



**DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES
August 13, 2015**

PRESENT: Kourosh Rad, Chair
Steve Murphy, Vice Chair
Rick Buhr
Kevin Conley
Catherine Courtney
Louis Lemoine
Rob LeBlanc
Anna Sampson
Jared Dalziel
Malcolm Pinto

REGRETS: Noel Fowler

STAFF: Richard Harvey, Major Projects Planner
Sarah Knight, Solicitor
Sherryl Murphy, Deputy Clerk
Cailin MacDonald, Legislative Support

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

The agenda, supporting documents, and information items circulated to the Committee are available online: <http://www.halifax.ca/boardscom/drc/150813DRCAgenda.php>

The meeting was called to order at 4:00 p.m. and adjourned at 5:40 p.m.

1. CALL TO ORDER

The Chair called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – July 9, 2015

MOVED by Mr. Buhr, seconded by Mr. Murphy

THAT the minutes of July 9, 2015 be approved as distributed. MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

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

The agenda was accepted as distributed.

The Chair noted that Committee member, Mr. Fillmore, is running as a candidate in the upcoming Federal Election and therefore he will be taking a leave of absence from the Design Review Committee in accordance with HRM's Public Appointment Policy.

4. BUSINESS ARISING OUT OF THE MINUTES – NONE

5. CONSIDERATION OF DEFERRED BUSINESS – NONE

6. CORRESPONDENCE, PETITIONS & DELEGATIONS

6.1 Correspondence

6.1.1 Email from Peggy Cameron regarding Case 19756, St. David's Church Redevelopment, dated July 10, 2015 was distributed to the Committee. The correspondence was noted as being received by the Committee.

6.1.2 Email from Dr. David Hirsch regarding Case 19855, South Park/Brenton Street, dated July 14, 2015 was distributed to the Committee. The correspondence was noted as being received by the Committee.

6.1.3 Email from Dawn Frail regarding Case 19855 South Park/Brenton Street, dated July 29, 2015 was distributed to the Committee. The correspondence was noted as being received by the Committee.

6.2 Petitions – None

6.3 Presentation

6.3.1 Preliminary Presentation: Emera Pedway and Building Recladding, Lower Water Street and Terminal Road

The following was before the Committee:

- 5151 Terminal Road Proposed Mid-Life Refresh & Pedway

The Chair and Ms. Sampson declared a Conflict of Interest and took seats in the gallery.

The Vice Chair invited Mr. Blaise Morrison, Manager, Planning, WSP, and Mr. Ron Burdock, Senior Architect, Architecture49, on behalf of the client, Emera, to give the Preliminary Presentation: Emera Pedway and Building Recladding, Lower Water Street and Terminal Road to the Committee.

Mr. Morrison described the midlife refresh of the 40-year-old building at 5151 Terminal Road. He noted that the design objective of this project is to visually update and upgrade the quality of the exterior envelope, including new cladding and new windows, of the building. He went on to state the projects' main goals:

- Support Emera's long-term commitment of investing in downtown Halifax by building high-quality, well-designed projects;
- Maintain and grow the number of workers and visitors to downtown Halifax;
- Visually integrate the existing Emera headquarters on Lower Water Street with the renovated Terminal Road building by using a shared design language and materials palette;
- Move 5151 Terminal Road towards a 'Class A' office level of quality;
- Significantly improve the building's energy efficiency with low impact and sustainable design; and
- Develop a physical link between the two buildings with an elevated pedestrian crossing, or pedway, across Lower Water Street that offers an alternative protective public path that links the Waterfront to Hollis Street.

Mr. Morrison commented that the Design Manual recognizes that pedways may be appropriate in some cases and that the design follows the guidelines outlined for pedways. He commented that the addition of a pedway helps create a holistic business campus between the two sites. Mr. Morrison stated that the proposed pedway design is located on an east-west roadway and will not obstruct views of the harbour. He continued that the design is simplistic and responds to the following parameters including that it:

- Is not more than a single storey in height;
- Designed to have as low a profile as possible;
- Is comprised of highly transparent materials; and
- Responds in an elegant and minimal manner to its context.

