

**Date:** Tuesday, October 30, 2017  
**Time:** 3:00 p.m.  
**Place:** Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall

**PRESENT:**

**Board**

J. Dobrovolny	General Manager of Engineering
A. Molaro	Assistant Director Urban Design (Acting Chair)
P. Mochrie	Deputy City Manager
A. Law	Director, Development Services, (Chair)
G. Kelley	General Manager of Planning and Development Services
J. Greer	Assistant Director of Processing Centre - Development

**Advisory Panel**

K. Smith	Representative of the Design Professions (Urban Design Panel)
B. Jarvis	Representative of the Development Industry
K. Maust	Representative of the Vancouver Heritage Commission
R. Chaster	Representative of the General Public

**Regrets**

N. Lai	Representative of the General Public
H. Ahmadian	Representative of the Development Industry
R. Wittstock	Representative of the Design Professions
M. Pollard	Representative of the General Public

**ALSO PRESENT:**

**City Staff:**

D. Wiley	Development Planner
A. Wroblewski	Project Facilitator
C. Joseph	Engineering

**105 Keefer Street - DP-2017-00681 - ZONE HA-1A**

Delegation  
Gregory Borowski, Architect, Merrick Architecture  
Cheryl Bounmeester, PINL Partnership  
Houtan Rafii, Owner, Beedie Living

**Recording Secretary: C.Lade**

**1. MINUTES**

It was moved by J. Dobrovolny, seconded by G. Kelley, and was the decision of the Board to approve the minutes of the meeting on September 5, 2017.

**2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**

---

None.

**3. 105 Keefer Street - DP-2017-00681 - ZONE HA-1A  
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: Merrick Architecture

**Request:** To develop a 9 storey mixed used building with one level Retail (1<sup>st</sup> floor) and 8 levels of residential (2<sup>nd</sup> to 9<sup>th</sup> floors) containing 111 dwelling units all over three levels or underground parking, having vehicular access from the lane.

**Development Planner's Opening Comments**

Ms. Danielle Wiley, Development Planner, presented the proposal and summarized the recommendations contained in the Staff Committee Report.

Ms. Wiley then took questions from the Board and Panel members.

**Applicant's Comments**

The applicant, Mr. Greg Borowski, thanked the staff and noted the development conformed to the regulations and guidelines in the zoning area. The applicant stated commitment to quality projects in the area consistent with the HA-1A guidelines involving re-habilitation of the building in a new heritage context. The applicant noted that it was uncertain whether changes would occur in the area. Mr. Borowski noted past commitments in the area to developing social housing at other sites. Mr. Borowski also noted the private investment involved with the development in the Chinatown revitalization plan.

Mr. Raffi, Vice President of Beedie Living, thanked the staff. Mr. Raffi noted the site underwent careful stakeholder consultation. The site had been a brownfield site for a decade, a gas station, and would not displace home owners or business under development. The applicant felt that as many amenities as possible were to be retained. The applicant's pursuit of rezoning was rejected, and the applicant intended to retain amenities at the site. There is a cultural space offered intended to service Chinatown seniors and members.

The alternative pursuit of a land swap has been pursued but no viable solution was found. The proposal has gone through extensive public consultation through outreach, feedback, and public hearings. Correspondence has been received from several stakeholders, and constructive correspondence pursued. The collective commentary gathered was through many associations, business owners, stakeholders and residents.

The hostile environment from Council has continued and many of the voices have been pursuing intimidation tactics, including acts of vandalism. However this location has been recognized as an important site and the applicant has developed it under special consideration. The applicant remains committed to the site, as well as the highest level of contextual design and cultural sensitivity.

The Applicant took questions from the Board and Panel members.

The Chair noted the conditions for development permit board and noted the speaker protocol.

**Comments Speakers:**

Speaker one, Jessica, noted the shopping and community connections in Chinatown from 8 years ago. There have been a lot of changes in Chinatown, especially at this site. The expensive buildings are unaffordable. Change has occurred in the neighbourhood, and the landlord has insisted the rent is too low and service has declined from the landlord. The service of low income residents has been affected by the expensive development in the area. More units for low income people should be built by the developer.

Mr. Gil Kelley, Director of Planning, noted the Board's authority. Ms. Molaro noted that the Board did not have the authority to impose Social Housing on the project due to zoning restrictions. Under rezoning policy there were rules that allowed social housing amenities to be considered.

