



**DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES
January 14, 2016**

PRESENT: Kourosh Rad, Chair
Steve Murphy, Vice Chair
Rick Buhr
Rob LeBlanc
Malcolm Pinto
Anna Sampson
Noel Fowler

REGRETS: Catherine Courtney
Jared Dalziel
Kevin Conley

STAFF: Richard Harvey, Major Projects Planner
Roxanne MacLaurin, 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/160114drc-agenda.php>

The meeting was called to order at 4:05 p.m., convened to an in camera session at 4:10, reconvened to public session at 4:35 p.m. and adjourned at 7:32 p.m.

1. CALL TO ORDER

The Chair called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – December 10, 2015

Mr. Buhr noted the spelling correction of Mr. Conley's name to the December 10, 2015 minutes.

MOVED by Mr. Murphy, seconded by Mr. Buhr

THAT the minutes of December 10, 2015 be approved as amended. MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

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

The Chair proposed holding the In Camera session immediately following item 6.3.

MOVED by Mr. Buhr, seconded by Ms. Sampson

THAT the Committee move item 8.1.1 up in the agenda to immediately follow item 6.3. MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

The agenda was accepted by the Committee as amended.

4. BUSINESS ARISING OUT OF THE MINUTES – NONE

5. CONSIDERATION OF DEFERRED BUSINESS – NONE

6. CORRESPONDENCE, PETITIONS & DELEGATIONS

6.1 Correspondence

6.1.1 Various Correspondence re:

Emails from Emma Fitzgerald, Katherine Kitching, Debra Ross, Ben Sichel, Mary Evans MacLachlan, Deborah Toogood, Peggy Cameron, Elizabeth Pacey, Beverly W. Miller, Beth Abbott, Harold Le Blanc, Kate Dunlay, James and Heather O'Brien, Iain Taylor, Joan Hicks and Lawrence Gordon, regarding the redevelopment of the block bounded by Spring Garden Road, Doyle, Brunswick and Queen Streets, Case 20126 Breton Place, and the proposed South Park Loft, were distributed to the Committee.

The Chair asked whether the committee had questions or comments.

The correspondence was noted as being received by the Committee.

6.2 Petitions - None

6.3 Presentation - None

MOVED by Mr. Leblanc, seconded by Mr. Murphy

THAT the Design Review Committee convene In Camera. MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

The Design Review Committee convened to In Camera session.

8. IN CAMERA

8.1 Legal Matter

8.1.1 Presentation at the Design Review Committee – Information Report

This matter was dealt with In Camera and the following motion was ratified in public session:

MOVED by Mr. Buhr, seconded by Mr. Fowler

THAT when a staff report is being received, the Committee allow the applicant to present after the staff presentation for a maximum of 15 minutes, should they choose to, not including questions and requests for clarification the Committee may have for the application. MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

7. REPORTS

7.1 STAFF

7.1.1 Case 20275: Substantive Site Plan Approval, 1565, 1599, and 1601 South Park Street and 5600 Sackville Street, Halifax

The following was before the Committee:

- A staff recommendation report dated January 4, 2016.

Mr. Leblanc declared a conflict of interest and took a seat in the gallery.

The Chair invited Mr. Richard Harvey, Major Projects Planner, to present Case 20227: Substantive Site Plan Approval, 1565, 1599, and 1601 South Park Street and 5600 Sackville Street, Halifax.

Mr. Harvey shared that he would be providing an overview of the location, elements of the proposal, planning context, review of the site against the Design Manual, wind conditions as well as the findings of the staff report and staff recommendation for the Committee.

Mr. Harvey stated that the site is comprised of two properties located on the south side of Sackville Street, between South Park and Brier Lane/Annadale Street. He continued that the site is surrounded by Citadel Hill to the north; the Halifax Regional Municipality Greenhouses and Public Gardens Cottage, diagonally across Sackville Street to the west; the Public Gardens, immediately across from South Park Street; the Paramount, a multi-unit building with ground floor commercial uses, immediately south; Park Lane and the Martello to the east, a mixed-use residential-commercial building with a parking garage on the south side of Annadale; as well as an office building located at 5566 Sackville Street, across from Brier Lane.

