

Date: Monday, April 15, 2002
Time: 3.00 p.m.
Place: Committee Room No. 1, City Hall

PRESENT:**Board**

F. Scobie Director of Development Services (Chair)
L. Beasley Director of Current Planning
B. MacGregor Deputy City Manager
D. Rudberg General Manager of Engineering Services

Advisory Panel

W. Franci Representative of the Design Professions (Urban Design Panel)
D. Chung Representative of General Public (present for Items 4 and 5 only)
J. Leduc Representative of General Public
M. Mortensen Representative of General Public
R. Bruce Scott Representative of General Public

Regrets

J. Hancock Representative of the Design Professions
P. Kavanagh Representative of Development Industry
J. Ross Representative of Development Industry

ALSO PRESENT:

M.B. Rondeau Development Planner
B. Adair Development Planner
A. Higginson Project Facilitator
R. Hargraves Asst. City Surveyor
P. Pinsker Parking & Development Engineer

1050 Smithe Street

T. Wolf Studio One Architecture Inc.
J. Losee Landscape Architect

828 Cardero Street

K. Hemphill Rositch Hemphill & Associates
M. McMaster Landscape Architect, Paul Sangha Ltd.
K. Bachra Orca West Developments

Clerk to the Board: C. Hubbard

1. MINUTES

It was moved by Mr. Rudberg, seconded by Mr. MacGregor, and was the decision of the Board:

THAT the Minutes of the Development Permit Board and Advisory Panel Meeting of April 2, 2002 be approved.

2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

909 Burrard Street - DE406328

With reference to the minutes of March 18, 2002 which were approved at the meeting of April 2, 2002, Mr. Beasley requested a clarification on p.9. Due to a conflict of interest he was not present at the April 2 meeting when these minutes were approved. He requested that the end of the penultimate paragraph be amended to read as follows:

Mr. Beasley said he believed the issue of *not* covering the windows is very important to ensure the store is visually attractive for the residents. *If display units block window space, a proper design solution must be found that removes this conflict (painting over the glass or using opaque glass would not be sufficient).*

The Chair agreed that the suggested amendment was in keeping with the Board's discussion. However, the Board considered it unnecessary to formally amend the March 18 minutes, noting that if any issues cannot be resolved between the applicant and staff, the application can always be returned to the Board.

3. 1050 SMITHE STREET - DE406228 - ZONE DD (COMPLETE APPLICATION)

Applicant: Studio One Architecture Inc.

Request: To construct a 21-storey, multiple dwelling building, containing 129 units, over 4-1/2 levels of underground parking on a site containing an existing underground TransLink rectifier station.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

The Development Planner, Mary Beth Rondeau, presented this application, referring to a model, posted drawings and the Staff Committee report dated April 3, 2002. She briefly reviewed the context, noting this is a transitional site, located between the Downtown District and the West End residential neighbourhood. The site currently contains surface parking, and the existing underground BCTransit rectifier station will remain in place and continue to operate under a right-of-way agreement. There is currently a grassy landscaped area above the rectifier station.

The proposal is for a 21-storey residential tower which seeks the maximum 6.0 FSR plus a ten percent heritage transfer of density. Ms. Rondeau briefly reviewed the conditions outlined in the report, subject to which the recommendation is for approval. Staff consider the proposed use and form of development very appropriate and the conditions are largely refinements.

Ms. Rondeau tabled an amendment to condition A.1.12 with respect to tree retention.

Questions/Discussion

The following issues were clarified in response to questions from the Board:

- the previous approved application on this site was for a hotel with some residential at the upper levels. It was of similar scale to this proposal but less slender. The previous proposal also incorporated a ten percent heritage density transfer;
- this proposal contains about half the amount of private open space that is normally sought;
- staff consider this site can accept the additional heritage density being requested.

Applicant's Comments

Tomas Wolf, Architect, said he had no problems with satisfying most of the recommended conditions, noting that some of the issues have already been resolved in discussions with staff. With respect to the request for more semi private open space, Mr. Wolf said they believe the amount proposed is sufficient in this urban location. As well, the space on the northerly side of the site next to the fire hall is not very attractive. It is also 7 ft. higher than the adjacent floor area

which makes it impractical to be incorporated. He said they will try to find a resolution, but requested that the first sentence of the **Note to Applicant** in condition 1.1 be amended to change "should" to "may".

