade of the building at 1721 Brunswick Street briefly reviewing the existing context, a project description and providing an overview of the matters for discussion under the Design Manual Guidelines. Ms. McIntyre advised that staff was recommending approval of the qualitative elements of the substantive site plan approval application for this proposal. A copy of the presentation is on file.

Ms. McIntyre responded to questions from members. Referring to the mechanical equipment on the roof, Mr. Fowler asked if the Committee could make a recommendation regarding screening. Mr. Harvey noted that the application included only the alterations to the façade. He indicated that the mechanical equipment had been an existing condition.

**MOVED by Mr. Fillmore, seconded by Mr. McBride that the Design Review Committee approve the qualitative elements of the substantive site plan approval application for alteration to the façade of the existing commercial build at 1721 Brunswick Street, as shown on Attachment A of the July 29, 2014 staff report.**

The Committee reviewed the checklist with Mr. Lemoine expressing concern that the requirement for animated street walls had not been met in this proposal. Mr. Fillmore pointed out that the alteration had improved the streetscape over what had existed.

Mr. Harvey noted that the guidelines do not provide different ways in which to handle proposals which vary in scope such as square footage, renovation cost or change of use. He indicated that this may be an area the Committee will wish to consider during the Five Year Review. Mr. Harvey recommended that the Committee consider this proposal in terms of degree and portion of change.

With regard to the change in the stucco cladding as per Section 3.3.2g of the Design Manual, Ms. McIntyre advised that the stucco cladding had been reduced from 100% stucco cladding to approximately 25%-30%.

Mr. Kawar suggested that the flat roof on the building should be landscaped.

**MOTION PUT AND PASSED.**

**MOVED by Mr. Lemoine, seconded by Mr. Black that the Design Review Committee recommend the Development Officer suggest to the developer that:**

- **The flat roof be treated with landscaping in keeping with the Design Review Guidelines**
- **The mechanical equipment located on the roof be screened**

**MOTION PUT AND PASSED.**

#### **7.1.2 Case 19390: Substantive Site Plan Approval – 5890 Spring Garden Road, Halifax**

The following was before the Committee:

- *A staff recommendation report dated July 29, 2014*

Richard Harvey gave a brief presentation reviewing the former building exterior in comparison to the existing, noting that the modifications included larger ground floor windows, alterations to entrances, cladding, signage and a canopy over the door on Spring Garden Road. Mr. Harvey indicated that staff is recommending that the Committee approve the qualitative elements of the application. A copy of the presentation is on file.

Mr. Harvey responded to questions from members of the Committee with Mr. Fillmore noting that the transparency of the new larger ground floor windows was lost when an opaque material was applied to the window. He asked if this something about which the Committee could make a recommendation. Mr. Harvey noted that he believed this matter could be referred to the Development Officer for consideration.

Concern was expressed regarding the loss of the awnings with the renovation to the building. Mr. Harvey indicated that reinstatement of the awnings would be within the scope of the Committee's deliberations. The Committee reviewed the checklist.

**MOVED by Mr. Saleh, seconded by Ms. Black that the Design Review Committee approve the qualitative elements of the site plan approval application for exterior renovations to the existing commercial building at 5690 Spring Garden Road, as shown on Attachment A of the July 29, 2014 staff report with the following conditions:**

- **The developer include an awning on Spring Garden Road over the sidewalk to provide the pedestrian protection as set out in the Design Manual Guidelines and the proposed door canopy be harmonious and contiguous with this awning, and further the Design Review Committee recommends that the developer continue the canopy on South Park Street.**

**MOTION PUT AND PASSED.**

**MOVED by Mr. Fillmore, seconded by Mr. Lemoine that the Design Review Committee recommend the Development Officer ensure that the window transparency requirements of Sections 3.1.1b and 3.2.3a of the Design Review Guidelines are met. MOTION PUT AND PASSED.**

### **6.3 Presentation**

#### **6.3.1 Preliminary Presentation – Lands Bounded by Clyde Street, Dresden Row and Birmingham Streets – Margareta Site**

Plans and renderings of the proposed mixed use development on the Margareta site, Clyde Street, Halifax, Nova Scotia from WM Fares Group were before the Committee.

