

Date: Monday, December 10, 2001
 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

T. Bunting* Representative of the Design Professions (Urban Design Panel)
 P. Kavanagh* Representative of Development Industry
 J. Ross Representative of Development Industry
 D. Chung* Representative of General Public
 J. Leduc Representative of General Public
 M. Mortenson* Representative of General Public
 R. Bruce Scott Representative of General Public

*present for first application only

Regrets

J. Hancock Representative of the Design Professions

ALSO PRESENT:

R. Segal Senior Development Planner
 M.B. Rondeau Development Planner
 L. Schmidt Project Facilitator
 F. Hill Project Facilitator
 G. McGeough Heritage Planner
 M. Thomson City Surveyor
 B. Macdonald Parking Engineer
 S. Harvey Social & Cultural Planner

Item 3 - 298 Thurlow Street - DE406001 - Zone CD-1

J. Cheng James K.M. Cheng Architects
 D. Guspie James K.M. Cheng Architects
 I. Gillespie Westbank Projects
 C. Philips Philips Wuori Long Landscape Architects

Item 4 - 2300 Ash Street - DE406035 - Zone C-3A

R. Chernoff Chernoff Thompson Architects
 S. Cressey Cressey Development
 N. Godfrey Cressey Development

Clerk to the Board: C. Hubbard

1. MINUTES

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

THAT the Minutes of the Development Permit Board and Advisory Panel Meeting of November 26, 2001 be approved.

2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

None.

3. 298 THURLOW STREET - DE406001 - ZONE CD-1 (COMPLETE APPLICATION)

Applicant: James K.M. Cheng Architects

Request: To construct a 40-storey, mixed-use, high-rise tower containing retail, office, live/work (129 units) and childcare uses, with 5 levels of underground parking accessed off Cordova Street and the right of way known as Waterfront Road.

To exclude from FSR, a public atrium area of approximately 5,740 sq. ft. located on the main floor level, under the Interior Public Space Guidelines.

The Chairman made reference to a memorandum to the Board from the Development Permit Staff Committee dated November 29, 2001. This memorandum is a follow-up to the Staff Committee Report dated October 3, 2001, which the Board reviewed on October 15, 2001. The Board deferred the application at that time so that the issue of the design related to the potential changing grade could be resolved.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

The Development Planner, Ralph Segal, presented the application, referring to the earlier Staff Committee Report and the November 29, 2001 memorandum. The two outstanding issues were the design grade to which this project should be built at its northerly and westerly edge and the design of the parkade.

After reviewing further view analysis and issues relating to the public realm interface, agreement was reached with the applicant that the northerly interface can be designed at an elevation of 14.5 m, without compromising street-end views. Acceptance of the 14.5 m elevation alleviates the possibility of retrofitting the project at a future date. Mr. Segal noted the 201 Burrard Landing CD-1 zoning was enacted recently by Council. Condition A.1.12 can therefore now be deleted. It was noted that condition A.2.8 can also be deleted because the subdivision has now been approved and registered.

With respect to the parkade design, a consensus has not been reached between staff and the applicant and there are two options presented for the Board's consideration. Staff recommend Option A, the applicant prefers Option B.

Mr. Segal drew the Board's attention to a letter dated November 22, 2001 from representatives of the owners of the Marine Building and Guinness Tower, withdrawing their previous objection to the height of the eastern shoulder of the tower. Condition 1.5 can therefore now be deleted. Mr. Segal also noted the applicant is no longer pursuing an FSR exclusion for an atrium under the Public Interior Space Guidelines.

Mr. Segal tabled some minor corrections to the recommended conditions contained in Appendix A attached to the November 29, 2001 memorandum. He advised the Staff Committee recommends approval of the application, subject to the recommended conditions and the Board's further deliberation with respect to the parkade.

Questions/Discussion

Mr. Ross and Mr. Kavanagh raised some questions concerning condition A.2.9. Mr. Segal explained that 175 public parking spaces for Arts Complex patrons was concluded by staff to be a fair allocation against this property. Mike Thomson, City Surveyor, recalled the applicant's earlier concern about permanently designating parking spaces for the arts complex and noted they will now be designated as public parking, not necessarily for arts complex patrons. In discussion, it was agreed condition A.2.9 should be modified to provide greater clarification.