However, under current Zoning, the Development Permit board is unable to impose conditions. Only physical development could be considered under the current zoning laws by the development permit board.

Speaker two, Henry Tom, as a business owner in the area, noted support for the project. The development achieves many of the goals of the community plan. The storefront achieves the rhythm of current Chinatown. Housing for incremental growth in Chinatown should be pursued. Mr. Tom supports the development and urged further research.

Speaker three King Mong Chan, presented in Chinese language and followed with noting the discrimination of Chinese people, and noted the threat of gentrification of Chinese people of working class in the neighbourhood. Almost 3000 people have signed a petition in the neighbourhood and noted the hostility and discrimination in the neighbourhood. Mr. Chan urged the DPB to reject the application.

Mr. Holloway, speaker four, noted the support for the development. The project is within specification of the area and noted it is within the guidelines.

Ms. Johal, speaker five, noted support of the development. The development is in alignment with the guidelines and the project is working, according to Ms. Johal.

Speaker six, Emily Kaplun noted support for the project and noted the project provided revitalization to the neighbourhood. The proposal provides housing, cultural space, and conforms to zoning.

Speaker seven, Lily Tang, noted if a huge building were to be built on the site it would not match the context of the area. The site is historically significant. There is a bill to protect the historic site, and Ms. Tang wondered if this bill could be used for the site.

Chen Hui Qing noted, speaker eight, noted the public was not allowed to attend the Open House. The government should listen to the Chinese community due to the historical reasons. Ms. Qing noted social problems in the area. The cultural space was noted for the site. Ms. Qing urged the three levels of government to build something together on the site. No social units are being offered. The construction could be pursued at another site.

October 30, 2017

King Mon Chan, speaker nine, noted the site is of cultural and historical significance. The government cares a lot about Chinese culture, and this is not an appropriate site for this development. 50-100% of the site's housing should be devoted to Senior's housing. The government should respect the opinions and voices of the community.

Luu Tai, speaker 10, noted her connection to the neighbourhood both culturally and historically. Because the land is next to the memorial monument, the site should be respected. Ms. Lai noted historical reasons for opposing the height of the building. None of the buildings are over 5 storeys in the area. There should be seniors housing built at the site. At the ground level, there should be cultural meeting room.

Leo Yu, speaker 11, was born in Vancouver. The proposal is culturally inappropriate and insensitive to the area. It will be seen as a major setback in reconciliation in the neighbourhood. It will set back food security and assets in the area. Personal history was noted in regards to the local legacy. The development is completely disrespectful to the area because locals cannot afford to live there. The question is whether the development is culturally appropriate.

Jean Swanson, speaker 12, noted the opposition to the development and supported social housing at the site. The housing should match the needs of the housing supply. Luxury condos at 105 Keefer do not match the needs of housing in the neighbourhood. The Chinese re-development plan did not consult with the working class neighbourhood. Why was a viable solution not met with Beedie Development? The group has been respectful, and the Beedie group was not fair to accuse the group of being disrespectful. Not allowing Chinese speakers more than 5 minutes to speak is clear discrimination.

Louis Lapprend, speaker 13, noted opposition to the development. Mr. Lapprend noted new business in the area that has made the area unaffordable to locals. Most of the new businesses are not affordable, accessible or appropriate to the community. The businesses rob the low income community of their dignity. Mr. Lapprend noted that staff should take a stand on the development.

Speaker 14, Cynthia Kent, expressed objection against the development. The proposal does not meet current guidelines. It does not meet the planning intent for 'contextual new development' and zoning does not merit outright approval. Regulations do not keep out historically inappropriate projects. It fails to consider activities of Chinatown. The applicant did not appropriately consult with the community.

Speaker 16, Lindsay Brown, expressed the failure of planning towards development.

Speaker 17, Sophie Fung, noted disapproval for the development application. The housing does not serve the needs of the community. There will be no access to the community to use the site.

Raza Mirza, speaker 18, noted the project does not speak the economic needs of the community.

Michael Tan, speaker 19, opposed the development and noted the procedural request and asked the Board refer approving the permit to City Council.

October 30, 2017

Kelly Talayco, speaker 20, opposed the development. Ms. Talayco, noted that Chinatown has changed. The proposed building does not conform to the historic identity of Chinatown. Gentrification will continue if the development is approved.

