

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE STRATA COUNCIL, STRATA PLAN LMS 2833,
TRINITY PLACE, HELD ON THURSDAY, AUGUST 30, 2011 AT 6:00 PM IN SUITE 307, 2490
WEST 2ND AVENUE, VANCOUVER, BC.**

Council in attendance: Kim Sheldon
Barbara Olsen
David Hovan
Elisabeth Wallis
Renee Hefti-Graham
Ryan Libech

Dino Chies,
Exp.

John Williamson
John Williamson Inc.

CALL TO ORDER:

The meeting was called to order by Ms. Kim Sheldon (President-in-standing) at 6:08 pm.

AGENDA:

Having no pre-set agenda the order of business was adopted as follows:

Dino Chies (exp. Senior Engineer)

Present an overview of the building envelope remedial work, design options and drawings - followed by council questions.

John Williamson (Project Manager)

Discuss balcony dividers, tender bids, building overhangs. Review the next steps in the remedial work.

A. BUILDING REMEDIAL WORK

Mr Chies addressed the concerns expressed by council that the exp. design for remedial work differed in some aspects to the RDH proposal. Several items were discussed and addressed: the type of balcony membranes and balcony modifications to be made, the repairs to the entire east wall vs. only partial repairs to the south east (SE) wall (including “wrapping” the repairs around the south wall to finish under the balconies), exposed swing exterior swing doors and the options of door overhangs (in the tender package and design).

Some council members queried Mr Chies as to when the design drawings had been presented to Strataco, why owners had not received copies and why the date of issue on the drawing package was June 23, 2011. Mr Chies stated that the issue date was not necessarily the date the drawings would have been sent out. One council member asked how long Strataco had had the drawings. The Chair interjected that the intent and line of questioning as out of order with the meeting agenda (suggesting this matter be tabled for internal council discussion), and the following items were addressed:

- i. **EAST WALL:** Council queried the rain screen of the SE walls in the building design drawings. Mr Chies explained that the east wall repairs needed to come around the hard edge of

the SE side of the building and tie in under the southern balconies to an inside joint. The windows on the south side would need to be removed and replaced (with either new or existing windows). One council member queried the option of the NE elevation in the tender and design drawing. Council reviewed the design drawings and the two prices for (1) the partial repair of the east wall (southern aspect and SE corner) only and (2) the separate price (\$35,500) for the rain screen on the north aspect of the east wall. Council discussed the pros and cons of a full repair of the east wall. Original and long-term owners on the Council gave input regarding the history of the north east wall repairs. Mr Chies stated a partial repair may be made since no issues were found with the NE side; however, council expressed their concern that the NE wall had had previous repair issues. Given the reasonable price the included the NE wall within the building repairs council informed Mr Chies to include a separate item price for the NE wall into the proposed budget for repairs. Mr Chies made a note to include the NE wall in the tender bids for councils approval prior to the SGM.

- ii. **TENDER BIDS:** Some council members raised the issue that the itemized column with price breakdowns for each tender did not seem to add up to their final quote stated on their cover letters. Mr Chies agreed each company had their own way of itemizing the quotes, and the grand total price for each tender was used to compare all bids.
- iii. **BALCONY MEMBRANES:** Council then reviewed the balcony membrane of suite 307 (an exposed balcony of the SE side). The owner of the unit stated they were not pleased with the past repairs to the membrane and that they were concerned about the type of product used. Mr Chies inspected the work and stated the urethane membrane was a very good product; however, poor application method general result in issues for any product. Mr Chies showed council how the balcony drainage had been modified to remove the gutter, which contributed to pooling and organic matters build up on the membrane. The sloped trough design of exp. would allow water to drain more effectively, and Mr Chies stated he used a “quarter” test - if the water did not cover the quarter the deck was well drained. Council stated they were satisfied with the urethane decks on the balconies if that was the best recommendation and that matter was of special concern given past issues to the balcony membranes.
- iv. **BALCONY RAILINGS:** The design details of the balcony railings were discussed. Mr Chies stated the railing were very similar in appearance to the railing been replaced. The mounting was slightly different and an improvement over the previous rail mounts and the top capping of the rail was slightly more rounded. Council agreed that replacement of a similar railing would not change the outward appearance of the building and should be agreeable to owners.
- v. **AWNINGS AND EXPOSED EXTERIOR DOORS:** Mr Chies clarified why options for canopies were in the design package. Options were provided given that RDH had proposed either higher performing exterior doors for the exposed aspects OR an over-hang for protection in the form of canopies or cornices to protect exterior doors. These protective options were discussed at length.
 - a. Mr Chies showed samples of a high performance door brand (Centra.com) which he recommended over the doors RDH had proposed. The vinyl swing doors were better priced for a better quality.
 - b. At this time he also clarified that a post-tender addendum to the bidder (New City) could be made for the over-hang options and an immediate decision was not necessary at this point.
 - c. Council discussed the door options and asked questions about that specification, information on the manufacturer and Mr Chies professional advice.