Referring to condition 1.2 which deals with Interim Edge Treatment, Mr. Beasley expressed concern about what occurs once there is construction to the north, and the need to ensure any temporary fencing is ultimately removed.

Applicant's Comments

James Cheng, Architect, suggested the Board could forego a staff presentation of Option A and B for the parking layout and access, noting they have concluded, after clarifying staff's intent for the parking and further study, that neither option is satisfactory. They have arrived at an alternative scheme which they believe works better. The Board members agreed they would prefer to deal with the most current proposal for the parking. Mr. Cheng noted the main reason for staff's objection is the lack of a turnaround, essentially forcing drivers who accidentally find their way down the ramp to then have to drive east as far as Main Street. Mr. Cheng briefly described their new scheme (Option 12) which has an internal ramp and allows for an exit at the lower level with a left-hand turn back onto the exterior ramp. The disadvantage of this arrangement is that it entails excavating one more level down, below the water table. A further solution (Option 13) would take advantage of the ramp (to be constructed by Marathon and ultimately handed over to the City), with the live/work residents entering the parkade off Cordova Street and all others entering at an intermediate level off the ramp. This is essentially two garages with two separate entrances and is their preferred option. General discussion ensued. Bob McDonald, Parking Engineer, stressed that Engineering Services remains strongly in support of Option A, with one, combined principal access. He also questioned the viability of an access point off the ramp, given the steep grade.

The applicant's parking consultant, Paul Bunt, said he believed the fundamental problem relates to the relative weight being attributed to the various user groups, with the City giving top priority to Arts Complex patrons. He reviewed the parking garage design and its operation and stressed the importance of having parking for the live/work use at the upper levels. In summary, Mr. Bunt said he believes Option 13 could work and it is possible to modify the ramp to allow an intermediate level access. Ian Gillespie, Westbank Projects, described their needs for the parkade and, in response to a question from the Chair, confirmed their first choice would be Option B and their second, Option 13. Dawn Guspie, Architect, added, the parkade has to be as user friendly as possible to all user groups, both in terms of access and internally. In response to a question from Mr. Beasley concerning Option 13, Mr. McDonald briefly described the difficulties involved in providing access off the ramp. At the request of Mr. Ross, Mr. McDonald reviewed Engineering's position on Options B, 12 and 13. In summary, he reiterated Engineering's strong support for Option A which has a common, strongly identifiable access point. General discussion ensued. With respect to Option 13, Mr. Thomson pointed out that moving the ramp to the east (to allow a more gentle grade) is probably not possible due to the location of the Skytrain right-of-way. Ms. Leduc commented she agreed with the applicant that the live/work parking should be separated. She also questioned staff's promotion of Option A when it is clearly unacceptable to the applicant.

Mr. Rudberg noted there are public objectives to be considered as well as private interests and the City must try to achieve a balance with respect to the design and operation of the parkade. In the discussion that followed, Mr. Gillespie asked the Board to also consider the requirements of the proposed major tenant of this building (Shaw Communication) and the public interest of creating a thousand jobs in the Downtown.

With respect to the parking spaces for the childcare facility, Mr. Cheng requested an amendment to condition 1.3 to delete reference to "without a parking pass card". Their preference is for the daycare users to pass

through a checkpoint so that these users can access the parking space for a limited period of time, at no charge. Sue Harvey, Social & Cultural Planner, explained the aim is to provide convenience to parents and caregivers dropping off their children and to avoid the necessity of having one parking pass associated with each child. She suggested an amendment to condition 1.3.

Comments from Other Speakers

None.

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

Panel Opinion

Mr. Bunting congratulated the applicant and staff on their efforts to arrive at a solution. He also complimented the Board for agreeing to consider such late negotiations to find a resolution. Mr. Bunting said he saw merit in the option which has a second access off the Cordova ramp, although its feasibility is not yet proven. Clearly, however, any resolution must be mutually acceptable. Commenting on earlier references to other downtown buildings with shared parking access, Mr. Bunting said he did not believe they are acceptable but are second-rate entries into high-end residential buildings. He urged that whatever decision is made, the principles should be clearly identified and agreed upon. This includes separation of parking access, which Mr. Bunting said is fairly important in this use. Given there is a ramp available on Cordova Street, he said he would like to see a solution which allows the public to loop back out, possibly combining it with the daycare drop-off. He said he was persuaded by most of the applicant's arguments that if this aspect is resolved it would result in a win-win situation.

