

Date: Monday, April 10, 2006  
Time: 3.00 p.m.  
Place: Committee Room No. 1, City Hall

---

**PRESENT:**

F. Scobie Co-Director of Development Services (Chair)  
L. Beasley Co-Director of Planning  
B. MacGregor Deputy City Manager  
T. Timm General Manager of Engineering Services

**Advisory Panel**

W. Franci Representative of the Design Professions (Urban Design Panel)  
R. Acton Representative of the Design Professions  
N. Shearing Representative of the Development Industry  
J. Scott Representative of the Development Industry  
M. Braun Representative of the General Public  
D. Chung Representative of the General Public  
K. Hung Representative of the General Public  
C. Nystedt Representative of the General Public

**Regrets**

R. Keate Representative of the Vancouver Heritage Commission

**ALSO PRESENT:****City Staff:**

R. Segal Development Planner  
F. Molino Development Planner  
A. Higginson Project Facilitator  
M. Thomson City Surveyor

**1238 Seymour Street**

L. Brydon Property Owner

**955 Burrard Street**

A. Endall Endall Elliot Associates/Stantec Architecture  
F. Inglis YMCA  
K. Bogress Concert Properties  
R. Lemon Heritage Consultant

Recorder: C. Hubbard, Raincoast Ventures

---

The Chair welcomed the following new members to the Board's Advisory Panel:

Walter Francl (Chair, Urban Design Panel), representing the design professions  
Norman Shearing, representing the development industry  
Darren Chung and Colleen Nystedt, representing the general public

The Chair also acknowledged the attendance of Ted Tyndorf, Chief Planner & Executive Director, City of Toronto, who is present to observe the Board's procedures for dealing with major development applications.

#### 1. MINUTES

The minutes of the meetings of March 13 and March 27, 2006 were not available for adoption but are expected to be distributed with the agenda package for the next meeting on April 24, 2006.

#### 2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

None.

#### 3. 1238 SEYMOUR STREET - DE410075 - ZONE DD (COMPLETE APPLICATION)

Applicant: Andrew Siwicky

Request: Interior alterations to construct a 77 sq.ft. addition to the existing mezzanine in suite 1104 in the existing multiple dwelling/residential unit with artist studio - class A building on this site, using a Heritage Density Transfer from 46 Water Street.

The Chair briefly explained the need to bring this small application to the Board, which is to bring into by-law conformity interior additions made to individual units in this loft building by way of transferring heritage density to the site. Mr. Scobie pointed out that the comments provided by Processing Centre - Building (Appendix C of the Staff Report dated April 10, 2006) reflect a very strict application of the Building By-law regarding egress from the upper storey. This issue was not pursued in previous similar applications given the alterations were fully contained within the suite, and at the most remote location on the mezzanine were still within the maximum permitted distance to an exit. This is also the case in the subject application.

#### Development Planner's Opening Comments

Ralph Segal, Development Planner, had nothing further to add, except to request deletion of the second paragraph of note B.2.1 of the Staff Report which is no longer relevant. He recommended approval of the application.

#### Applicant's Comments

The property owner, Linda Brydon, had no comments.

#### Comments from other Speakers

None.

**Panel Opinion**

There were no comments from Advisory Panel members.

**Board Discussion**

In response to a question from Mr. Timm about the necessity for the Board to deal with applications of this nature, Mr. Scobie advised that only the Board can approve heritage density transfers. He added, however, that once the maximum 15,000 sq.ft. of heritage density that can be transferred to the site is reached, any future owners seeking approval will be required to make a rezoning application for approval by City Council.

**Motion**

It was moved by Mr. Timm and seconded by Mr. Macgregor, and was the decision of the Board:

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. 410075, in accordance with the Staff Report dated April 10, 2006, with the deletion of paragraph two of B.2.1.

**4. 955 BURRARD STREET - DE409971 - ZONE CD-1  
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: Endall Elliott

Request: To: retain the easterly portion (30 ft.) of the Municipally-Designated heritage building (YMCA); develop a new six-storey building immediately adjacent to the retained portion of the heritage building containing a four-storey YMCA fitness centre and a two-storey, 69-space, child day care centre and family development centre; and develop a 42-storey residential tower containing 261 dwelling units on the west portion of the site, all over six levels of underground parking.