Vania Chan, speaker 21 noted the opposition. The development does not benefit the community and in fact will harm the local community. The site represents local history. Chinatown recognizes the history of colonial policies. The development demonstrates the pursuit of profit over the community and will affect the community in the area. The seniors need the housing for survival and the development will effect isolation and revitalization in the community.

Ms. Molaro noted that the development does not require social housing under current zoning laws.

Speaker 21, Vania Chan, opposed the development due to the site not meeting the economic and social context of the HA-1A district schedule. The intent of the social and cultural needs of the neighbourhood would be accommodated contextually. The economic context of the low income seniors in the area did not fit into the guidelines.

Bryce Gauthier, speaker 22, noted the authentic aspects of Chinatown. The development will not ruin the neighbourhood. Chinatown is changing, but the site should not bare the burden of development overall. The site did offer at a certain point. The project is within guidelines and the site will be better used.

Bill Yuen, Heritage Vancouver Society, noted opposition for the project. It is far from best practice for heritage. Mr. Yuen noted the excessive focus on the zoning guidelines, but rather asked the staff focus on the character suiting Chinatown. It impacts the community and negative impacts on the area will have huge social costs. The project is not consistent with the over-arching policies for Chinatown.

Yi Chien Jade Ho, speaker 26, noted opposition for the proposal due to the proposed luxury housing and affordability concerns. The location of the project does not respect the legacy of colonization in the area.

Frantz De Rycke, speaker 27, note the importance of the site as a historical site for the area architecturally. Frantz noted his shock as a citizen at the approval of the site because of the historical significance of Chinatown. The architecture does not retain the heritage of the neighbourhood.

Steffanie Ling, speaker 28, noted opposition to the development, and hoped staff would not approve the development.

Karen Tsang, speaker 29, noted opposition to the development, and noted the lack of representation on the Board was not of the Chinese community. Ms. Tsang noted the obligation for historical reconciliation of Chinatown and the architectural considerations of the site.

Huanmeil Han, speaker 30, opposed the development and asked the panel to apologize for the lack of translation into Mandarin / Cantonese. Ms Han noted that Beedie's language was not appropriate. The low income Chinatown seniors were not given the opportunity to participate due to time restriction and linguistic restrictions.

Yule Ken Lum, speaker 31, expressed opposition to the project. Mr. Lum noted the elm trees that lined the streetscape and noted that 30 trees would be removed on 6<sup>th</sup> Ave and Mr. Lum expressed opposition to the removal.

Tin Chen, speaker 32, expressed opposition to the project. Ms. Trem noted the colonial aspects as well as the gentrification effects of the site.

Rob McIldon, speaker 33, expressed support for the application. Mr. McIldon noted the extensive consultation and noted the conditions follow the policy for the site.

William Lim, speaker 34, expressed opposition to the development. Mr. Lim noted historical reasons for opposition to the privatization of land use.

Yulunda Lui, speaker 35, noted opposition to the site. Ms. Lui noted the location of the site as historically inappropriate and noted the condo development would not be culturally appropriate.

Devon Hussack, speaker 36, noted support for the project, and noted the proposal conformed to the guidelines. Mr. Hussack also outlined concerns about intimidation tactics of opposition.

Rebecca Hartley, speaker 37, expressed support for the project and noted the benefits for business and potential housing in the community.

Marielle Wall, speaker 38, expressed opposition to the project. Ms. Wall noted historical and cultural reasons for opposition to development of site due to gentrification of the neighbourhood and connection to culture.

Emily Howard, speaker 39, noted that the development could serve a mix of uses and offered support for the project. The family housing units in the development were the type of housing that will be in demand.

Speaker 40, Eric Szeto, noted disappointment at the loss of housing for seniors. Mr. Szeto noted that the project is following the guidelines. Mr. Szeto noted the public would be welcome at the site and business would improve.

Mark Lee, speaker 49, pointed out the language discrimination that the seniors face. The seniors in the neighbourhood were facing displacement. The architectural expression of the project is not respectful to the community. Mr. Lee noted that the community benefit was not reflected in the proposal due to lack of Chinese language used during consultation.

Nathanial Wo, speaker 50, noted the exclusionary linguistic barriers during the Development Board meeting. The market unit housing at the site is a loss for low income housing in the area. Mr. Wo noted the consultation process was not appropriate to the community.