Mr. Ross commented that the major issues around the parking suggests it is premature for the application to be before the Board. Option A is clearly not satisfactory to the applicant and he could not recommend it. He also recognized the City's concerns regarding Option B. He said he agreed with the traffic consultant that having the entrance for the arts complex parking closer to that facility makes sense. In summary, Mr. Ross said he tended towards recommending Option B but that staff and the applicant must resolve the problems.

Mr. Kavanagh said it is clear that everyone is trying to reach the same goal of making the parkade user-friendly. He commented that all the parking is "public", including the office workers and the live/work residents who are also members of the public. He also noted that this applicant has often shown ability and attention to producing the best workable solution. As long as the City's concerns about the ramp grade are addressed then it should be left to the applicant to design the best possible solution for the parkade. He suggested an amendment to condition A.2.9.

Ms. Leduc agreed that Option A will not work. She said one of the key factors in this project is the thousand jobs that will be created in the downtown and the City must do what it can to facilitate it. She said there has to be a division between the residential and the commercial uses, for safety and marketability reasons. Option B therefore looks like a workable option, with amendments worked out with staff. Ms. Leduc added that, with good signage, casual visitors should be able to find their way into the parkade.

Mr. Scott also recommended Option B, with finetuning and agreement between the applicant and staff.

Mr. Mortensen also supported Option B, being a cleaner solution which separates the residential from the commercial parking. He commented there is some merit to locating the residential parking lower than that for visitors. However, he agreed there must be some mutually acceptable solution. Mr. Mortensen also acknowledged the importance of the proposed major tenant who will bring a considerable number of jobs to the city.

Option B was also recommended by Mr. Chung as being the cleaner solution. It also provides greater security for the live/work residents. He added, however, that there has to be a better configuration to make it as

user-friendly as possible for infrequent visitors.

Board Discussion

Mr. Rudberg said he was concerned that the Board was having to deal with unresolved issues at this stage. Clearly, there are private interests involved with regard to the efficiency and cost of the parking. There are also private issues with regard to the separation of uses, namely, security and ease of use. As well, there are the public interests of providing good, safe, convenient parking, including arts complex visitors. The challenge is how to achieve a balance between private and public interests. In moving approval of the application, Mr. Rudberg acknowledged the Advisory Panel's strong support of Option B. He stressed there needs to be good signage so that the public is as informed as possible. There also needs to be some provision for a turnaround so that there is a way for visitors to exit in the event the parkade is full. The daycare drop-off also needs to be better addressed.

Mr. Beasley seconded Mr. Rudberg's motion. Notwithstanding the focus of today's discussion, Mr. Beasley commented that this project is much more important than parking because it models a new kind of development. It reinforces the commercial development of the downtown and job creation and provides diversity in housing. He agreed with providing a turnaround, on-site and simple, without involving a complete re-vamp of the parkade. He stressed this project needs a decision. It will help to set the pace for other projects to further contribute to the downtown housing stock and revitalize the important downtown commercial component. He also noted that proceeding with Option B means there will be grade level landscape on the plaza.

Mr. MacGregor agreed it is time to proceed with the project. He commented, he was not totally comfortable with the solution because the issue around the entrance off Cordova Street is one of marketing the live/work component. On this site, more than any other in the downtown, there is opportunity to have a very convenient lower level entrance for the live/work residents. It is therefore unfortunate that there has been so much emphasis on the costs associated with the other options. He agreed, however, that the City has to try to facilitate economic development in the downtown and this project is important. With respect to condition A.2.9, Mr. MacGregor added he would like to see that the parking operator contributes to any extra costs associated with peak congestion times, if they occur. He asked that this be included in the legal agreement referred to in the condition. Mr. Rudberg agreed that this can be considered when the agreement is formulated.