Mr. Burdock commented that Architecture49 was engaged by Emera to look at a number of upgrades for 5151 Terminal Road which included creating a unified look for Emera's properties. He continued that the building would be recladded to improve its energy efficiency and take advantage of this opportunity to update its look. Mr. Burdock commented that the current building has a clean contemporary design and that this design will work with the existing form and use materials similar to that of 1H, Nova Scotia Power/Emera Headquarters, located at 1223 Lower Water Street. He noted that the proposed recladding will accentuate the building's existing massing and define its articulation.

Mr. Burdock shared that the colour palette will be similar to H1 to reflect the existing pale silver and bluish/black hues and that the lower portion will have increased transparency. He commented that the proposed pedway will provide an alternative protective public path through to the existing H1 site into the renovated 5151 Terminal Road site, linking the waterfront to Hollis Street through an internal public atrium, gallerias and the pedway. Mr. Burdock noted that the proposed pedway will create functional access for the occupants of the two sites, by providing all-weather access and by separating the vehicle traffic at this corner. He continued that it will extend the limited-use public space and create a possible connection to the future site of the Discovery Centre.

Mr. Burdock continued that the dimensions of the building are not being changed and that associated upgrades to the landscape are planned. He also noted that some of the functions on the interior of the building are being discussed although much of what has been presented outlines the design intent. He remarked that the view of the proposed pedway will be discreet and minimal and that it is not anticipated to impede on any significant views.

The Vice-Chair thanked Mr. Morrison and Mr. Burdock for their presentation and opened the floor to questions and comments from the Committee.

A copy of the presentation is on file.

Mr. Buhr inquired for further description on the spandrels. Mr. Burdock responded that the existing spandrels are simply shield with approximately one inch of insulation behind them and noted some of these will remain. He continued that in other areas, the spandrels will be extended by approximately three inches and that a combination of the two will be used to further articulate the sides of the building.

Mr. Buhr asked for further explanation regarding dimensions of the pedway. Mr. Burdock commented that there is a required setback of 45 feet for the street right-of-way and explained that the 84 feet 3.5 inches is the distance between the two property lines.

Mr. LeBlanc inquired whether the proposed pedway was expected to be public or private. Mr. Burdock responded that it will be public. There will be a connection from 5151 Terminal Road through to the atrium and elevator of the 1H site through to waterfront access. Mr. LeBlanc asked whether the ground floor of 5151 Terminal Road would be public spaces. Mr. Burdock responded that the ground floor will be like a mall, noting that some areas would be designated for staff uses, like a fitness centre and innovation space, and that the other areas would be available to both occupants of the building as well as the public.

Mr. LeBlanc further commented that normally when considering pedways in design, long-term connectivity and other uses are considerations. He asked whether any thought had been given to how it will connect to other buildings. Mr. Burdock commented that there have been discussions about the possibility of developing a piece of land, owned by Emera, north of 5151 Terminal Road, which would extend the business campus. He stated that the client is looking at this project as an opportunity to provide a public amenity out of a functional imperative.

The Vice Chair reminded the Committee to funnel questions through the Chair rather than directly to the presenters.

Mr. LeBlanc inquired whether the footprint of 5151 Terminal Road would be altered to reflect the Lower Water Street setback limit of within four metres. Mr. Morrison responded that the building's footprint would not be changing and that it would be grandfathered in. He stated that the project consists of pure recladding and changes the interior to make it more amenable as a public space.

Mr. Buhr asked whether there had been any thought to reducing the height of the mechanical stack on the top of the building. Mr. Burdock noted that presently there are no plans to change the mechanical stack and that it would be grandfathered into the design.

Mr. Lemoine commented that the proposed design did not appear to be much better than the existing design and shared that he does not generally support pedways as it takes people off the street rather than encouraging people at street level. Furthermore, he questioned how the project would be improving the connection of streetscape to the development itself and how landscaping would be used to enhance the pedestrian experience at street level to contribute to its animation. Mr. Lemoine commented that an opportunity exists for the design to have visual impact architecturally which had not been fully explored considering it will be completely recladded and that it sits on a corner lot.

Mr. Lemoine asked what plans existed for public art. Mr. Burdock commented that public art had not yet been discussed, but that a note has been made.

Mr. Burdock shared that the existing activity on the main floor are private uses, and that what is being proposed will encourage more activity as a public/private space, to include a fitness centre and meeting spaces, and will use transparent materials to help animate the streetscape. As well, he commented on the expression of the building and noted that as a primarily non-public building the design reflects the notion of it being a secondary, background building.