The Chair drew attention to a memorandum from the Project Facilitator dated April 10, 2006 which provides corrections to typographical errors in conditions 1.2 and 1.3 contained in the Development Permit Staff Committee Report of March 29, 2006. As well, a further two responses to notification were received which were not reflected in the Report.

**Development Planner's Opening Comments**

Francisco Molino, Development Planner, presented this application to develop the YMCA site at Burrard and Barclay Streets. This site, together with the adjacent site containing the First Baptist church, was rezoned in April 2005. Mr. Molino briefly described the immediate site context and noted that most of the existing towers in the area provide a backdrop to the low scale heritage character of this part of Burrard Street. The proposal also locates its highest element on the west side to reinforce this character.

Mr. Molino noted the form and character of the proposal was finely determined at the rezoning stage, with the conditions of rezoning seeking further refinement in a few areas. With respect to floor area, the application exceeds the permitted maximum as a result of omission in the CD-1 by-law of below-grade mechanical/electrical equipment which is typically excluded from FSR calculations. Staff seek to correct this oversight by way of an application for Text Amendment which is expected to be considered by Council on April 18, 2006 and referred to a Public Hearing on May 16, 2006.

Following a brief description of the complex programming requirements for the YMCA facilities, Mr. Molino briefly reviewed the applicant's response to the conditions of rezoning. He said

staff believe that with some further refinements the project will achieve the quality expected for this prominent downtown site. Referring to the Development Permit Staff Committee Report, Mr. Molino briefly reviewed the major recommended conditions of approval. He advised response to notification included concerns about the proposed height of the building and increased traffic congestion in the area. He noted the height was established at the rezoning stage and staff and the developer's traffic consultant indicate no necessity for infrastructure improvements as a result of this development.

#### Questions/Discussion

Mr. Beasley sought clarification concerning the relationship of this development with the existing 9-storey apartment building to the west. Mr. Molino advised a condition of the rezoning sought to improve this interface and the floor plan has been adjusted to increase the separation between the buildings. Additional sculpting of the façade has also occurred, as well as introduction of a garden deck over the parking entry which further improves this relationship. Mr. Molino added, this is an improvement over the rezoning massing proposal and a considerable improvement over the current condition in which the 9-storey apartment building faces a 4 - 5-storey blank wall of the existing YMCA podium structure.

In response to a question from Mr. Beasley regarding condition 1.6, Mr. Molino confirmed it is not intended to set the buildings farther back than proposed but for the applicant to explore ways to further improve the interface between the building and the public sidewalk.

Mr. Beasley sought clarification regarding condition 1.4. Mr. Molino advised the intent of the condition is for the applicant to explore various options now under consideration, in consultation with Heritage Planning staff and taking into account the advice of the Vancouver Heritage Commission.

Referring to the letter dated March 6, 2006 from the General Manager of Engineering Services to the applicant concerning treatment of the lane adjacent to the site (Appendix F), Mr. Beasley noted that it seems to be somewhat insistent with a rezoning condition which calls for trees and landscaping in the lane. Mike Thomson, City Surveyor, explained the final treatment of the lane has not yet been determined and he confirmed that Council's condition will be satisfied. It was noted that treatment of the lane is not a matter for consideration by the Board and will be approved by the General Manager of Engineering Services.

Mr. Timm noted that Text Amendments are required to exclude below-grade mechanical spaces in the calculation of floor area, and to exclude the rooftop mechanical appurtenances and elevator overrun in the height calculation. He questioned whether the proposal for the roof includes more than mechanical penthouse and elevator overrun because it appears to be quite high and beyond what is typically excluded in this category. Mr. Molino explained that part of the Text Amendment regarding the height includes a specific definition of the exclusions. The mechanical component is approximately two storeys with an 18 ft. screen. Height to the tower roof slab exceeds maximum permitted height by about 1.2 ft. which is intended to be reduced by adjusting floor to ceiling height. Ralph Segal, Development Planner, added that condition 1.5 includes refinement to the mechanical screen to improve the overall vertical expression of the upper portion of the tower, and that the Text Amendment is to allow what is typically permitted as exclusions for mechanical penthouse and elevator overrides.

Mr. MacGregor questioned whether the condition calling for removal of the trellis on the roof of the heritage component will affect functionality of the daycare. Mr. Molino advised there are a number of ways to address safety issues without limiting the use of the outdoor play area, including the use of glass in addition to the substantial buffer now shown on the landscape plan.