Mr. Roberto Mendez, WM Fares Group, gave a brief presentation outlining the architectural design and massing of the proposed 'Margareta'. Mr. Mendez reviewed the configuration of the various levels and landscaping features. He noted that a central courtyard facing Clyde Street considered the historic nature of Schmidville, however, did not meet the design guidelines. Mr. Mendez provided renderings illustrating the Margareta streetscape and site.

Mr. Mendez indicated that the primary intention of the presentation was to allow the Committee an opportunity to assess the merits of the architecture given that the central courtyard on Clyde Street would require a street wall width variance under Section 3.6.4 of the guidelines. He noted that he believed all other aspects of the proposal met the guidelines. Mr. Mendez reiterated that the design recognized the significance of Schmidville. Mr. Mendez responded to questions.

Mr. Lemoine congratulated Mr. Mendez on the design noting that it animated the street. He suggested that there was an opportunity to increase soft landscaping at street level. He noted that the proposal was a tremendous addition to the street and was a world class design.

Mr. Kourosh noted that there appears to be some discrepancies in the plans for level 100 and noted this was something to consider for the next submission.

Mr. Fillmore commended Mr. Mendez on the design noting the attributes of breaking down the mass of the building to address Schmidville, the transparency at grade, and the crisp architecture in particular.

Mr. Fowler also congratulated Mr. Mendez indicating that he could support a variance for this proposal.

Mr. Conley noted that he liked the design and pointed out that the south exposure was a positive in terms of landscaping. He noted a discrepancy in the drawings relative to decking and the grass area and the composite banding.

Note was made that the roofline overhang may also require a variance. With reference to the roofline, a suggestion was made that it be made softer.

The Chair thanked Mr. Mendez for his presentation.

### 6.3.2 Preliminary Presentation – Lands at the North-West Corner of Hollis and South Streets

Plans and renderings of the proposed mixed use development at Hollis and South Streets, Halifax, Nova Scotia from WM Fares Group were before the Committee.

Mr. Jacob JeBailey, WM Fares Group, gave a brief presentation describing the site and the context of the proposal. Using diagrams, he went on to provide the design rationale. Of note, is a plan to increase the sidewalk width on Hollis as it is somewhat narrow. Based on renderings, Mr. JeBailey illustrated how the building would look within the neighbourhood noting a number of features of the building (e.g. windows). He went on to review the floor plans and landscaping. Reviewing the elevations, Mr. JeBailey noted the pattern of brick cladding on the building. In closing, Mr. JeBailey sought input from the Committee regarding the proposed development.

During the discussion the Committee noted the following matters which they would recommend be addressed in the final application:

- Provide more information on the easement at the rear and how it will be impacted by this proposal
- The location of the lobby to benefit residents is commendable; however, it is a significant loss of opportunity. The corner on which the lobby is situated is very important and would serve the commercial portion of the development well
- The proposal does not consider the Hardman Building, located next door on Hollis Street. This building is close to 150 years old
- The brick cladding on the rear of the building is well balanced and composed, while it is too busy on the front of the building.
- The roofline has no definition and close consideration should be given to the roof treatment
- Use of the land buffer should be either private or public (not both).

The Chair thanked Mr. JeBailey for his presentation.

## 8. ADDED ITEMS

### 8.1 Five Year Review – Design Guidelines – Andy Fillmore

Mr. Fillmore noted that the Committee would be discussing the five year review of the Design Guidelines with Luc Ouelett, Senior Planner at the September meeting. In order to provide some structure around those discussions, Mr. Fillmore suggested that members identify areas of concern, reflect and provide their written comments to the Clerk prior to the meeting, **to which the Committee agreed**. These comments will be collated and distributed for the meeting. Mr. Fillmore noted that a running list of issues has been maintained by the Committee's Legislative support and this would also be distributed.

## 10. DATE OF NEXT MEETING – Thursday, September 11, 2014

## 11. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 8:22 p.m.

Sherryl Murphy  
Deputy Clerk