In reference to connectivity and public access, Mr. Buhr asked whether there would be a street exit from the pedway. Mr. Burdock responded that access remains through the building's entrances which are near to the door for security reasons.

Mr. Dalziel noted that he would like to see a rendering looking forward towards the Westin Nova Scotian since the site has a prominent visual terminus. He continued by echoing Mr. Lemione's comments around the sites' landscaping plans and he noted the site's close proximity to the Halifax Seaport Farmer's Market as well as a busy intersection presented opportunities to include benches in the design.

Mr. Lemoine commented that an opportunity existed to create a natural plaza or walking promenade at the base of 5151 Terminal Road. As well, he suggested celebrating the pedway and making it obvious rather than design it plainly.

Mr. Morrison shared that creating a promenade was a definite option and one that was being considered for the site. He continued that the proposed pedway design was intended to complement the industrial features of the area and that the pedway served an important function to not have pedestrians crossing at street level as it is a busy traffic intersection and main artery into the Halifax Port Authority.

Mr. LeBlanc shared that understood the design rationale for proposing a narrow and simplistic pedway. He commented that since the building reflects a campus-style design and is setback from the street, there is opportunity to consider a more urban treatment with street art to help bridge the non-active public uses on the ground level and noted that plans exist to redevelop and invest in Cornwallis Park, kitty-corner to the site, which would be nice to carryover.

Mr. Pinto asked whether more vertical elements were planned to support the pedway and expressed some concern. Mr. Burdock responded that those indicated were the only supports planned.

Mr. Conley commented that he agreed with Mr. Buhr's comments around the mechanical stack and shared that he believed the proposed refit is an improvement and understood the design intention for treating it as a background building.

Mr. Morrison commented, on behalf of Paul Currie of Emera, that work still needs to be done to address the project's mechanical stack and that there is potential to reduce it.

The Vice Chair asked whether the Committee had any further questions or comments for the presenters, and hearing none, he thanked Mr. Morrison and Mr. Burdock for their presentation.

6.3.2 Preliminary Presentation: Green Lantern Building Redevelopment, Barrington Street

The following was before the Committee:

- Green Lantern Next

The Vice Chair invited members of WSP and Architecture49 to give the Preliminary Presentation: Green Lantern Building Redevelopment, Barrington Street presentation, to the Committee.

Mr. Jason Ghoson provided the Committee with a brief project introduction and noted the project's intent to appreciate, maintain and revive as much of the Chicago-style architectural elements as possible and that the design was a collaboration between old and new. He then invited Mark Archibald as well as Abigail MacEachern of Architecture49 to speak.

Mr. Archibald shared a brief outline of the building's nearly 200 year history and its historical significance to the streetscape. He cited that through their research and analysis of the building's history it was determined that not only the façade but also the front half of the building facing Barrington Street has historical significance.

Ms. MacEachern shared that the proposed redevelopment is modeled after the existing building. She noted that the proposed design will retain and restore some of the original features of the 1896 Barrington Street side including its entries to the street, masonry walls, an elevator shaft, safe vaults and the original floorplates. Ms. MacEachern continued that a proposed addition would be added to the Granville Street side and that this add-on would be extended vertically as well to increase the building's capacity. She remarked that the Granville Street side will have three levels of underground parking accessed from an adjacent building development and that the new floorplates at the rear will be a lot closer together which will help increase the density of the building.

On the Barrington Street side, Ms. MacEachern commented that the floorplates will remain and will provide structure to support the new loading of two additional levels. She went on to state that the 1896 Barrington Street commercial frontage would be reinstated. Ms. MacEachern continued that the addition would be setback and that its design will be clean and modern, and that architectural interest will be in the details.

On the Granville Street side, Ms. MacEachern shared that the interior units will have an industrial loft design, and the exterior will reflect this form, simple and modern. On this side, she went on to state that it would be revitalized with a commercial unit with a transparent façade at pedestrian level and that the rhythm, material and form of this architecture will be simple and modern and will pull from the architecture on the Barrington Street side. Ms. MacEachern commented that the middle section of the Granville Street side of the building will have similar materials to the Barrington Street side, although the design will be modern as not to impede on the existing historical elements.

Moreover, Ms. MacEachern described the planned rooftop form, stating that it would be light, modern and a signature element of the building's design. She remarked that the form, a reference to the "Green Lantern," a former building tenant, will be made of a copper green material and that its origami-like folds would be lightly placed. She continued that its impact on the pedestrian level would be minimal as the intent is to highlight the building's historical elements. Ms. MacEachern described and provided illustrations of the varying perspectives of the rooftop structure for the Committee.