Mr. Harvey commented that the project consists of the demolition of the CBC Building and the development of two separate buildings, one being referred to as the 'Pavilion' building, at the corner of Sackville and South Park Street, and the other being referred to as the 'Rental' building by the applicant. He continued stating that the proposed project is a mixed-use development which will be comprised of a new recreation facility, retail, dwelling units as well as underground parking.

Mr. Harvey provided the Committee with an overview of the planning context. He shared that Regional Council amended the Regional Municipal Planning Strategy, the Downtown Halifax Secondary Municipal Planning Strategy, and the Downtown Halifax Land Use By-law (LUB) to increase the maximum height allowances and reduce a setback requirement from South Park Street for the subject site. He continued by sharing that these changes were the result of an application by the YMCA which was seeking to obtain additional development rights for the replacement of its recreational facility. He further noted that the alternative height and setback requirements were approved through an appendix in the Downtown Halifax LUB and that the appendix may be used on the condition that a recreation facility is included as part of a development proposal.

Mr. Harvey noted that recreational facilities are unique because they have required utilitarian features and the Design Manual should be applied in a balanced manner to accommodate these features. He noted that the Design Manual does not differentiate between streets, and that staff has taken a practical approach when reviewing Brier Lane in the context of this project and has identified this area as appropriate to house various utilities.

Mr. Harvey shared that overall the proposal generally meets the Design Manual guidelines particularly given its complexities as a recreational facility. He continued by briefly describing the discussion items as identified by staff including *Awnings and Canopies*, *Future conversion to retail or commercial uses*, *Quality and Character of the Streetwall*, *Flat Roof Landscaping*, *Corner Sites* and *Lighting*.

Mr. Harvey went on to outline the wind report and shared that a full wind study has been submitted. He stated that while the report identifies some minor opportunities to improve conditions, no significant adverse wind impacts are expected upon or around the site.

Mr. Harvey commented that over 14 variances are being sought to the quantitative requirements of the Downtown Halifax LUB for the project and that these variances have been reviewed against specific conditions found in the Design Manual. He noted that the applicant has also outlined each of the variance requests through diagrams and provided a rationale for them pursuant to the criteria that are found in the Design Manual.

Mr. Harvey commented that the variance conditions have been identified for each building and that the Committee has been provided this graphically to outline further context. He continued by reviewing the graphics with the Committee and gave high-level examples of how to interpret the variance documents provided.

Mr. Harvey shared that a sketch-up model, provided by the applicant, has been inserted into a city model to help give the Committee greater context of the site and its surroundings. He continued by noting that staff aimed to look at streetwall height within the context of the complete streetscape, the separation distances, Brier Lane, the tower width as well as the interior separation of the property line.

Mr. Harvey indicated that the Committee is being asked to review this proposal against specific criteria in the Design Manual and he highlighted areas of concern including: the setback requirement variances being sought with the portion of the building that is abutting the Paramount property, concerns with Brier Lane as well as with the flat roof landscaping. He also noted that the findings of the wind study are acceptable.

Mr. Harvey concluded that adjustments to the proposed design to respect appropriate setbacks and other related requirements would be required by the applicant to comply. Therefore, he continued that it is recommended that the Design Review Committee refuse the substantive site plan approval application.

A copy of the presentation is on file.

The Chair thanked Mr. Harvey for his presentation and opened the floor to questions and comments from the Committee.

Mr. Buhr asked for clarification around the number of variances being sought by the applicant and how a project of this significance made it this far in the design process with such a high number of variances. Mr. Harvey responded that the number of variances is determined in order to enable the project as envisioned by the applicant and commented that he was unable to speak to the process from the applicants' perspective.