- a. The issue that the blinds attached to the current doors would need to be changed was also raised. Mr Chies confirmed that blinds would need to be re-moved and re-fitted, but the dimensions for the replacement doors were the same.
- b. Several council members expressed discomfort at deciding on the door type without the Ownership input as a whole.
- c. Mr Chies demonstrated how the proposed doors would differ little in appearance from the older wooden doors. Mr Chies re-iterated that the high performance doors would withstand the exposure and that the options of over-hangs were not needed in addition.
- d. Council then discussed the warranty issues of not attaching canopies to the exterior walls (given that the recommendation had been made in the RDH proposal), Mr Chies stated that no other engineering company would recommend awnings or canopies as a necessary aspect for the building warranty since they would not offer 100% protection of the doors, and that the doors would be of a high quality and were designed for exposed aspects. Council thanked Mr Chies for his advice.
- e. Council deliberated that the Ownership had not asked for alterations (such as canopies) to the building appearance and that in order to make alterations they would need to go to the Ownership. Mr Williamson confirmed that an alteration or re-design to the building appearance would require a resolution of the ownership group.

It was MOVED AND SECONDED:

That no over-hangs were to be added to the exterior of the building and that the budget for the option (glass canopies) could go to the contingency fund. The council agreed unanimously on the motion.

It was MOVED AND SECONDED:

That council approved (1) Mr Chies's recommendation of the Centra high performance exterior doors and (2) that the change in door types would be credited against the tendered quote.

At this point in the discussions, some of council once again expressed concern regarding making decisions for the Ownership as a whole. Mr Chies and Mr Williamson re-iterated that Council were given direction in the SGM (Feb 17th, 2011) resolution to appoint TROW (now exp.) as the engineering consultant to complete the pre-construction phase for the building repairs and to obtain tenders and prepare the construction documents. The Strata Council had not made any alterations to the building appearance or design outside of remedial work recommended. If the Ownership needed to make additions/subtractions to the base remedial work a post-tender addendum could be made to the assigned contractor. Council expressed their satisfaction on the decisions made in the meeting, the subject of balconies, railing, doors and canopies was considered resolved for the purposes of developing the budget and resolutions for the SGM.

A. INFORMATION TO OWNERSHIP AND COMMUNICATION

- i. Council then discussed communication to owners and the information meeting and schedule for the SGM. It was requested by council that information should flow between all parties (exp, Strataco, Project Management and Council) for clarity and good communication. Mr John Williamson presented an overview of the next steps and offered to put together an information package for the

ownership, including elevation drawings posted on the notice board on the ground floor for ownership review. Mr Williamson asked that the council review the package ASAP once it was received as he wished to post the package to owners prior to the scheduled information meeting on September 12, 2011. Following this meeting, where he and Dino (Mr Chies) would be present to answer owners' questions and present the design to repairs, there would be an SGM allowing the owners would vote on a resolution to proceed with council's recommendation to appoint the repair contract to New City Contracting Ltd.

- ii. Wood Partitions: the wood partitions between the balconies were discussed and some of council noted that some partition may have rot and need replacing. Mr Chies stated that if it was necessary the partitions would be replaced out of the contingency funds. The issue of repairing the inspection hoes was raised and Mr Chies indicate this would be completed by the awarded contractors.
- iii. Mr Chies was then thanked by the council and left the meeting at 7:45 pm.
- iv. Mr Williamson then presented the following summary for the next steps:
 - a) **Information Meeting package** (10 days prior to SGM) – to contain what was would be done and where (i.e. units affected directly)
 - b) Delivery Sept 10th, 2011
 - c) **Contract for execution** of exp. services presented to Ms K. Sheldon. Ms. Sheldon stated these would be presented as new business when council formed on Sept 1, 2011.
 - d) **Entitlement Assessments** – resolution for repairs to be completed at SGM, partial payment options presented by Strata Council, two bank accounts would be created (by Strataco) to distribute and handle funds (1) Holding Account for 10% funds + interest to owners following final payment (2) Account for majority of funds and invoicing from contractor (s).
 - e) **References from Strata Corporations** for New City Contractors handed to council with a list of generic questions for reference checks.
 - f) **Contractor would inform owners** of order of work in their suites and Mr Williamson would re-iterate this is his information package.

ADJOURNMENT

There been no further business on the agenda the meeting with adjourned at 8:20 pm.

Kim Sheldon (recorder)
flynkiwi@telus.net
Trinity Strata Council