Ms. MacEachern noted that the units would be premium industrial loft-style with exposed original brick. She went on to note that the 1896 Barrington Street side reinstates the original commercial façade which includes uncovering the original pilasters. Ms. MacEachern commented that the commercial spaces will be transparent, set back and overall, inviting, to encourage pedestrian curiosity.

Concerning the Barrington Street façade, Ms. MacEachern remarked that the Chicago-style architectural elements will be maintained and restored to its original detail including elements damaged during hurricane Juan.

Ms. MacEachern stated that there will be a total of 63 residential units, plus approximately 3900 square feet of commercial space at grade, and 29 underground parking stalls provided for on three levels and accessed through the adjacent building. She stated that there will be 17 micro-loft units, 18 two-bedroom units and a possible three-bedroom unit in the rooftop structural element. Ms. MacEachern continued that there will be two, possibly three, commercial units on Barrington Street.

Ms. MacEachern described the proposed variances for the project. She commented that presently, the proposal does not provide for any awnings to preserve the historic character of the building and stated that if awnings are a requirement then the proposed style would be thin, non-imposing, modern glass awnings that will not block the façade of the building. Ms. MacEachern noted that since the doors of the commercial units are setback, they felt that the proposed design meets the intention of the Design Manual.

In regards to the second requested variance, Ms. MacEachern noted that a streetwall height of 17.5 metres is being requested along Barrington Street, rather than the required 15.5 metres, to maintain the building's existing historic façade.

For the third requested variance, Ms. MacEachern shared that a proposed streetwall height of 20 metres is being requested along Granville Street, rather than the required 18.5 metres, to aid with the transition from the front to the back of the building. She continued that this increase will also provide for a better visual connection of the building.

Ms. MacEachern shared a couple of final discussion points and requested the Committee's feedback on the three options for the rooftop sculptural element as well as comments regarding the Granville Street storefront treatment.

A copy of the presentation is on file.

The Vice-Chair thanked Mr. Ghoson, Mr. Archibald and Ms. MacEachern for presenting and opened the floor to questions and comments from the Committee.

Mr. Lemoine commented that it was nice to see an older building be brought back to life especially on Barrington Street. He further shared that awnings and canopies often encourage discussion around the table for the Committee and agreed that light and transparent awnings and/or canopies should be considered. He continued that the streetwall variances requested seemed acceptable, although he cited that it was going to be important how lighting and signage are treated.

Mr. Lemoine inquired whether there was a proposed variance requested in respect to overall height. Ms. MacEachern responded that there was not. Also, he asked for clarification on the connections between the underground parking levels and Ms. MacEachern clarified that parking is accessed via a ramp of the adjacent building.

Mr. LeBlanc questioned the usability of the proposed commercial space due to its limited size and asked what types of uses were planned for this space. Ms. MacEachern commented that presently there are no tenants, but suggested a coffee shop or a small retail store as occupants.

Mr. LeBlanc commented that the Granville Street façade appeared to need further consideration to its design to better integrate the modern and heritage elements. As well, he commented that considering this building is within the heritage district, it was difficult to assess how this new building would relate to its neighbours without seeing renderings which include the buildings next door.

Mr. LeBlanc remarked that it seemed like the design of the rooftop sculptural element was playing to the metaphor of the lantern, and commented that its design required further refinement and consideration.

Mr. Buhr questioned the amount of parking available. Ms. MacEachern responded that there are plans for a future building next door which would include further parking accommodation.

In reference to the Barrington Street façade, Mr. Buhr questioned the rhythm of the design and how well it relates together. He commented on the top floors of the building across the street as an example of a random façade which did not rely on the existing structure and as a result appeared to remove the entire grid so where it aligns is unknown. Mr. Archibald stated that maintaining the structure is in response to the vision of the existing building.

Mr. Pinto asked for clarification regarding maintaining the existing floorplates. Ms. MacEachern shared that the existing floorplates would remain and that concrete floors would be added. Mr. Archibald stated that the intention is to retain as much wood as possible from a heritage and design point of view and that it will ultimately be determined by code compliance.

The Vice-Chair thanked Mr. Archibald and Ms. MacEachern for their presentation.

Mr. Rad and Ms. Sampson rejoined the meeting.