Mr. Pinto inquired whether there were any windows planned for the Rental building on the side located across from the Paramount and asked whether this was given consideration by staff. Mr. Harvey responded that the windows were considered, however, the main concerns relate to the setback requirements outlined in the Design Manual which allow for spacing at the mid- and high-rise levels.

Mr. Pinto asked for clarification on the wind study report. Mr. Harvey clarified that a full wind study was submitted by the applicant. Mr. Pinto further asked whether a sun study was part of the application requirements. Mr. Harvey responded that a sun study is not a requirement for applicants.

Mr. Pinto asked for clarification regarding the flat roof landscaping requirements. Mr. Harvey explained that there are amenity requirements at grade and for rooftop areas pursuant to the number of dwelling units. He went to note that there is an additional requirement within the LUB as well as the Design Manual indicating that all flat roofs have a landscaping component included and that this level of detail has not been provided by the applicant to date.

Mr. Buhr inquired whether the wall facing the Paramount building has habitable windows. Mr. Harvey confirmed that there are residential unit windows on that wall. Mr. Buhr asked whether the design of the Paramount building meets today's current requirements. Mr. Harvey responded that the Paramount building was built under a land use by-law that predates the downtown plan.

Ms. Sampson asked what level of detail is expected to be included in applications for flat roof landscaping. Mr. Harvey responded that staff looks for a conceptual basis that would typically have a moderate level of detail.

Mr. Murphy asked for further information regarding the development of Appendix C. Mr. Harvey responded that one of the height requirements in the downtown protects heights around Citadel Hill and noted that YMCA sought to increase the maximum height allowance and proposed an alternative which included a new series of setback requirements be applied to sites. He also noted that the LUB specifies that for multi-district recreation facility development, the appendix becomes the new built form requirements for the site.

fffMr. Murphy asked for further clarification around the landmark element variance. Mr. Harvey responded that the Design Manual allows for a landmark element variance for places to add additional height to make something special or to accentuate a particular feature and noted that there are unique parameters for sites of a significant visual terminus and in this instance the site is located at the entrance to the downtown.

Mr. Fowler asked about the development's plans for lighting, noting that it is a significant issue. Mr. Harvey noted that while lighting is outlined in the Design Manual, the staff report includes little discussion. He commented that staff recognizes, from a practical perspective, that these details will come at a later time.

The Chair noted the three main concerns of staff as outlined on page 8 of the staff report, and asked for further explanation on these areas as related to the variances and the staff recommendation. Mr. Harvey responded by providing further context, noting that staff concern is not related to the overall building volumes rather, volumes being sought in particular areas where variances are being sought. He continued by sharing that staff reviewed the requested variances against the LUB and Design Manual and commented that on this assessment their findings indicate that the requested variances go beyond the scope of the LUB as well as what can be sought through variances.

Ms. Sampson noted that in an effort to create an interesting roofline, as per the Design Manual, the applicant exceeded the height requirements. She asked whether staff felt this was a contradiction. Mr. Harvey acknowledged that while the roofline is attractive, it does not meet the height requirements outlined by planning documents and he explained that it is a question of whether the roofline can be lowered and not necessarily a question of making it flat.

The Chair inquired whether the Committee has the authority to approve all of the variances being requested by the applicant. Mr. Harvey responded that this would be within the Committee's mandate.

Mr. Fowler commented that for staff the amount of variances is less concerning and rather the significance of the variances being sought. Mr. Harvey agreed with Mr. Fowler's statement and commented that the Committee's role is to consider the requested variances against the conditions outlined in the Design Manual.

Mr. Buhr asked for further context and clarification regarding Brier Lane and why some requested variances are recommended and why some are not. Mr. Harvey responded that given the narrow width of Brier Lane, the lack of streetwall and upper storey streetwall setbacks, results in a situation where the building is too close to the street providing for little relief and that the variance conditions are not being met. As well, Mr. Harvey further clarified differences related to the areas of Brier Lane which have been acquired by the YMCA.