Jonathan Losee, Landscape Architect, addressed the issue of tree retention, in particular the existing large red maples. He briefly described the procedure and potential problems associated with relocating mature trees. He stressed, however, that it can be done, although there is no guarantee that the trees will survive. He assured the Board that he will work with staff to find a satisfactory solution. Where it is not reasonable to retain any of the trees they will be replaced with the largest specimens possible.

Mr. Beasley noted that relocation of the trees at the easterly end of the site next to the rectifier station is to accommodate a grass boulevard between the curb and the sidewalk. He suggested an easier solution would be to retain these trees in place without changing the sidewalk, and deal only with the trees that are next to new construction. In discussion, Mr. Losee agreed that a good solution would be to move the trees to another location in the city if it is not possible to relocate them on this site.

With respect to condition 1.3, Mr. Wolf agreed they can make some improvements to the base of the building, but would be reluctant to adjust the columns. He requested deletion of condition 1.4, dealing with the top of the building. He noted the elevator penthouse rises 19 ft. above the last elevator stop, and they are well below the maximum permitted height in this zone. Mr. Wolf agreed that a water feature can be reintroduced, as called for in condition 1.5.

Comments from Other Speakers

None.

The meeting adjourned briefly for Board and Panel members to review the model and posted materials.

Panel Opinion

Mr. Francl said there was a suggestion from a member of the Urban Design Panel that the landscaped space to the northwest of the building could be used as an amenity area, noting it is the only sunny location on the site. The Panel had no concerns about its proximity to the fire hall. Mr. Francl urged the applicant to try to achieve some usable open space in this location. The Panel supported enlarging the plaza at the easterly end of the site and moving the benches into this area. The height of the tower was not specifically identified when the project was reviewed by the Urban Design Panel. However, Mr. Francl observed that the two-storey glazed portion at the top could be lowered, noting it would highlight other prominent features, such as the elevator and the adjoining segment of the tower to the south. Their current relatively uniform height is not particularly advantageous in design terms. The Panel was generally very supportive of the project.

Mr. Scott recommended approval and said it is a handsome project. With respect to the trees, Mr. Scott said the sidewalks should be left alone if it means the trees can be saved.

Mr. Mortensen agreed it is a handsome building on a fairly difficult site. He also agreed the existing sidewalks should be retained in favour of retaining the mature trees. He also appreciated the applicant's gesture to relocate trees elsewhere in the city if necessary. Mr. Mortensen said he thought there might have been an opportunity to provide some semi private open space on the roof deck. He supported the application.

Ms. Leduc commended the applicant for a well designed building on a difficult site. She agreed it would be better to sacrifice some curb grass if some trees can be saved. She also thought the applicant should try to achieve some semi private open space to the northwest, provided it does not involve a reconfiguration of the ground floor. Ms. Leduc recommended deleting condition 1.3, with the design details at the base of the building left to the architect. She also recommended deleting 1.4.

Board Discussion

Mr. Rudberg agreed this is a difficult site and he hoped this application would be successful, noting there have been a number of previously approved applications which did not proceed. With respect to the conditions, Mr. Rudberg said he was not convinced that the northwest open space needs to be developed if it proves to be very difficult or unworkable. He agreed to retain condition 1.3, on the understanding that the adjustments sought are fairly minor. He moved amendments to 1.1 and A.1.12, deletion of 1.4, and confirmation of 1.5.

Mr. Beasley agreed it is a good project. He urged the applicant to do more work on the ground plane landscaping, noting that semi private open spaces are very important in high density areas. An effort should be made to achieve some usable open space to the northwest, which need not involve major adjustments to the scheme. Mr. Beasley strongly supported Mr. Rudberg's amendment regarding the trees, noting the existing mature trees on this site are a valuable asset to the neighbourhood. There is no reason to move the existing trees over the rectifier station, and the applicant's proposed solution for the other trees on the site, which may not be able to remain, is very good. Mr. Beasley added, he believes the proposed all-residential use is preferable to the previous hotel proposal which had impacts on neighbouring residents.