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. 406001, in accordance with the Memorandum dated November 29, 2001, with the following amendments:

Add to 1.2:

, including the ultimate removal and making-good of any temporary guardrails, planters, etc., in order to complete the intended public realm treatment and interface;

Delete 1.3 under Parking Layout and Access for Parking Option A;

Amend 1.3, Parking Layout and Access (Option B):

- ~~the column locations for the future viaduct and the vertical alignment of the adjacent streets, including a detailed analysis which demonstrates the provision of acceptable sight distances~~, including a detailed analysis which provides the minimum sight distances;
- the seven parking spaces serving the needs of the childcare facility are to be located in compliance with the Childcare Design Guidelines noting that these spaces must also be located ~~near the staffed parking booth and accessible without a parking pass card~~ *more conveniently and with operational access, to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Engineering Services and Director of Social Planning;*

Add to 1.3:

- *provision of a convenient turnaround opportunity for patrons of the office/public parking;*

Delete 1.5;

Delete A.1.12;

Add to A.2.6:

(m) acceptable slope within the driveway crossing from Waterfront Road to the loading area;

Note to Applicant: The 10 percent slope across the boulevard or sidewalk area is too steep. Relocation of the loading area further to the east may alleviate this difficulty. Regardless, the applicant should demonstrate that the effective vertical clearance achieves the required minimum 11.5 ft. (3.5 m). This should include taking into account the final slope on entry. Furthermore, the applicant is strongly encouraged to consider providing additional vertical clearance to serve a broader spectrum of trucks.

Delete A.2.8;

Amend A.2.9:

prior to issuance of the development permit, the applicant shall enter into an agreement to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Engineering Services and the Directors of Legal Services and the Office of Cultural Affairs to provide access at prevailing market rates to 175 conveniently accessible automobile parking spaces which are ~~designated~~ *available* as public parking ~~for use and which may be used~~ by the City's adjacent public amenity (Arts Complex) between the hours of 6:00 p.m. and 12:00 a.m. Monday through Friday, and between 12:00 p.m. and 12:00 a.m. on weekends and statutory holidays.

4. 2300 ASH STREET - DE406035 - ZONE C-3A (COMPLETE APPLICATION)

Applicant: Chernoff Thompson Architects

Request: To develop this site with a 6-storey health care office building, including retail at grade, with 3 levels of underground parking and to relocate, restore and designate the Shaw heritage 'B' house for office use.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

The Development Planner, Mary Beth Rondeau, presented this complete application in the C-3A zone. 1.0 FSR and 30 ft. height is permitted outright in C-3A, relaxable up to 3.0 FSR and 90 ft. The application seeks a height of 87.5 ft. Existing on the site on 7th Avenue is the heritage 'B' Shaw house which the applicant proposes to relocate to Ash Street next to another existing heritage 'B' house (not part of this site). The proposal is to fully restore and designate the Shaw house, for which additional density is sought, for a total density of 3.05 FSR. Under Section 3.2.5 of the by-law, the Board may approve additional density above 3.0 FSR where the cost of rehabilitating a heritage resource causes hardship. Real Estate Services has reviewed this issue and has concluded the additional FSR is warranted. Ms. Rondeau noted there was a previously approved development application for this site in 1997 which proposed ground floor commercial use, a residential tower to a height of 107 ft. and a 4- and 5-storey residential podium at the corner of 7th Avenue and Ash Street. The height relaxation at that time was in recognition of the heritage resource.

The current proposal is for retail use along 7th Avenue, providing continuous weather protection and street trees. As well, there are currently four driveway crossings on Ash and 7th which will be closed, completing the pedestrian sidewalk in this location. Some improvement is sought to the retail podium (condition 1.4). The remainder of the 6-storey building is for health care/office use, which could be medical research laboratories or medical/dental offices. The proposed use is supportable in this Central Broadway location. An open space is proposed at the corner of 7th Avenue and Ash Street. Staff are requesting that this be secured for public use (condition A.1.8), which would also contribute to the application earning the additional density and height. Some refinement to the space is sought in condition 1.2. A view corridor passes over the easterly end of the site which the massing of this building respects. However, condition 1.7 calls for any landscape to be kept low enough not to intrude into the view corridor. The proposal also requests a variation in the massing from that suggested in the guidelines, although there are benefits in terms of shadowing as a result of the narrowing of the building at the front. No concerns about view blockage have been expressed by people to the rear of this building.