Ms. Sampson noted that in some cases Brier Lane is referred to as a service lane and in other cases it is being referred to as a street. Mr. Harvey responded that there is no distinction when it comes to streets in the Downtown and commented that generally staff looks for animated streets, sharing that sections of the Design Manual outline requirements for utilitarian features, parking garage doors and similar matters from a practical perspective. Mr. Harvey noted that the LUB built form features do not allow for that same relief.

Mr. Pinto asked whether or not the Committee would be setting precedence by allowing a particular setback for this project. Mr. Harvey responded that allowances would not become LUB requirements.

Mr. Fowler inquired about the varying streetwall heights. Mr. Harvey explained that the Design Manual allows for varying streetwall heights based on different categories of streets and noted that it was a 1:1 relationship against the width of the street.

Mr. Harvey referred the committee to table on page 8 of the staff recommendation report to review the requested variances and staff recommendations.

The Chair asked whether there were any further questions, and hearing none, he thanked Mr. Harvey for his presentation. The Chair then clarified the new process and invited the applicant to make a 15 minute presentation followed by a question and clarification period.

Mr. Jim Spatz, Chairman and CEO of Southwest Properties, thanked the Committee for the opportunity to speak, briefly introduced the project to the Committee and provided a high-level overview the priorities of the project. He then invited Mr. Brian Posavad, CEO of the YMCA Greater Halifax/Dartmouth, to say a few words. Mr. Posavad briefly shared his perspective on the project and his desire for the Committee to approve their application as he feels that the new facility will be in the best interest of the city.

Mr. Eric Burchill, VP Planning and Development of Southwest Properties, introduced Mr. Mansoor Kazerouni of IBI Architects to present.

Mr. Kazerouni commented that significant considerations of the project were the terminus character as well as the architectural character of the building and its nod to the former CBC building, and he shared that these informed the sculpting of the corner as well as of the north face of the Pavilion building that faces directly across from Citadel Hill to create a greater architectural presence.

Mr. Kazerouni then commented on the previous design of the development in comparison to the development that is currently being presented and outlined some of these differences for the Committee.

Mr. Kazerouni shared that the design takes the views of Citadel Hill into consideration. He went on to show the large volume spaces of the interior YMCA which include a swimming pool, gymnasium and exercise facilities.

Mr. Kazerouni reviewed their process with the Committee, describing that Schedule C and the Design Manual were overlaid and showed an illustration. He commented that the proposed design creates a fourth front for the site which establishes an animated 'muse' or a community space between the two sites to improve the architectural expression.

Mr. Kazerouni showed the Committee the elements of the design which could have been built out further and shared that their rationale for not doing this was to maintain the integrity of the built form. He indicated that the site is built to 85 per cent of the volume allowed for.

The Chair thanked Mr. Kazerouni for his presentation and opened the floor to questions and comments from the Committee.

Mr. Murphy complimented Mr. Kazerouni on the building's design and noted the importance of this project to the downtown. He then asked Mr. Kazerouni to further clarify the rationale provided for variances 5 and 10. Mr. Kazerouni explained that, variance 10, relates to the streetwall on the south building opposite of the façade of the Paramount. He commented that their design mimics the design of the Paramount and that it was felt that this approach created a better urban condition in relation to the neighbouring building. He continued by sharing that the design team concluded that this design feature would not negatively impact the public realm. Mr. Kazerouni noted that an area of concern identified was the shadow impact on the Public Gardens and that it was determined after completing an incremental shadow study the results illustrate minimal impact.

The Chair asked for further identification of the property line between the two buildings. In reference to a diagram, Mr. Kazerouni explained where the balconies end in relation to the Paramount. He also shared that screens will be incorporated so that visual privacy is assured and commented that the owners of the Paramount support the design. The Committee continued to discuss the details related to variance 10 with the applicant.