Chan Sam Giu, speaker 51, noted opposition to the development. Condos would disrespect the culture of Chinatown and noted the affordability factors in the area. Ms Giu noted the area needs social housing not market condos in the area. Ms. Giu noted the lack of translation services affecting the community from participating in the process.

Terry Kaufenberg, speaker 52, noted support for the development. Mr. Kaufenberg noted the Beedie group support for the arts community.

Mr. Dobrovolny noted that speakers should limit themselves from referring to individuals.

Theo Kim, speaker 53, supported the project and noted businesses in the area were appreciated by patrons such as himself. The project would provide a community space for locals and provide homes.

Andrea Lum, speaker 54, played a recording of Mayor Gregor speaking about the development proposal during the rezoning stage. Ms. Lum noted the diversity issues in regards to the decision makers for the project.

Yuk Kwan Ng, speaker 55, noted support for the project. Ms. Ng noted there would be improved business in the area and noted it was a private property and not owned by government. Ms. Ng expressed her support for a quick resolution of the development.

Kwong Ming Cheng, speaker 56, expressed support for the project because it would revitalize the community. The units ideally should be sold at a lower price to the Chinese community. Services for seniors would be beneficial.

Shiu Hing Pang, speaker 57, expressed her support for the project and appreciated the space offered.

Soloman Siu, speaker 58, expressed support for the project. Mr. Siu noted the project would bring more employment.

Andrea Greenway, speaker 59, expressed support for the project. Ms. Greenway noted the importance of local people such as herself to buy in Chinatown.

Alva Kim, speaker 60, noted her support for the project. Ms Kim noted her desire to buy on the site where there is a 3 bedroom home being offered and the project will revitalize the community.

Chris Karu, speaker 61, noted connections with the site as a local. Beedie development is offering housing, community space and should be approved without delay.

Speaker 62, Jody Mak, noted opposition to the project. Ms. Mak noted the gentrification of the neighbourhood and the potential displacement of low income residents.

Lenee Son, speaker 63, noted opposition to the project. Ms. Son noted the homeless situation in the neighbourhood. The Beedie project is a part of a larger issue of development and colonialization.

Angela Ho, speaker 64, expressed opposition to the project. Ms. Ho noted the project does not meet the needs of the community by building luxury condos or the Chinatown historical and cultural identity.

Rita Wong, speaker 65, noted opposition to the development. Ms. Wong noted the inappropriateness of the site both culturally and historically. Ms. Wong noted the building is

out of scale and proportion to the site. The project has been repeatedly disapproved. Historical and equity issues should be taken into account by the Board.

Susan World, speaker 66, noted opposition to the application. Ms. World noted historical reasons for opposition, and expressed that the site was the 'heart' of Chinatown.

Stacey Ho, speaker 67, opposed the development. Ms. Ho noted the negative impacts on the community. The proposal is a threat to the right and safety to a home in the neighbourhood.

Amanda Huynh, speaker 68, opposed the development. Ms. Huynh noted the cultural reasons, including culturally appropriate amenities for local seniors. Ms. Huynh noted the developer's amenity offers were scaled down with development. The development should be socially sustainable.

Vincent Kwan, number 69, noted opposition to the development. Mr. Kwan noted the concerns for the architectural context of the site in the neighbourhood.

Robert Sung, number 70, noted opposition to the project. The development is a loss for the community. Mr. Sung asked for all stakeholders concerned to intervene.

Erica Isomura, number 71, opposed the project. The proposal is not appropriate for the local residents.

Zoe Luba, speaker 72, opposed the project. Ms. Luba noted the violation of the contextual piece of development and noted the street frontage, and other aspects. The neighbourhood is being gentrified and the new development should be social housing. The community space should be intergenerational.

Kathy Shimizu, speaker 73, noted opposition to the project. Ms. Shimizu noted the policy and architectural reasons that the project does not fit the community. Ms Shimizu noted the lack of linguistic accessibility during the planning process.

Jian Hua Li, speaker 73, noted support for the project. Ms. Luba supported the community space.

Kiku Hawkes, speaker 73, noted opposition to the project. Ms. Hawkes is a concerned resident in Strathcona. Concerns include: inappropriate scale, massing, and character and history. The architecture expressed a disregard for the site. It is the wrong building at the wrong time. It will block site lines and cast shadows.

