

DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE
MINUTES

April 8, 2010

PRESENT: Mr. Alan Parish, Chair
Mr. William Hyde, Vice Chair
Mr. Ramzi Kawar
Mr. Terry Smith-Lamothe
Ms. Anne Sinclair
Mr. Nick Pryce
Mr. Roy McBride
Ms. Sue Sirrs
Ms. Angela Dean
Ms. Suzanne Saul
Mr. Cesar Saleh
Mr. Jeff Pinhey

STAFF: Ms. Kelly Denty, Supervisor, Planning Applications
Mr. Luc Ouellet, Planner I, Western Division
Ms. Melody Campbell, Legislative Assistant
Ms. Julie Vandervoort, Legislative Support

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	CALL TO ORDER.	3
2.	APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES.	3
3.	APPROVAL OF THE ORDER OF BUSINESS AND APPROVAL OF ADDITIONS AND DELETIONS.	3
4.	BUSINESS ARISING OUT OF THE MINUTES	3
5.	CONSIDERATION OF DEFERRED BUSINESS	3
6.	REPORTS/DISCUSSION	
	6.1 Committee Procedures.	3
	6.2 Presentation Procedures.	4
	6.3 Staff Reports - Formatting.	5
	6.4 Report Timelines (decisions by Design Review Committee).	5
	6.5 Update on Recommendations from Design Review Committee regarding Starfish Properties.	5
7.	ADDED ITEMS	6
8.	NEXT MEETING DATE.	6
9.	ADJOURNMENT.	6

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 6:05 p.m.

2. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Mr. Smith-Lamothe referred the Committee to the top of page 5 of the minutes for the March 4, 2010 meeting and noted that the wording of the first point was incorrect. He stated that the Committee had recommended that the mechanical penthouse *not* be retained. The minutes for the February 11, 2010 meeting were accepted.

MOVED by Mr. Smith-Lamothe, seconded by Mr. Pryce, that the minutes of February 11, 2010 be approved and the minutes of March 4, 2010, as amended, be approved. MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

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

7.1 Mr. Pryce circulated historic photographs of Barrington Street.

MOVED by Ms. Sirrs, seconded by Mr. Hyde, that the order of business, as amended, be approved. MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

4. BUSINESS ARISING OUT OF THE MINUTES - None

5. CONSIDERATION OF DEFERRED BUSINESS - None

6. REPORTS

6.1 Committee Procedures

In response to questions from Committee members, Ms. Kelly Denty, Supervisor, Planning Applications and Mr. Luc Ouellet, Planner, explained that staff are now asking for a greater level of detail from applicants before the application reaches the Committee. Mr. Ouellet provided the example of asking about the colour and material of awnings not just their position on the building. Ms. Denty indicated that if the Committee is still uncomfortable with the information, it can approve an application with conditions but the conditions must be specific.

Staff provided an update on the Starfish Properties, Case 15842, application previously before this Committee stating that the applicant was willing to consider traditional Barrington Street awnings but did not want awnings that covered the entire storefront;

that a green roof would also be considered; that the plans would not change from aluminum window frames to wood.

The Committee concluded that supporting a proposal with recommendations did not appear to be a satisfactory compromise vehicle and in the future the Committee would have to work within the three options in the legislation.

The Committee discussed the implications of approving with conditions or adjourning until additional information was received given the 60-day timeline and the Committee's meeting dates. Ms. Denty explained that staff does not know when an application will arrive but they will do everything they can to work with the dates and timelines. Several members of the Committee made the point that what can be accomplished during a meeting depends on the level of detail provided in the application, that better information is needed and that the Design Manual sets out what an application requires.

The Committee discussed the role of the Heritage Advisory Committee and the Chair stated that the Design Review Committee makes its own decisions. Ms. Sinclair noted that if the Heritage Advisory Committee had highlighted the issue of conserving the existing sills in the Starfish application, the Design Review Committee could have followed up on it.

6.2 Presentation Procedures

The Committee discussed whether, prior to the Staff Report or after the Staff Report but prior to the Committee Decision, applicants should be invited to answer questions or offered the opportunity of a brief presentation. Some concern was expressed that the plans alone may not be enough for complex proposals while other members indicated if the details provided were complete, that should be sufficient. Several members raised the issue of whether such a presentation procedure would require additional meetings, especially in view of the 60-day timelines and more meetings may not be feasible or reasonable for the applicants or the volunteer Committee members.

**MOVED by Ms. Sirrs, seconded by Mr. Kavar, that the Design Review Committee may invite the applicant to present the proposal at a meeting following the submission of the completed site plan application and that such a presentation may be waived by the Committee where the project scope is minor in nature.
MOTION PUT AND PASSED.**

MOVED by Ms. Saul, seconded by Mr. McBride, that following the staff presentation, the Design Review Committee may ask staff questions of clarification only and the applicant or designate will then be offered ten minutes

to present the proposal after which s/he will respond to questions of clarification from members of the Committee. MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

The Committee also discussed whether to receive oral or written third-party presentations on applications. There was general agreement among the members that this Committee was not the venue for such presentations nor was it the Committee's mandate.

MOVED by Mr. Hyde, Vice-Chair, seconded by Mr. Smith-Lamothe, that the Design Review Committee receive written presentations from third parties. MOTION DEFEATED.

It was noted the Mr. Parish, Mr. Smith-Lamothe, Mr. Hyde, and Mr. Pinhey supported the motion on the floor.

MOVED by Mr. Pryce, seconded by Mr. Saleh, that the Design Review Committee not receive oral presentations from third parties. MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

It was noted the Mr. Smith-Lamothe did not support the motion on the floor.

Mr. Pryce offered to draft a response to those third parties who have requested an opportunity to present; he stated he would forward this response to the Chair.

6.3 Staff Reports - Formatting

Ms. Denty asked the Committee for feedback on the previous staff report. Mr. Pryce complimented staff on the report and Ms. Sinclair said she found the comments helpful. Mr. Smith-Lamothe suggested that staff prioritize and present the items in order of importance. The Chair mentioned that he liked the checklist, however the use of the word "discretionary" in the chart of compliant and non-compliant items was confusing. He proposed using the term "uncertain".

6.4 Report Timelines (decisions by Design Review Committee)

The Committee agreed that this item had been dealt with under 6.1.

6.5 Update on Recommendations from Design Review Committee regarding Starfish Properties

The Committee agreed that this item had been dealt with under 6.1.

7. ADDED ITEMS

7.1 Historic Pictures - Barrington Street

Mr. Pryce circulated historic photographs of Barrington Street.

8. NEXT MEETING DATE

The next regularly scheduled meeting is Thursday, May 13, 2010.

9. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 7:52 p.m.

Julie Vandervoort
Legislative Support
&
Melody Campbell
Legislative Assistant