In reference to variance 5, Mr. Burchill explained that it was determined that adding height would have no interference on the presence of the street, the sky view or shading. The Committee continued to discuss with the applicant the implications of variance 5.

Ms. Sampson referenced the priorities that were discussed at the outset of the applicant's presentation. She continued by asking what architectural, structural and functional compromises would be made to accommodate the variances related to Brier Lane, the Paramount and the maximum tower width. Mr. Kazerouni responded that there would be structural and functional compromises and complexities as a result of stepping back.

Mr. Kazerouni further commented on Brier Lane and noted that at 7.5 meters wide its primary function is servicing the surrounding sites and shared that the design concentrated on the urban condition of the site and therefore prioritized Sackville and South Park Streets as well as the 'muse' area in between the two buildings. The Chair inquired whether there have been discussions around lighting in or other ways to improve Brier Lane. Mr. Burchill responded that lighting would be improved and that they are planning to upgrade septic. He also noted that they would be looking at resurfacing the street and other ways to improve the aesthetics of the alley.

Ms. Sampson inquired whether a storey would be lost or it would be a flat roof if the building did not have the additional height. Mr. Kazerouni responded that the building would have a flat roof. Ms. Sampson asked for further understanding on LEED and the environmental commitments, and its impacts on the

variances presented. Mr. Kazerouni noted that there is always a commitment to sustainability and that LEED is a factor in all of the design choices. Mr. Burchill clarified that sustainability has a larger impact on the envelope of the design, mechanical footprint and the materials used rather than the variances at hand.

Mr. Fowler noted that the building is targeted for LEED gold and asked whether that was for both buildings. Mr. Burchill responded that there is a commitment to try and achieve a gold LEED standard for both although it has not been determined where the YMCA would fall into this.

Mr. Fowler inquired about the light plans for the site. Mr. Burchill responded that there would be a significant amount of up-lighting to highlight various architectural distinctions.

Mr. Buhr inquired how much of the winged rooftop element would be lost if the building were to be stepped back. Mr. Kazerouni outlined that a significant portion would be lost.

Mr. Fowler asked about the view from Citadel Hill. Mr. Burchill described the view, sighting the activity that will be able to be viewed from the YMCA and noted the energy that it will lend to the streetscape.

Mr. Buhr inquired about the mechanical systems. Mr. Burchill responded that mechanical systems have been internalized on the backside of the penthouse and that it was intentional not to have any mechanical exposed. Mr. Pinto inquired about the mechanical systems located at grade. Mr. Kazerouni noted that an air intake unit is located at grade on the southwest corner and he commented that it would be architecturally treated with louvres to minimize its impact.

The Chair asked Mr. Kazerouni to walk the Committee through the pedestrian experience at street level. Mr. Kazerouni responded by describing the significant elements at grade including the retail spaces, the 'muse' area as well as landscaping plans and features.

Mr. Buhr inquired about the acquisition of Brier Lane. Mr. Burchill explained the history of this proposal from the city and shared that the YMCA was not in position to purchase Brier Lane at that time. Mr. Buhr also inquired about the pavers on the internalized street. Mr. Burchill confirmed that it would be a high quality paver and that they would work with the municipality to make it consistent along Brier Lane.

The Chair asked whether there had been consideration of incorporating glazing along the pool façade. Mr. Burchill responded that the decision of the material will be made by the YMCA but that it is recognized that it should be balanced and that the material may be softened with the use of frit. Mr. Kazerouni clarified the size of the floorplate for the Committee and noted that the variance requested relates to the functional use of the building.

Mr. Fowler asked about the materiality of the coloured panels. Mr. Kazerouni noted that a final material had not yet been determined but that they are looking at different possibilities including glass, ceramic and frit.

The Chair asked whether the Committee had any further questions and hearing none, he thanked the Mr. Kazerouni and Mr. Burchill for their presentation.