With respect to the landscape plan, Mr. Beasley requested inclusion of a condition relating to the provision of hose bibs.

In response to a question from Mr. Scott concerning loading, Mr. Thomson explained the Parking By-law requires a total of four Class B loading spaces (three for non-residential, one for residential). The application proposes two Class B loading spaces which Engineering Services is prepared to support provided an additional two class a spaces are included.

Mr. Scobie sought clarification regarding the request to consider removal of the trellis structure along the lane edge as well as along the Burrard Street elevation. Mr. Molino explained the intent is to achieve a simpler expression. He also confirmed, in response to a question from Mr. Scobie, that the form of development was approved in principle by Council at the time of rezoning.

In response to questions from Mr. Acton, Mr. Molino provided further clarification regarding programming of the daycare roof area, and regarding the intent of condition 1.1.

#### **Applicant's Comments**

Alan Endall, Architect, noted that this has been a very challenging project that has been several years in the making, and since the rezoning they have worked to satisfy the project's demanding programmatic and design requirements. The site has a significant slope and is very prominent and constrained for this project which includes retention of the heritage component, the addition of a new YMCA with its specific program areas, and provision of a two-storey child day care centre and family development centre. Mr. Endall said he believes they have made significant progress in addressing areas of concern, particularly with respect to the form of expression and the YMCA component. As a result, they have no concerns with the proposed conditions of approval which have already been reviewed in detail with staff.

With respect to the height, Mr. Endall noted that their method of calculating height above base surface differs from that used by staff. He confirmed it will be brought into conformance by reducing the height by 1.2 ft.

Mr. Endall noted they are proposing a terrace on the uppermost roof of the tower, accessible from the unit below, and have included a small area intended for storage of patio furniture. He agreed there may be an issue if this is deemed habitable space and he requested the Board's consideration in order to facilitate usability of the roof. He noted the Text Amendment required for the rooftop mechanical is something that is routinely excluded from height in the Downtown District.

Referring to the Standard Conditions in Appendix A, Mr. Endall requested deletion of A.1.14 regarding street trees. He explained they would prefer not to provide a street tree at the corner because the owner would like to preserve as much visibility of the corner of the heritage building as possible and to announce it as the new primary entrance to the building.

With respect to the request in condition A.2.3, to incorporate two additional Class A loading spaces into the lay-by off the rear lane, Mr. Endall requested that they be permitted to locate them at the P1 level where they can easily be accommodated and which they believe is a better solution. Mr. Thomson confirmed that Engineering Services can work with the applicant to arrive at a practical solution. However, with respect to the additional width of the Class B space called for in A.2.4, the concern is about accessibility when this space is occupied by a truck. He confirmed that this can be addressed in discussion with the applicant.

**Questions/Discussion**

Mr. Scobie questioned whether the Board may consider approval of the proposed upper roof deck and storage area. Mr. Segal advised it is not the intent of the Text Amendment to allow what would have to be characterized as habitable space. He confirmed the Board is unable to relax the maximum height specified in the CD-1 by-law but a stairway or roof hatch that does not exceed the maximum permitted height may be considered. Mr. Scobie noted that Fire & Rescue Services has a strong preference for stair access rather than a roof hatch. In discussion, Mr. Beasley stressed that, to be equitable, it would be inappropriate for the Board to pursue the definition of habitable space which equates to negotiating how FSR is calculated. Mr. Scobie concurred. Mr. Timm suggested a stairway or hatch could be included in the Text Amendment but he did not believe a storage area was intended in the CD-1 by-law. Mr. Endall added, the access stair is code compliant and it does not contribute to bulk because it is within the area of the tower core footprint.

In response to a question from Mr. Shearing regarding sustainability, Mr. Endall noted that all the roof areas are green but the total area is insufficient to contribute to LEED certification requirements.

With respect to condition 1.1, Mr. MacGregor questioned whether setting back the upper two levels of the new YMCA building on the north side would negatively impact the daycare centre. Mr. Endall agreed they are restricted in how much they can set it back but there can be some increased setback without affecting the daycare.