Mr. MacGregor strongly concurred with Mr. Rudberg's comment that the changes requested in 1.3 are very minor. In addition, he requested that Engineering Services review the width of the sidewalk to ensure it is suitable for the high volume of pedestrians in this area, including adequate access for disabled.

Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. 406228, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated April 3, 2002, with the following amendments:

Amend the **Note to Applicant** in 1.1 to change "should" to "may";

Delete 1.4;

Confirm 1.5;

Amend A.1.12 to read:

design development to retain as many trees as possible along Smithe Street, including keeping the existing sidewalk in its current location if that assists in retaining the trees. Any trees that need to be moved should be relocated to an alternate site (on public property) within the downtown core, in consultation with the Park Board.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

**4. 828 CARDERO STREET - DE406407 - ZONE C-5
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: Rositch Hemphill & Associates

Request: To construct a five-storey retail/residential building with one-and one-half levels of underground parking, and incorporating the transfer of heritage floor space in the amount of 2,856 sq. ft.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

The Development Planner, Bob Adair, presented the application, referring to a context model, a project model and posted drawings. He briefly reviewed the context of the site which is located at the southeast corner of Robson and Cardero Streets. The proposal comprises a single storey retail base with four storeys of residential above containing 36 dwelling units. Access to the residential component is through an entry lobby off Cardero Street. Access to parking and loading is at the rear from the lane. Issues identified by staff relate to the request for heritage density transfer, height relaxations and streetscape and massing.

The issue of heritage density is the main reason for this application to be brought to the Board. Staff have analysed the impact of the additional density with respect to height, shadowing, views and general massing. The overall height of the proposal is 53 ft. which is within the 60 ft. maximum permitted in this zone. However, the applicant is seeking relaxation of height envelope regulations that apply along the Robson, Cardero and lane elevations. These height envelope restrictions may be relaxed provided consideration is given to impacts on adjacent properties and response to notification. Shadow diagrams indicate the shadow impact does not extend to the sidewalk on the north side of Robson Street, nor is there major shadow impact to the west. Relaxation of the height angles at the rear has no shadow impact because it is to the south of the building. The only potential for view impact is on the Cardero Street elevation.

Staff have some concerns about the massing and streetscape, mainly that the single storey base is not adequate for a major retail street such as Robson. As well, staff are concerned that a single storey base could prejudice the redevelopment potential of neighbouring properties. Staff therefore recommend additional height at the ground floor on the Robson Street frontage and part of Cardero Street. This can be achieved either by adding a second storey or increasing the height of the first storey and detailing it appropriately. Staff are also concerned about the expression of the residential part of the building and recommend improvements, as called for in condition 1.2. These issues have been discussed with the applicant and staff believe they can be resolved satisfactorily.

Seven negative letters of response to notification have been received. The major concerns related to provision of adequate parking, increased traffic in the lane, and impact on nearby properties. The proposal does provide the required amount of parking. Staff also believe the lane, which is a 33 ft. wide commercial lane, can accommodate the additional vehicles generated by this project. Concerns were also expressed about light blockage to properties to the south on Cardero Street. Staff note that the angle relaxation at the lane results in the central portion of the building being approximately 7 ft. closer to the lane; however, it is still 15 ft. back from the lane and staff do not believe the impact on light access will be significant. Concerns about loss of view over this site were expressed by residents of the 3-1/2-storey residential building directly to the south. Staff note the proposal is below the outright permitted height of 60 ft. but at 53 ft. this proposal does preserve some views from taller buildings to the south. Staff are also recommending that the mechanical penthouse at the top of the building be reduced in size.

Mr. Adair noted the inclusion of a standard condition relating to minimum dwelling unit size. Development Services has consistently calculated minimum dwelling unit sizes from the inside face of all perimeter walls. By this measurement, four of the units are below the minimum of 400 sq.ft.. Staff note that the Director of Planning and the

Board have never knowingly approved units smaller than 400 sq.ft. except where there is some public benefit to be achieved (eg., non-market housing or guaranteed rental accommodation).

In summary, staff believe that, subject to the conditions outlined in the Staff Committee Report dated March 20, 2002, the proposal meets the standards discussed in the Character Guidelines for this section of Robson Street as well as general Planning guidelines on shadowing, views and privacy. Staff recommend approval of the additional heritage density and the relaxations of the height envelopes as requested.