The Chair declared a 10 minute recess.

The Chair asked whether the Committee had any further questions for staff and hearing none, he opened the floor to debate.

MOVED by Mr. Murphy, seconded by Ms. Sampson

THAT the Design Review Committee Refuse the substantive site plan approval application for the mixed-use development consisting of two buildings at 1565, 1599, and 1601 South Park Street and 5600 Sackville Street, Halifax as shown on Attachment A;

The Chair invited the Committee to share their comments on the proposed staff recommendation.

Mr. Buhr commented that this application is complicated and noted his concerns with the tower's south face. He further commented on the impact of paring back to the project's massing, scale, proportion, roofscape and believed that the proposed design seems to have relatively limited impact on the Paramount.

Mr. Pinto commented on the findings of the wind study as well as the limited impact of shadowing. He also remarked that his initial concerns with regards to the Paramount had been addressed during the applicant's presentation and commented on the impact of the requested variances on Brier Lane. Mr. Pinto further shared that he was in favour of the development moving forward.

Mr. Fowler commented on the volume-related variances, stating that based on the applicant's presentation, the proposed variances were not introduced in an attempt to increase the building volume. Mr. Harvey responded that staff's concerns relate within the context of the Design Manual and LUB and noted that the overall volume was not relevant.

Ms. Sampson acknowledged the series of priorities and compromises made in an effort to achieve the priorities set forth for the benefit of the public realm and commented that the requested variances seem to have minimal impact on the public realm. She also shared her struggle with how introducing stepbacks would impact the overall design.

Mr. Murphy shared that he appreciated the overall architectural design and interest, and commented that he initially had concerns around variances 5 and 10. In reference to variance 10, he remarked that the rationale presented by the applicant seemed justified. Mr. Murphy further commented that initially he had concerns that the applicant was seeking greater volume and noted that the applicant's presentation identified that only 85 per cent of the allowable built form was being developed. He shared that he would be voting against the staff recommendation.

The Chair echoed many of the Committee members' comments and shared that he understood staff's perspective. He commented that he appreciated having an informed discussion with the applicant to understand the rationale behind the decisions made by the applicant. He continued by acknowledging that while the LUB provides an excellent framework, for unique projects allowances should be considered. He further commented on the significant value that this project will add to the city.

The Chair called for a vote for the Motion on the floor.

MOTION PUT AND DEFEATED.

The Chair invited the Committee to share their comments on any conditions or recommendations that the Committee would like to put forth related to the application.

Mr. Murphy commented that he would like to see more detail provided relating to the rooftop landscaping as well as exterior lighting. Mr. Harvey shared that this detail would come as part of a later stage in the application process. He noted that the Committee is welcome to identify specific conditions for the applicant or can identify general observations and recommendations which would not be binding as conditions.

The Chair shared that he is interested in knowing the landscaping plans for the parts of the roof visible from Citadel Hill. Ms. Sampson noted that within the application she recalled that the applicant was looking at pavers rather than a green roof likely because of its high reflectivity. Ms. Sampson also noted that based on attaining LEED certification the rooftop would most likely be made of a highly reflective material or a vegetative landscape. Mr. Harvey commented that the Committee may wish to encourage a vegetative rooftop landscape. The Chair remarked that the Committee is encouraging that a vegetative rooftop be considered. Mr. Buhr also commented there seemed to be limited detail provided regarding the

landscaping at grade and noted that landscape articulation and features for this area should be encouraged.

Mr. Buhr shared a general comment that future applicants should be required to provide 3D scans and/or other ways of illustrating developments in the context of the city, commenting that this application did not provide this additional context and noted that it should be a standard of acceptance. The Chair agreed, and asked staff to include this topic as a discussion item for the next meeting.

Ms. Sampson noted that the variances were not provided to the Committee during the preliminary presentation and she commented that much of this discussion and concerns could likely have been addressed at that time or in preparation for this meeting.