Lillian Deeb, speaker 74, noted opposition to the project. Ms Deeb noted the need for change in the community. Ms. Deeb noted the Beedie project does not fit the context of the policy and therefore should not be approved. The community has asked for affordable housing in the neighbourhood.

Karen Lee, speaker 75, opposed the project. The development noted the Beedie group's project would cause harm to the community. Ms. Lee referred to the project as a 'white supremacist project'.



October 30, 2017

Wendy Pedersen, speaker 76, opposed the project. Ms. Pederson noted that participating in approving the project would be a mistake in the community, and noted the frustration with the process. Ms. Pedersen noted a land swap would be appreciated.

Andrew Lau, speaker 77, opposed the project. Mr. Lau noted the development contravenes the current zoning guidelines. Mr. Lau noted the reasons for the contraventions.

Sam Dharmapala, speaker 78, opposed the project. Because Mr. Dharmapala noted the project was not appropriate for the community. Mr. Dharmapala noted the city was pushing poor people out of communities. Mr. Dharmapala noted that developers were destroying communities.

John Cassidy, speaker 79, noted that there is enormous opportunity on the site and opposed the project. Mr. Cassidy noted the opportunity of retaining Chinatown heritage. The permit should not be issued because the project is too vague and the project does not offer anything in terms of cultural space.

Kevin Huang, speaker 80, noted opposition the project. The project does not fit the guidelines, and noted that the community does not want the project. The food assets were not considered. Policy has left out needs by omission. Mr. Huang noted the neighbourhood identity aspects.

Kell Gerlings, speaker 81, noted opposition to the project. Ms. Gerlings expressed concern for the tangible battle that residents and young people were involved with. Ms. Gerlings noted the disregard of the community, as the Greenest City, and urged the rejection of the proposal.

Sid Tan, speaker 82, opposed the project because it is inappropriate to the neighbourhood. Mr. Tan noted the soul of Chinatown needs to be preserved.

Kathleen Taylor, speaker 83, opposed the project. Ms. Taylor noted the reasons the ways gentrification affects the community. The superficial design does not fit the cultural and historic identity of the neighbourhood.

Christina Lee, speaker 84, opposed the project. The tokenistic elements of development and the eventual erasure of Chinatown history are not supported. Ms. Lee outlined the historical and cultural reasons for opposition to the development.

Nathan Edelson, speaker 85, opposed the project. Mr. Edelson noted the project was not cultural appropriate for the neighbourhood. The development is bulky. The uses and design of the ground floor of the ground floor were not supported. Mr. Edelson noted the historical discrimination of the Chinese community. Mr. Edelson noted that the history of the site needed consideration.

Sam Alder, speaker 86, opposed the project. Mr. Alder noted the intent of HA-1A guidelines, and noted the community was the vitality of Chinatown. Mr. Alder requested a different body to consider the site.

July Chan, speaker 87, opposed the project. Ms. Chan expressed the apparent lack of concern from the City. Ms. Chan noted the language barriers that took away the right of the community to participate. Ms. Chan compared the development to 'a rotten fruit' being served to the community.

Ellis Sam, speaker 88, opposed the project. Mr. Sam noted the historical significance of the area and historical exclusion in the area of the Chinese population.

Doris Chow, speaker 89, opposed the project. Ms Chow noted the historical reasons for opposing the project and noted the encouragement of a UNESCO heritage site in the area. The proposal is not what people in the neighbourhood want to see. Ms Chow noted the guidelines did not meet the community.

June Chow, speaker 90, noted opposition to the proposal. Ms. Chow noted that luxury condos were not appropriate at the site and the affordability factors of the area.

Alexander Wright, speaker 91, noted support for the proposal. Mr. Wright noted the proposal conforms to the site guidelines and the government was transparent during the process.

Nicholas Yung, speaker 92, noted opposition to the proposal. Mr. Yung demonstrated the difficulties that lack of translation posed to the community.

Rhiannon Maberley, speaker 93, noted support for the proposal. Ms. Maberley noted the proposal meets the guidelines, and noted the difficulties in the neighbourhood. Ms. Maberley noted respect for the voices that were heard but voiced support for the proposal.