Questions/Discussion

The following issues were clarified in response to questions from the Board and Advisory Panel:

- if the proposed single storey podium is permitted on this development, it would be potentially more difficult for the neighbouring site to develop in an acceptable way at two storeys, which is preferable on Robson Street;
- standard condition A.1.16 seeks confirmation that the notification sign is removed from the site once the application has been approved, to avoid confusing the public;
- a reduction in floor area is required, to a maximum of 2.42 FSR.

Applicant's Comments

Keith Hemphill, Architect, said they have spent considerable effort on the streetwall issue, following some constructive criticism from the Urban Design Panel. He noted there are no specific design guidelines applying to this zone but the C-5 zoning regulations indicate that the first storey shall be built to the front and side property lines and the remaining storeys may terrace back, which implies that a single storey frontage is quite acceptable. Retail viability was investigated, which indicated that a second storey retail use in this end of Robson Street is not viable. An alternative residential arrangement was also considered, bringing a façade to the second storey on the Robson Street frontage but a number of practical problems were identified. Mr. Hemphill presented a rendering to show that they have now arrived at a solution that they believe considerably improves the project.

With respect to height, Mr. Hemphill noted the height angle regulations work better with larger sites than this. The proposed 5-storey scheme allows more people to benefit by being able to see over the building. For the neighbours directly across the lane, there is no impact that would be any different than if they had built exactly to the building envelope specified in the by-law. With respect to materials, Mr. Hemphill questioned condition 1.4 which calls for a higher quality of materials. In discussion, it was agreed that this should be "high quality".

Mr. Hemphill said they are aware of the minimum unit size requirement. However, the Planning Department's method of calculation is quite different from what might be anticipated and they were not aware of this difference until quite recently. The City's method of calculation, to the inside face of the wall, is not addressed anywhere in public documents. Mr. Hemphill therefore requested the Board to consider relaxation of this requirement to allow them to retain as proposed the four units in question. Mr. Hemphill noted they have looked at other recently approved projects and while the Planning Department does not knowingly approve unit sizes that do not meet the minimum, there are many units on the market that are almost identical in area to what they are proposing. Mr. Hemphill also recommended that the Planning Department publish an official bulletin explaining the method of calculation that is required.

With the foregoing exceptions, Mr. Hemphill confirmed they can address the conditions contained in the report.

Discussion

With respect to the calculation of unit sizes, Mr. Adair said he is not aware of anything that would indicate the City has ever approved less than 400 sq.ft. measured to the inside of the perimeter walls, other than for achieving some sort of public benefit.

Comments from Other Speakers

Darlene Patrick, 1549 Haro Street, said she and her neighbours are very pleased to see the redevelopment of this very important corner. She pointed out that the scale of the context model is inaccurate. Ms. Patrick was concerned about shadow and view impacts. She said she would prefer the building to be situated closer to Robson Street and terraced, and that the building should be smaller on this small site. She noted that their parking entry is directly opposite the one proposed for this building, causing potential safety problems. She explained that they have to back

out of their garage into the lane. She also noted that this particular lane is a popular alternate route to Robson Street. Ms. Patrick was also concerned that the existing mature trees on the site might be in jeopardy with this development.

Mr. Adair confirmed the inaccuracy of the context model in that 1549 Haro is shown higher than it should be. In response to Ms. Patrick's concerns about shadowing, Mr. Adair reiterated that this project will never cast shadows on her building because it is to the south. With respect to view impacts, he noted that view loss is inevitable because a height of 60 ft. is permitted outright in this zone. He also explained that if the building is located closer to Robson Street, it would contravene the height envelope regulations which are intended to prevent shadowing on the northerly sidewalk. With respect to the trees, Mr. Adair noted they are on public property and he confirmed that they will be retained. Paul Pinsker, Parking & Development Engineer, addressed the issue of traffic in the lane. He explained they have calculated there will be approximately 30-35 vehicles in or out of this development in the peak hour of the day. With respect to the unusual access into the parking at 1549 Haro, Mr. Pinsker recommended installing a parabolic mirror to aid visibility.

Jim Deva, 1549 Haro Street, was concerned about loss of privacy. He questioned why the building is not closer to Robson Street and terraced back in a similar way to the development at 1688 Robson Street. He was concerned about the proportions of the residential component and said it does not fit in with the architecture of the retail below it. Mr. Deva was also concerned about the potential impact of the retail use on the existing retail on Davie and Denman Streets.

