

DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE  
MINUTES

March 10, 2011

- PRESENT: Mr. Alan Parish, Chair  
Mr. Terry Smith-Lamothe, Vice Chair  
Mr. Ramzi Kawar  
Ms. Anne Sinclair  
Mr. Roy McBride  
Ms. Sue Sirrs  
Mr. Cesar Saleh  
Mr. Jeff Pinhey
- REGRETS: Mr. William Hyde  
Mr. Nick Pryce  
Ms. Angela Dean  
Ms. Suzanne Saul
- STAFF: Ms. Kelly Denty, Supervisor, Planning Applications  
Mr. Luc Ouellet, Planner  
Mr. Austin French, Manager, Planning Services  
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/STAFF UPDATES .....	3
5.	CONSIDERATION OF DEFERRED BUSINESS .....	3
6.	DELEGATIONS/PRESENTATIONS .....	3
7.	REPORTS/DISCUSSION .....	3
	7.1 Application Process Review General Discussion – Committee/Staff ...	3
8.	ADDED ITEMS .....	4
9.	NEXT MEETING DATE .....	5
10.	ADJOURNMENT .....	5

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m. in Halifax Hall, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor City Hall.

**2. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**

The Chair requested that the final paragraph of item 7.1 be amended to read “the staff analysis contain reasons both for and against any questionable issues in the approval or variance requested.”

The Chair requested that the tape recording of the February 10, 2011 meeting be checked to verify that the vote on the second motion on item 7.1 did result in a tie.

The Vice-Chair stated that he recalled an additional motion on item 7.1., moved by himself and seconded by Mr. Pinhey, that does not appear in the minutes. The Vice-Chair requested that the tape recording be checked to verify this.

Ms. Sirrs requested that the February 10, 2011 minutes, and future minutes, provide the names of any representatives speaking on behalf of the applicant.

**MOVED by Ms. Sirrs, seconded by Mr. McBride, that the minutes of February 10, 2011, as amended, be approved. MOTION PUT AND PASSED.**

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

**MOVED by Mr. Kawar, seconded by Mr. Smith-Lamothe, that the Order of Business, as presented, be approved. MOTION PUT AND PASSED.**

**(Note: Further into the meeting, Mr. French stated he had an information item for the Committee and requested this matter be added to the agenda. The Committee agreed to hear the item following item 7.1)**

**4. BUSINESS ARISING OUT OF THE MINUTES/STAFF UPDATES - None**

**5. CONSIDERATION OF DEFERRED BUSINESS - None**

**6. DELEGATIONS/PRESENTATIONS – None**

**7. REPORTS/DISCUSSION:**

**7.1 Application Process Review General Discussion – Committee/Staff**

The Chair opened the discussion by thanking Mr. French, Ms. Denty and Mr. Ouellet for attending. Staff then responded to questions, explaining the 60-day time limit for applicants and how this timeline affects the Committee’s process. Staff clarified that the 60-day deadline starts after the public consultation meeting, once staff receive the formal application documents. Staff also confirmed that it is not required that applicants

make a presentation to the Committee but stated that such presentations could be invited and encouraged as standard practice. The Committee agreed that it should be made clear to the applicant that the purpose of the presentation is to demonstrate how the proposal meets the Design Manual guidelines.

The Committee entered into a discussion on the matter and agreed that, depending on the timeline, some applications may require two meetings: the first meeting to receive the presentation and a second meeting to make a decision on the application.

The point was made that members of the public are not allowed to present to the Committee and a concern was raised about the degree of participation in the Committee's meetings by applicants. There was general agreement that the presentations are very helpful to clarify certain issues; however, applicants' comments should be restricted to demonstrating adherence to the guidelines and responding to the Committee's questions. The Committee also agreed that in cases where there is second meeting to decide on the application, the applicant should not be allowed to speak or intervene.

Committee members then discussed the format of the staff reports it receives. There was agreement that it is useful to have the checklist used by staff included in the report and this practice should be kept. The Committee requested that any design issues that staff consider "uncertain" or "contentious" be clearly brought to the Committee's attention.

Committee members were in general agreement that if they received application documents as soon as possible from staff (and before the applicant presented to the Committee) each member could review the application against the requirements of the Design Manual and be better prepared for the applicant's presentation. Members requested that applicant plans, drawings and renderings sent to the Committee not be reduced. Members also requested that any comments received by staff following the public consultation meeting be forwarded to the Committee.

Staff confirmed that there were no new applications pending for the Committee's next regularly scheduled meeting. There was some discussion of the scope of the Committee's role in terms of suggesting design changes to an applicant, what members bring to the process and whether their role is limited to determining adherence to the Design Manual. Committee members agreed that they would use the April meeting time to hold a "workshop" where members would try to come to an agreement on interpretations of the Guidelines, especially for issues that come up repeatedly such as awnings, corner lots and roof landscaping. Members agreed that it would be helpful if Mr. Andy Fillmore could make a presentation at the April meeting. The Chair requested that the Committee be sent a one-page schedule of what the presentation will cover.

## **8. ADDED ITEMS – Information Item (Staff)**

Mr. French informed the Committee that staff is recommending that Regional Council initiate the process to amend the Downtown Plan and By-law. He stated that the Design Review Committee would have an opportunity to comment on any proposed

amendments before Council holds a public hearing on those amendments. He added that there was a long list and a short list of proposed amendments and the short list was expected to be addressed within a few months.

**9. NEXT MEETING DATE**

The next regularly scheduled meeting is April 14, 2011.

**10. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 7:35 p.m.