In summary, Ms. Rondeau noted the following areas in which this proposal earns the additional height and density it seeks: securing the open space for public use, preservation of the view corridor, improved massing, creation of a heritage streetscape on Ash Street which in turn creates a transitional massing between the Fairview Slopes neighbourhood and the Cambie/Broadway corridor, pedestrian amenity, lane dedications, and high quality building materials. In general, the heritage Shaw house earns its own way in the additional density for the restoration and designation of the property. Ms. Rondeau noted that concerns have been expressed by residents of the "Omega" (638 West 7th Avenue, directly west of this site) about view blockage. Staff note, however, that many of these views would be lost by an "outright" and guideline/conditional development of this site. Their northerly views are not affected.

Ms. Rondeau tabled amendments to conditions A.1.7 and A.1.8, noting the Staff Committee recommendation is to approve the application, subject to the conditions outlined in the report dated November 14, 2001.

Questions/Discussion

In response to a question from Mr. MacGregor concerning the deck area at the corner, Mr. Chernoff explained

they are hoping the heritage house might ultimately accommodate a café and this area could be used for outdoor seating. Mr. Chernoff tabled a suggested a revision to condition 1.2 which addresses the concern about the publicness of this area. Gerry McGeough, Heritage Planner, briefly described the procedure for designating the Shaw house.

Mr. Scobie sought clarification with respect to the lane, which is substandard and in a "T" configuration. Ms. Rondeau said the Staff Committee had no concerns about the lane being able to handle the traffic, noting the T configuration helps the situation. Mr. Thomson noted the building to the south does not take its parking access off the lane and Engineering Services believes the lane can support the parking access as proposed for this development, with the three lane access points. With respect to the future potential relocation of the heritage house at 2310 Ash Street (not part of this development), Mr. Thomson agreed the 10 ft. pinch-point in the lane could exist for some time.

Applicant's Comments

Russell Chernoff, Architect, commented on the importance of the corner and the relocation/retention of the Shaw House, noting it forces the building to be pushed back away from Ash Street which is a positive aspect of the project. Mr. Chernoff gave a brief overview of the potential users of the building, noting this is an excellent location for bio-tech uses because of its proximity to the hospitals. He stressed the bio-tech users require flexible space and noted that buildings of this nature also require a larger footprint than office buildings. Mr. Chernoff briefly described the design and said he had no concerns with the conditions recommended by staff, with minor amendments suggested to 1.2 and 1.4. Ms. Rondeau confirmed these amendments are acceptable to staff.

Comments from Other Speakers

Dr. Richard Stavik, spoke on behalf of the owners of 638 West 7th Avenue. He advised that some of their concerns have been addressed but they believe there are still some negative aspects that will impact the neighbours. Dr. Stavik noted the existing neighbourhood is primarily residential, especially in the 600 block West 7th Avenue. Their concerns relate to the size of the building and its aesthetic impact on the neighbourhood, traffic congestion, and impact on property values. Dr. Stavik also presented a petition signed by 96 residents, objecting to the requested height and density relaxations being sought.

In response to a question from Mr. Beasley, Dr. Stavik said the residents would rather have a 4-storey building, in keeping with the rest of the block. The increase in traffic will also be an issue for the bicycle route, regardless of the elimination of the existing four vehicular access points across the sidewalk, noting that some of these access points are not functional. In response to a further question from Mr. Beasley, Dr. Stavik advised he was not informed by his realtor that there was an approved development application on this site, for a taller building than the current proposal.

Mr. Bruce Redpath, owner of Max's Deli, and his consultant, Mr. Jim Lehto, addressed the Board. Mr. Redpath said he had no problem with the design of the building and its use. His concerns related to the lane, noting there are three points of access which are substandard. This development will increase congestion in the lane and overload the entrances. He recommended that access to this site be off West 7th Avenue or Ash Street rather than the lane, as proposed. Referring to a diagram, Mr. Lehto described the existing lane conditions.