Patricia Hargreaves, 856 Cardero Street, was most concerned about the density of this proposal. She also thought the amount of parking being proposed is inadequate, and questioned the arrangements for garbage. Increased traffic in the lane was also a major concern.

Mr. Pinsker confirmed the amount of parking proposed for this building exceeds the parking requirements. He also noted that City Council recently modified the parking standards for restaurants to be the same as for retail in the C-5 and C-6 zones. Studies have shown that restaurant patrons in the West End either live there or are coming to the West End for another purpose, with restaurant being a secondary destination. Mr. Adair described the access to the garbage, which is located underground.

The Chair explained that this application would not be before the Board except for the request for transfer of ten percent heritage density, and the discretionary aspects, in part, relate to the height angles prescribed in the zoning.

Kal Bachra, Orca West Developments (developer of the subject site), noted they have been working closely with the Planning Department on the proposal. He pointed out that the building was located to ensure the survival of the trees. He noted the Urban Design Panel supported the extra ten percent density on this site. He added, they have worked on the height angle issue and the protrusions are very small. This proposal is responding to the needs of the market, providing opportunities for first time buyers to purchase a unit.

Panel Opinion

Mr. Francl noted this application was thoroughly debated by the Urban Design Panel and the issues raised by the neighbours were not considered to be significant. The Panel did feel very strongly about the urban treatment along Robson Street and the potential impact on neighbouring properties to the east. The applicant has subsequently responded very well to the concern that there should be a two-storey presentation to the street. Mr. Francl noted that several Panel members thought the building envelope, as currently situated, tends to drive the building further back than would be ideal for a more urbane presentation to Robson Street. However, the applicant has made adjustments to the façade on Robson Street that will adequately address these issues. Mr. Francl suggested it would not be particularly difficult to shift the building slightly further to the north, noting the Panel felt there was a perception that the mass tends to be rather far back on the site. Many other features of the project as proposed were considered to be quite handsomely detailed, and the materials and architectural treatment quite appropriate for this part of Robson Street. The Panel acknowledged the existence of the large trees on Cardero Street and considerable concern was expressed that they should be retained without any serious damage. In general, it was considered to be an appropriate project for Robson Street, at a density and height that did not seem to exceed what might be expected for a site of this size.

Mr. Chung said he did not believe it is necessary to have a two storeys along Robson Street, and at most it should be a partial second storey. He said the applicant has worked to deal with the site in the best way possible, in particular preserving the large trees. He sympathized with the neighbours to the rear, but noted that view loss would be inevitable. He thought a solution should be found for the parking arrangements and traffic in the lane, and possibly the applicant could help by installing parabolic mirrors.

Ms. Leduc recommended approval of the additional ten percent heritage density. With respect to the units that are below 400 sq.ft., she suggested that, in this case, the applicant be allowed to proceed as proposed. She noted there has been considerable reconfiguring of the mass to address all the constraints. As well, the issue has only recently come to light, and it is apparently not clear to developers how the unit size should be calculated. Otherwise, Ms. Leduc said the applicant appears to have met all the requirements and their suggested solutions to the conditions look quite attractive.

Mr. Mortensen also supported the transfer of heritage density to this site. He commented it is interesting to see the resolution of the Robson Street retail and he liked the applicant's contemplated response which gives the base more emphasis. Regarding the minimum unit size, Mr. Mortensen said it should be clear what the standard is for measurement and he supported requiring the minimum 400 sq.ft. as it is applied to all developments. He sympathized with the concerns of the neighbours but suggested that an "outright" development would have a greater impact. Pushing the building back to save the trees is also a public benefit. He recommended Engineering Services see what can be done to improve the conditions in the lane.

Mr. Scott noted there have been a lot of changes made to the proposal to date and he was pleased to see the latest rendition which is very favourable. He recommended approval of the application. He did not support relaxing the 400 sq.ft. minimum unit size and strongly recommended that the method of calculation be made clear to applicants.