7. REPORTS

7.1 STAFF

7.1.1 Conflict of Interest Legislation and Committee Role

The Chair invited Ms. Sarah Knight, a Solicitor with the Municipality, to give a presentation on the *Municipal Conflict of Interest Act* with the Committee.

A copy of the *Act* is on file.

Ms. Knight commented that the *Act* applies to Regional Council as well as local boards with authority of any kind, including the Design Review Committee. She continued that the *Act* is in place as it can have an impact on the members of the councils and committees as well as on decisions being made by the committee or on advice that is being given. Ms. Knight stated that while an individual may be acting in a way that they think would be considered helpful, a decision could be challenged at a later date should a potential conflict exist.

Ms. Knight noted section 3(a) of the *Act* noting that if an individual personally has financial interest in a project, a conflict exists and that it can sometimes become trickier when a project is related to business connections.

Ms. Knight noted section 3(b) of the *Act* as having significant relevance for the Design Review Committee. She stated: *A member has an indirect pecuniary interest in any matter if the member is a partner of or associated in a joint venture with a person, or is in the employ of a person or body, whether incorporated or not, that has an interest in any matter in which the council or local board is considered.*

Ms. Knight stated that if an individual's firm has completed work on a project, the individual would be considered to have an interest in the outcome of the application.

Ms. Knight cited section 3(a) of the *Act*, noting that a member has an indirect pecuniary interest in any matter is a shareholder in, or a director or senior officer of, depending if it is a privately or publicly shared corporation as well as a generic catchall, a member has an indirect pecuniary interest if they are a member of a body that has an interest in any matter in which the council or local board is concerned.

Ms. Knight went on to discuss section 5 which outlines situations when the *Act* does not apply and said that these are generally when your interest is common to everyone's interest. She noted 5(k) of the *Act* and commented that when considering whether or not you have a conflict it is the committee member's decision to decide for themselves whether one exists. Ms. Knight stated that the role of legal services is to provide counsel to governing bodies and not individuals and if questions arise, Committee members may begin by consulting with the Clerk's Office and their questions will be fielded appropriately.

Next, Ms. Knight discussed the process for declaring a conflict of interest and commented that the process was followed correctly this evening. She shared that a Committee member must disclose the interest and withdraw from the table and sit in the public area during public meetings or outside of the room for closed meetings. As well, individuals must refrain from attempting to influence the decision and not participate in conversation or discussion as it relates to the matter.

Ms. Knight continued by sharing an example of a case where a Councillor contacted fellow Councillors in advance of a meeting and offered to discuss an upcoming project since the member planned to disclose his/her interest at the meeting. Ms. Knight commented that this interaction was in conflict according to courts. Ms. Knight noted a case where a member had declared a conflict of interest however discussed the matter with members of the public following the meeting which contravened the *Act*. Ms. Knight commented that members in the gallery are asked to sit quietly and not discuss applications with colleagues before, during or after the meeting.

Ms. Knight commented that one of the biggest consequences would be losing one's seat and that a second issue would be concerns about bias where conflict of interest can arise and whether applications are getting a fair hearing and decisions may be subject to be challenged down the road. Ms. Knight stated two areas of concern: the first, Committee members involved in an application should never be part of a presentation to the Committee and the second, regarding bias. Ms. Knight commented that Committee members need to be careful when speaking to presenters before or after a presentation as it may appear that they are taking a special interest in a project. She noted that Committee members are making decisions on a project based only on information publicly available.

The Chair thanked Ms. Knight for the presentation and opened the floor to questions and comments from the Committee.

The Chair shared that some of the Committee members work in publicly traded companies and that it was advised that they not take part in a particular application because their firm could potentially obtain work on this project once approved. He cited 3(a)(i) of the *Act*. Ms. Knight commented that it was correct to declare a conflict of interest in this situation.

Mr. Lemoine stated "When in doubt; sit it out." He gave an example of when a presenter attempted to discuss an application with him, prior to the presentation. Mr. Lemoine told the presenter that he was unable to discuss matters of the application due to the *Municipal Conflict of Interest Act*.

Mr. Murphy shared an example where a Committee member may have the opportunity to submit a proposal on an application after it has been approved although there was no contract in place prior to the presentation. Ms. Knight commented that in this type of situation where other firms are able to submit proposals on a particular project and it is considered a level playing field, it would be up to the member to decide whether they are comfortable proceeding.