Mr. Scott questioned the requirement in condition 1.3, to retain the original brick pilasters in situ, which he suggested would be impossible. Mr. Molino noted this was a recommendation of the Vancouver Heritage Commission and the understanding was that the pilasters would be dismantled during construction and reinstated in their original location. Robert Lemon, Heritage Consultant, agreed this was his understanding of what the Commission was seeking.

In response to a question from Mr. Scobie regarding the potential issues raised by Processing Centre - Building, Mr. Endall confirmed they are satisfied they can be addressed, noting they have two code consultants on the project.

**Comments from other Speakers**

None.

**Panel Opinion**

The Chair noted that Mr. Francl was not a member of the Urban Design Panel when this application was reviewed. With respect to the disappointment expressed by the Panel that the project has lost some clarity since the rezoning stage, Mr. Francl said he believes the proposed conditions of approval will address the Panel's concerns. He agreed with the Panel's concerns about the separation of the two structures and the weight required of the atrium space in this regard. Mr. Francl also agreed with the Panel that there should be increase in transparency, which he suggested might be improved by introducing glazing on an elevator. Mr. Francl said he believed that any adjustments to the upper floors of the daycare on Barclay Street should not be made at the expense of the daycare's functionality but some modest adjustment should adequately address the concerns. Regarding condition 1.2, Mr. Francl said he considers the trellis structure on the lane elevation to be an enhancement to the roof area and it should be retained. With respect to the proposed screen at the top of the building, Mr. Francl said he believes it can contribute to the verticality of the building. He said he would strongly support any access being provided to the rooftop and urged that some way of achieving it be pursued with staff. Mr. Francl supported the applicant's request to eliminate one of the trees along

Barclay Street in order to celebrate the exposed heritage façade. He also supported deletion of the Notes to Applicant in conditions A.2.3 and A.2.4.

Mr. Acton said he quite liked this scheme, particularly the distinction between the old YMCA and the proposed tower as well as the horizontal separation between the base and the tower which is very well resolved. Mr. Acton questioned the need for the setback called for in condition 1.1. With respect to condition 1.2, he was in favour of planting on the heritage building roof, supporting the approach that heritage buildings should be layered and changed over time. He thought the trellis could be a positive feature. In condition 1.3, Mr. Acton said he preferred the cleaner options being considered and recommended providing the flexibility to achieve the best solution. With respect to condition 1.4, Mr. Acton said he strongly disagreed with the recommendation to lower the "book end" which he thought would detract from the YMCA. He expressed concern about being too specific about reflecting the heritage portion, noting the programming of the new building demands a different scale. He did not believe a small landscape strip along the Barclay Street edge would contribute much to the scheme, suggesting a hard edge to the pool could provide a positive relationship to the street. He thought the Note to Applicant in 1.5 was superfluous. Regarding condition 1.6, Mr. Action questioned whether it might bring the cars more into the sight lines of the neighbours rather than screening them. He concurred with the applicant regarding elimination of a tree at the corner. He recommended approval of the application.

Mr. Shearing said it is a great project. With respect to condition 1.1, he questioned the need to be so literal in handling the urban form of the atrium space and supported the way it is proposed now. Regarding condition 1.2, Mr. Shearing supported removal of the trellis along Burrard Street but considered the trellis at the upper levels along the lane elevation to be a positive feature. While setting back the upper part of the building on Barclay Street can be done, it will not be discernible at street level. He was concerned about potentially compromising the daycare space and urged that any benefits of a further setback be carefully considered. With respect to the tower rooftop, Mr. Shearing said it would a lost opportunity for it not to be accessible and is well worth exploring, noting there is a means of egress by way of the existing stairwell. Mr. Shearing supported condition A.1.14 regarding the street trees, noting the heritage building should be able to handle a tree in front of it and it does provide a public benefit.

Mr. Scott commended staff for providing clear and concise conditions for this very complex project. He was pleased to see the retention of the heritage component and he concurred with the architect's request to delete the corner street tree in order to better expose the heritage facade. He recommended deletion of reference to "in-situ" in 1.3 noting the brick pilasters can still be retained. Mr. Scott supported deletion of the notes to applicant in conditions A.2.3 and A.2.4. With respect to the overheight issue, Mr. Scott said he was confident that staff can work something out to allow access to the roof without a Text Amendment and noted a "New York type" hatch can work well. He was pleased to see the generous amount of bicycle spaces being provided.