The Chair asked about including a condition to add additional lighting along Brier Lane, considering the requested variance. The Committee continued to discuss the implications of lighting as related to Brier Lane. The Committee strongly encourage that Brier Lane and the muse area be well lit to enable safe pedestrian access from all vantages.

Ms. Sampson shared her concerns with the blank wall facing the Paramount. The Committee agreed that a condition be included to address the applicant's use of privacy screens on the balconies as well as adding enhanced architectural detailing that is consistent with the nature of the architecture of the building on the wall facing the Paramount.

The Committee individually reviewed and discussed each variance, not being recommended by staff, against the Design Manual Checklist as outlined in Attachment F.

The Chair led the Committee in a review of the Design Manual Checklist. The Chair read aloud the following guidelines and invited the Committee to share additional comments: 2.3c, 3.2.1a, 3.2.1c, 3.2.1e, 3.2.1f, 3.2.1g.

In reference to 3.2.1g Mr. Murphy recalled that the applicant proposed an architectural treatment of the vent on South Park Street and suggested that the Committee adopt this as a condition. The Committee agreed with Mr. Murphy's remarks.

In reference to 3.2.1e, 3.2.1f, 3.2.1g, Ms. Sampson inquired about the partial compliance as it relates to the materiality of Brier Lane at the ground floor. Mr. Harvey responded that it should be treated with some practicality and that the checklist highlights the inconsistencies. Mr. Buhr remarked that the finishes indicated on the base of the Rental building are ceramic and metal and that presumably this will continue on to Brier Lane. Mr. Buhr and Ms. Sampson commented that the Committee should consider recommending that the ground floor of the Pavilion building on Brier Lane use the same finishes as those used on the Rental building. The Committee continued to discuss the Brier Lane elevation as a proposed condition.

The Chair continued reading aloud the following guidelines: 3.2.3b, 3.2.3 c, 3.2.5c, 3.2.5d, 3.2.7a, 3.3.4c, 3.4.2c, 3.5.1f, 3.5.4a, 3.5.4b and 3.5.4c.

In reference to Attachment H, the Chair commented that the Committee's decision is based on the review of the Design Manual requirements for variances and that the Committee is satisfied with the discussion and information provided related to the variances.

The Chair thanked the applicant and staff for their contributions.

MOVED by Mr. Murphy, seconded by Mr. Fowler

THAT the Design Review Committee approve the substantive site plan approval application for a mixed-use development consisting of two buildings at 1565, 1599, and 1601 South Park Street and 5600 Sackville Street, Halifax as shown on Attachment A; with the following conditions:

- That the applicant include privacy screens on the balconies facing the Paramount as well as enhanced architectural detailing consistent with the buildings' existing design on the blank wall opposite the Paramount;
- That the applicant include an architectural louvre on the corner of South Park Street; and
- That the finishes on Brier Lane be consistent with the metal and ceramic finishes on the Rental building.

MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

MOVED by Mr. Buhr, seconded by Mr. Pinto

THAT the Design Review Committee accept the findings of the Qualitative Wind Impact Assessment as contained in Attachment E.

MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

8.1.2 Discussion Regarding the Inclusion of Applicants at the Approval stage.

Mr. LeBlanc returned to the table. Ms. Sampson commented that the in this instance the applicant elaborated on their presentation during the question and answer period which was improper procedure. Mr. Murphy suggested that if applicants stray from providing a direct response to a Committee member's question, the Chair may interrupt the applicant to regain control the conversation.

The Chair reiterated that the process for applicants will include a maximum 15 minute presentation and an unlimited question and clarification period. The Committee agreed that 15 minutes was a sufficient amount of time.

9. DATE OF NEXT MEETING – February 11, 2016 beginning at 4:00 p.m.

10. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 7:32 p.m.

Cailin MacDonald
Legislative Support