Mr. Pinto commented that his firm receives a lot of proposals, and that they do not always know whether other firms have been solicited or whether they will be the successful proponent until later on in the process. He continued that from this presentation as long as a signed contract is not in place then it would not be considered a conflict of interest although it could be perceived in that way. Mr. Pinto further commented on the perception of speaking to presenters, particularly where it is a small community and he knows many of the presenters coming in and chatting with them would be a perceived conflict. Ms. Knight responded that while perception plays a part there does need to be substantive evidence of its influence.

The Chair commented on the ability to discuss applications with fellow Committee members prior to the meeting and asked staff to expand on this. Ms. Knight commented that this example relates to Committee making decisions on a project based on only information publicly available and the decision should be made at this table and that the conversation needs to be held here. Ms. Sherrill Murphy, Deputy Clerk, commented that this instruction speaks to the transparency of the Committee and that discussions need to be held around the table not by phone, by email or in the hallway.

Ms. Sampson inquired whether or not if a large company with lots of clients, which had projects on the books or a lingering connection, would be considered a conflict of interest. Ms. Knight commented that it would likely be in a grey area since timing and degree of connection would make a difference.

In relation to the role of the Committee, Mr. Harvey shared that the planning staff wanted to check in with the Committee to see how the review process for preliminary presentations is working. As well, he reminded the Committee that staff often tries to vet presentations, but that sometimes they are hearing presentations for the first time just like the Committee. He noted that presentations need to be taken into a bit of context whether the proposal meets the requirements of the Land-Use Bylaw (LUB) and context around the variances. Mr. Harvey commented that overall Committee members should have fairly good knowledge of the LUB and the Design Manual to aid in these preliminary discussions. He also reminded the Committee not to give absolutes for or against project elements.

Mr. Dalziel commented that it would be helpful to have some hard rules on what variances are being applied for. Mr. Harvey responded that at the preliminary presentation stage of the application process, he would recommend that presenters not place emphasis on variances. He stated that sometimes discussions during preliminary presentations can imply variances will be approved, although in many cases the Design Manual outlines particular conditions for when variances may be considered.

Mr. Dalziel shared that he would prefer that variances not be discussed during preliminary applications. Mr. Harvey noted that the level of detail to which variances are discussed may be where the concern lies.

Mr. Lemoine commented that he prefers variances to be discussed at this stage of applications. He continued that in his view, these presentations are opportunities for exploratory conversations and not for making final decisions or offering firm advice. He continued that this is an opportunity for the Committee to share broad comments and that part of this process is to challenge the presenters.

Mr. Buhr commented that showing buildings within the context of the streetscapes would be helpful when reviewing presentations. Mr. Lemoine agreed and stated that while he understands that the presentations are high level, he noted that there should still be enough information to make informed comments on elements like context, materiality and connections. Mr. Lemoine commented that he preferred to have more information and detail in presentations. Mr. Harvey responded by stating that the amount of information to include in these presentations is something that is often debated among staff, so this was helpful feedback to have.

Ms. Sampson commented that she would be concerned about the scope of work being required of applicants at such an early stage in the project. Mr. Harvey noted that typically the process is loose when it comes to preliminary presentations since the amount of vetting by staff is minimal. He went on to state that once a pre-application has been made and if the proposal has changed or if it has been some time, staff may feel it would be necessary for the Committee to review the application prior to a staff report being presented as a starting point for discussion. Mr. Harvey acknowledged that generally for preliminary presentations to be effective, the Committee needs to have a wholesome understanding of the design in an urban context.

Mr. LeBlanc asked for clarification on when in the process it would be appropriate to ask questions on specific aspects of the design. Mr. Harvey responded that any questions related to areas of the LUB and/or the Design Manual would be appropriate at this stage. He acknowledged that while the presenters may not have answers at this stage, it can still be brought up.

The Chair commented that a workshop to review the LUB and the Design Manual may be useful for the Committee. Other Committee members agreed and staff noted this as something that could be accommodated, possibly at a regular meeting or arranged for a different time.

The Chair thanked staff for their presentation and contributions.

7.2 COMMITTEE MEMBERS

8. ADDED ITEMS – NONE

9. DATE OF NEXT MEETING – September 10, 2015 beginning at 4:00 p.m.

10. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 5:40 p.m.

Cailin MacDonald
Legislative Support