Board Discussion

Mr. Beasley said he would have been concerned if the net effect of this building was shadowing on the buildings to the south, but this is clearly not the case. However, if the building is moved further to the north it will shadow the Robson Street sidewalk. It is in everyone's interest to keep the sun as much as possible on Robson Street because it is one of the key pedestrian streets of the West End, if not the whole city. Mr. Beasley stressed he would also have been concerned if this development had caused the loss of the trees on the boulevard. With respect to the lane, he noted this lane is significantly wider than those adjacent to most commercial streets, so there is ability to accommodate the extra traffic. Additional traffic calming measures may be necessary and should be investigated by Engineering Services. He also suggested the applicant might assist the residents across the lane by helping them to install a parabolic mirror. However, this applicant should not be held responsible for a design solution to an awkward parking arrangement on an adjacent property. Even with an "outright", insensitive development on this site, Mr. Beasley noted the three storey building behind would lose its views. However, the views are not made much worse by this scheme. The lower than maximum permitted height will also reduce the impact. Mr. Beasley said he was satisfied there is sufficient parking, noting that many West End residents do not own cars and at least one space per unit has been provided. He did not accept that the method of calculating unit size was a surprise, noting that other applicants are calculating it correctly. It would, however, be helpful for staff to publish a bulletin describing how the unit sizes are calculated so that there is no ambiguity. In this instance, a relaxation is not warranted. It would also set a negative precedent because the Board has been consistent in only doing so in cases where there is a significant public purpose served. As well, given the applicant is requesting an additional ten percent density, the Board is obliged to ensure the unit sizes meet the minimum prescribed in the by-law. Finally, Mr. Beasley said the applicant needs to work with staff and the neighbours on the treatment at the base of the lane, which could be more neighbourly. In general, it is quite a neighbourly, handsomely designed building and the changes that have occurred in the process have resulted in a better development.

Mr. MacGregor agreed the minimum unit size should be maintained, and noted the by-law refers to the amount of "living accommodation". He said he would not be prepared to approve the heritage transfer of density if the minimum unit size was not met. He also agreed it would be worthwhile for the matter to be clarified in a bulletin.

Mr. Rudberg supported the motion of approval. He also thought strongly that the minimum unit size requirement should be maintained and staff should pay particular attention to it, given it is an important public policy objective. With respect to the lane, Mr. Rudberg requested staff to review the situation to see if anything can be done to improve

safety around access to parking. He noted the Board is dealing with zoning that is in place and is not in a position to change it.

Mr. Scobie advised that the method of measuring the minimum dwelling unit size will be included with the next list of outstanding necessary miscellaneous text amendments. The information will therefore be provided as part of the by-law rather than by administrative bulletin.

Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. 406407, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated March 20, 2002, with the following amendments:

Amend 1.4 to change "higher" to "high";

Confirm 1.7;

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

5. OTHER BUSINESS**1399 Chess Street (new City Works Yard)**

This application is scheduled to be considered by the Board on May 13, 2002. Mr. Scobie advised that some public concern has been expressed about the time of this meeting, with suggestions that it should be held in the evening or a weekend. It was noted the Board always meets at 3.00 pm on Mondays. While the public is welcome to attend its meetings, the purpose of the Board is not only to hear from the public (unlike a Public Hearing). In discussion, the Board did not think its usual practice should be changed. It was noted that public delegations are frequently not heard until the early evening anyway, and many members of the public indicate that they prefer to attend in the afternoon. Members of the Advisory Panel agreed, although Mr. Chung pointed out that a 3.00 pm meeting time may limit students from participating, noting the City's policy of encouraging young people to get involved in civic affairs.

Mr. Rudberg advised he does not intend to participate on this application, given it is an Engineering Services project.

Board Procedures

Mr. Scobie advised it is intended that the Board formally adopt its procedures, to provide greater certainty to the public as to how the Board conducts its business. He is working with Ms. Hubbard to bring forward draft procedures in the near future.

1280 Richards Street

This development application was approved by the Board on February 4, 2002. The approval was recently the subject of a third party appeal to the Board of Variance and the Development Permit Board's decision was overturned. The minutes of the Board of Variance meeting will be forwarded to Board members as soon as they are available. A staff presentation was also recommended, in order to understand the logic of why the Board's decision was overturned.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6.20 pm.

C. Hubbard
Clerk to the Board
/ch

F. Scobie
Chair