Mr. Braun commented that this will be one of the tallest buildings in the city and he encouraged staff to be vigilant in ensuring all the conditions are met. He also urged the applicant to recognize the building's prominence and to work diligently to make it special. Mr. Braun saw no reason to delete the corner street tree and did not think it would overwhelm the heritage façade.

Ms. Hung commended the applicant for being able to accommodate such specific and complicated programming requirements. She also commended staff for providing well thought out conditions. Regarding condition 1.2, Ms. Hung concurred with deleting the rooftop

landscape elements on the heritage component but to retain the trellis structure on the new portion, noting that rooftop greening will be very desirable on the lane side. She agreed with Mr. Acton that the westerly "book end" does not need to be lowered, noting it can rise with the slope of the site. Ms. Hung found the residential tower very attractive and thought condition 1.5 would help to achieve a stronger vertical expression on the Barclay elevation. She also hoped it would be possible to pull back the penthouse mechanical screening. She supported deleting the corner street tree given the prominence of the corner, and recommended approval of the application.

Mr. Chung commended the applicant for a well conceived project, with new components providing a very good contrast to the retained heritage portion. He recommended deletion of condition 1.2 and to keep the trellis along both the Burrard and lane elevations because it will add character and soften the heaviness of the façade, particularly when seen from afar. He recommended deletion of the corner tree to fully expose the retained heritage façade. He recommended approval.

Ms. Nystedt added her kudos to the applicant team. She noted the responses to notification have been about the height/density, additional traffic and parking and while these have been taken into consideration they need to be further emphasized. The addition of 261 dwelling units as well as the YMCA activities calls for traffic and parking needs to be looked at very carefully. She recommended approval of the application.

Mr. Segal stressed that the Notes to Applicant provided by staff are not composed casually but recognize the intent of the conditions of rezoning and take into consideration the comments of the Urban Design Panel. They have also been carefully reviewed with the applicant who has already developed some preliminary sketches in response. He urged the Board to take this into consideration when making its decision.

#### **Board Discussion**

Mr. Beasley commented that the absence of a Heritage Commission representative attending as an Advisory Panel member on a project of this nature is unfortunate, to ensure heritage objectives are upheld and to offer the Commission's advice to the Board. He added that in considering the advice of the Advisory Panel today he would err on the side of the advice provided by the Heritage Commission in the report. Mr. Beasley recalled there were several years of searching for the chemistry for a successful project on this site. This was largely achieved at the rezoning stage, as evidenced by the modesty of the design conditions now under consideration. It is an excellent concept and the newest kind of development in which public and private objectives are successfully married. To be able to accommodate the complex YMCA programming, the childcare facilities, family development centre and the housing, while also successfully retaining the heritage façade, is a major achievement.

Mr. Beasley said the design development that has occurred since the rezoning has been excellent. The recommended conditions are good and will take that design development to the final stage of resolution. They are, however, very minor conditions for a project of this scale and they have been endorsed by the applicant. Mr. Beasley said it is also important to notice the absence of public opposition given the earlier significant challenges that were ultimately resolved at the rezoning stage. Given the size of the project it is unusually neighbourly at an intimate scale and significantly improves the existing the relationship with the adjacent apartment building to the west.

Mr. Beasley acknowledged the comments of the Advisory Panel regarding the trellis on the lane but said he was compelled to heed the advice of the Heritage Commission regarding the landscaping and trellises on the heritage building. With respect to conditions 1.4 and 1.6,



Mr. Beasley said he would err on the side of the advice of the Urban Design Panel which provided a detailed review and recommended very minor adjustments which they, along with the Heritage Commission, thought would lead to a better relationship both with the scale of the street and to the heritage building. Notwithstanding the advice of the design representatives on the Board's Advisory Panel, Mr. Beasley said the collective view of the Urban Design Panel needs to be honoured. He did not believe the lane landscape treatment was yet resolved in a way that is consistent with the rezoning conditions and he commended Engineering Services to carefully consider these conditions in reaching a conclusion regarding the lane. With respect to the small area on the tower rooftop, Mr. Beasley said it is not within the Board's purview to consider. He said the street trees are very important to reinforce the ceremonial quality intended for Burrard Street but there can be some flexibility on Barclay Street. Mr. Beasley said that, overall, he was very pleased with the proposal and he commended the applicant team for arriving at an excellent scheme that appeared to be very elusive in the earlier stages. He moved approval of the application with some amendments to the conditions.