Mr. Yi Fusu, speaker 94, expressed support for the proposal. Mr. Fusu noted the history of the site and the activities in the area were of concern.

Mr. Daniel Tsigi, speaker 95, expressed opposition for the proposal. The luxury development offered no affordable housing and it disrespected the history of the community.

### **Panel Opinion**

Panel members offered a range of comments on the proposal, including:

Chair, Kim Smith from the Urban Design Panel, noted the controversial nature of the project and the mandate of the UDP which is to note the conformity of the project to the zoning area. The panel supported the project with recommendations by planning. The cultural centre could face the plaza at grade level.

Mr. Jarvis made noted comments from the speakers which included: cultural assets, the desire for social housing, reconciliation, and other comments. In response to the cultural and social issues, Mrs. Jarvis stated that the land was a private piece of land with allowable uses. Mr. Jarvis pointed out the democratic process that resulted in policy and allowable land use for the area with many levels of consultation. Mr. Jarvis noted the proposal was within zoning laws. Mr. Jarvis also noted the larger discussion of speakers is not geared at the correct forum, but rather could be geared towards other levels of government.

Ms. Maust heard the current sentiments from the community and noted that the community were consulted throughout the process over 10 years. Ms. Maust noted that the consultation came up with a policy of revitalization and noted the change in position of the community. Ms. Maust also congratulated the community for the activism and hoped the community would be informed on the process of creating policy in future.

Ms. Maust noted the development was following heritage guidelines, and that the developer is under no obligation to create social housing. Ms. Maust noted the roofline could use additional

refinement to be more responsive to the neighbourhood. Ms. Maust noted the speakers were heard and would bring the concerns back to the heritage commission.

Ms. Chaster noted appreciation for the speakers. However, he did not notice comments that were critical to the particular application. Ms. Chaster noted the need for a larger conversation on Chinatown direction, but noted the advisory panel was bound by legislation to consider the current zoning. Ms. Chaster encouraged the community to get involved upstream in the process where the concerns could be integrated. Ms. Chaster also noted the design features of the project: the double fronting breezeway along the lane, and noted the bedroom and prior-to condition for amenity space was welcomed. The retail frontages were welcomed and corner element at Keefer were noted for further design development.

### Board Discussion

Mr. Kelley made a motion to defer the decision of the development application to a meeting to be held in a week on November 6<sup>th</sup> at 5 pm, and asked of specific information to inform with deliberation. Mr. Kelley clarified that the real estate department was involved with negotiations with the developer regarding a potential land swap. Mr. Kelley noted he was not involved with those negotiations.

Mr. Kelley noted cultural responsiveness or context would be explored that go beyond physical responsiveness. Mr. Kelley noted exploring the cultural or economic aspects and if those aspects could be considered in terms of 'cultural context'.

The expression of the word 'urbanism' would be considered as interpreted by staff.

Another consideration to explore with staff is the obligation of staff to adopt other policies in particular in relation to the downtown eastside.

Mr. Kelley would like to explore also if Staff might have to refer the decision to City Council who might have a broader consideration.

Mr Kelley noted design specifications on the site, such as moving up the ground floor ceiling height, and increasing the prominence of the parapet which might require a relaxation of height. Another issue is the non-compliance with the retail frontage, with a limitation of 20 feet. The status of the memorial plaza design would be looked into as well.

Mr. Kelley noted consideration of the consultation process, particularly around language guidelines and access to content both during the meeting and prior to the meetings, and how this could be improved.

Furthermore, Mr. Kelley inquired as to how the ground floor of the project would be curated with appropriate retail and community space in terms of size and accessibility to the public.

Mr. Dobrovolny noted the wording of 'retractable awnings' as continuous weather protection and the understanding of how it achieves continual weather protection.

Mr. Mochrie noted the microcosm of serious issues that the community is wrestling with at the hearing and noted the importance of discussing those concerns in a respectful way.

Mr. Mochrie also noted the importance in the ability to discuss things in a constructive way, and that there was no simple solution for the types of things being heard by attendees.

**Motion**

It was moved by Mr. Kelley and seconded by Mr. Dobrovlny, and was the decision of the Board:

THAT the Board **DEFER** decision of Development Application No. DP-2017-00681, to the date November 6, 2017 at 5pm and that the Speaker's List would be closed.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

None.

**5. ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 11:45 pm.