Mr. Thomson said Engineering Services prefers not to see crossings introduced on West 7th Avenue because they would interfere with bicycles, pedestrians and possibly street trees. He agreed there is no question that the lane is currently constricted by the 16 ft. north-south leg and the southerly leg behind the liquor store; however, the east-west lane is 20 ft. for most of its length. He reiterated they believe the lane will be able to support the traffic generated by this development.

Mr. Frits Huckriede, representing owners of 587 West 7th Avenue, referred to his letter dated November 29, 2001 which outline their concerns. Mr. Jan Timmer, Architect, who has been retained by the owners to design a building on their site, described some recommended amendments to the massing which would address their

concerns.

In response to a question from Mr. Beasley concerning the massing, Mr. Chernoff advised the building has a lot of stepping and is set back from Ash Street. Ms. Rondeau also noted the building is narrow across the front which reduces shadow impact across the street.

Panel Opinion

Mr. Ross noted there is a big need for biotech space in the city currently. He recommended approval of the application. It is a well thought-out, quality building, in a mixed use area with mixed heights. The proposal is preferable to a 4-storey "box" on the site, and the retention of the heritage house and the open space are beneficial to the neighbourhood. Mr. Ross supported the proposed vehicular access off the lane, notwithstanding its less than ideal condition at present. He did not support stepping back the building and increasing the height.

Mr. Scott supported the application. He did not support stepping back the building. He had some concerns about the parking access off the lane and suggested the developer help the constricted situation by adding mirrors, rounding off corners, etc. to make it as user friendly as possible.

Ms. Leduc also supported the application and noted there is a need for more biotech space. She was very pleased to see that the Shaw house will be preserved and designated. She questioned if the City could do anything to facilitate the early redevelopment of 2310 Ash Street so that the lane can be fully upgraded.

Board Discussion

Mr. Beasley acknowledged the Advisory Panel's advice about not stepping back the building given its impact on the program. He noted the proposal also performs better, from a shadowing point of view, than a Guideline scheme. The public benefits of this scheme are significantly better than often achieved in the C-3A zone, noting the preservation of the heritage house and a significant public open space. With respect to parking access, Mr. Beasley said he believed it is better to use the lane, even though it is somewhat constricted, and work towards a long term solution. He moved approval of the application, with some amendments to the conditions.

Mr. MacGregor supported the application. He commented this is a difficult area but this proposal has achieved an appropriate balance. There is no easy solution to the parking access off the lane given that achieving an acceptable lane geometry is a long process but many sites in the city function with substandard lanes. Restoration and dedication of the heritage house is important and it provides considerable benefits to this development. He recommended a further amendment to condition 1.2, which was accepted by Mr. Beasley.

Mr. Rudberg supported the application. He concurred with Mr. Beasley that in terms of what is commonly achieved in the C-3A this application has certainly earned the additional height and density being requested.

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. 406035, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated November 14, 2001, with the following amendments:

Amend 1.2:

design development to enlarge the public area of the corner plaza by *integrating* ~~deleting~~ the northerly, raised deck *into the plaza to create an outdoor seating area to be used by the Shaw House and users of the*

adjacent public realm, to be covered by a right-of-way agreement associated with the Shaw House and replacing it with sloping landscaping or lawn area (see Standard Condition A.1.9 regarding public access to the corner plaza);

Amend 1.4:

design development to refine the detailing and provide *high* ~~higher~~ quality materials on the 2-storey podium and canopies to improve architectural expression and pedestrian amenity along the 7th Avenue frontage;

Amend A.1.7:

arrangements shall be made, ~~such as an option to purchase or other arrangements,~~ to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Engineering Services, for the dedication of the southerly 3.05 m (10 ft.) of Lot 2 Ex. East 9 ft., and the southerly 3.05 m (10 ft.) Of Lot 3 East Ptn, both Block 320, Plan 590, District Lot 526;

Add new A.1.8:

dedication of (or other arrangements such as an option to purchase to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Engineering Services and the Director of Legal Services) the south 3.05 m (10 ft.) of Lot 1 except the south 40 feet;

Renumber A.1.8 - A.1.23 to A.1.9 - A.1.24.

5. OTHER BUSINESS

None.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8.05 pm.

C. Hubbard
Clerk to the Board

F. Scobie
Chair

/ch

Q:\Clerical\DPB\Minutes\2001\Dec10.wpd