In discussion regarding the small area on the tower rooftop, it was noted that condition A.1.6 calls for compliance with the height requirement. It was stressed it is the intent of the Board that this area does not form part of the approval but may be pursued by means of a Text Amendment.

Mr. Timm seconded the motion and agreed it is an excellent development. Reflecting on current concerns about the loss of commercial space in the downtown, he added it is also noteworthy that it includes new commercial floor space as well as the institutional and residential uses. He strongly supported the mixed use nature of projects such as this which are proving to be a very effective way of reducing traffic congestion in the downtown core.

Mr. MacGregor said it is a wonderful project for the area, including the retention of the YMCA heritage façade. He agreed with Mr. Beasley that the lack of public attendance is worth mentioning, as well as the small amount of response to notification. He supported the motion and particularly endorsed conditions 1.1 and 1.4 being subject to the functionality of the child daycare centre and family development centre not being compromised, noting that these facilities, together with the heritage retention, are the major public benefits gained from the rezoning. He supported deletion of the corner tree on Barclay Street. With respect to the tower rooftop Mr. MacGregor stressed that the City does support access to rooftops. In this instance, if it can be accommodated in the Text Amendment, he said he would support it. In discussion as to whether the approval preamble should be amended to reflect this possibility, it was agreed to leave it as written noting it is not before the Board to consider at this time. Mr. Beasley stated that, as Director of Planning, he would support an application for Text Amendment. Mr. Timm added, he has no objection to providing access to the roof and providing exclusion for access; however, the model indicates a fairly large glazed, enclosed area which goes beyond the height of the building. He suggested adding reference to stairwells to condition A.1.7. Mr. Beasley concurred.

Mr. Scobie encouraged the applicant team to consider as early as possible the matter of air space subdivision. He also commented on the lack of public input today, adding it is unfortunate that some of the response to notification raises concerns about height and density when these matters were clearly established by Council's decision at the time of rezoning and are unable to be revisited by the Board. He suggested the City should improve communications at the earliest stages of development to make it clear to the public that when Council has dealt with a site specific rezoning some fundamental issues are not open for further discussion at this Board.

**Motion**

It was moved by Mr. Beasley and seconded by Mr. Timm, and was the decision of the Board:

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. 409971, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated March 29, 2006, with the following amendments:

Amend the last sentence in the **Note to Applicant** in 1.1 to read:  
Additional setback for the upper two levels of the new YMCA building along its north side, *without compromising the interior or exterior of the child daycare centre and family development centre*, combined with a stronger, simpler horizontal expression and greater sense of transparency of the glass atrium should also be considered;

Amend 1.2 to delete the last sentence of the **Note to Applicant**;

Amend the second sentence of the **Note to Applicant** in 1.3 to read:  
The original brick pilasters *should be re-established similar to their existing location* and the location and details of any material that is proposed to be relocated within the entry vestibule *should be clearly indicated.*;

Amend the **Note to Applicant** in 1.4 to add to the first sentence:  
*, without compromising the interior or exterior of the child daycare centre and family development centre.*;

Amend the first item under A.1.7 to read:

- *the exclusion of areas related to machine rooms, elevator overruns and stairwells from the calculation of height; and*

Amend A.1.14 to delete "one new street tree along the Barclay Street frontage and";

Amend the first sentence of the **Note to Applicant** in A.1.14 to read:  
These *two* new trees will fill in the gaps in the existing and proposed tree colonnades;

Further amend the **Note to Applicant** in A.1.14 to delete the second sentence;

Add a new condition A.1.16:

*clarify provision of an irrigation system for common areas, roof decks and patios. Hose bibs to be provided and noted on drawings.*

*Note to Applicant: Irrigation system design and installation shall be in accordance with the Irrigation Industry of B.C. Standards and guidelines.*;

Re-number A.1.16 to A.1.21 to A.1.17 to A.1.22;

Delete the **Note to Applicant** in A.2.3;

Delete the **Note to Applicant** in A.2.4.

5. OTHER BUSINESS

None.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

---

C. Hubbard  
Raincoast Ventures Ltd.

---

F. Scobie  
Chair

C:\DATA\CAROL\WORK\DPBapr10.doc