

Meeting: No. 483
Date: Monday, July 10, 2000
Time: 3.00 p.m.
Place: No. 1 Committee Room, City Hall

PRESENT:**Board**

F. Scobie Director of Development Services [Chair]
L. Beasley Co-Director of Planning
B. MacGregor Deputy City Manager
T. Timm Deputy City Engineer

Advisory Panel

J. Cheng Representative of the Design Professions [Urban Design Panel]
J. Hancock Representative of the Design Professions
P. Kavanagh Representative of Development Industry
R. Mingay Representative of General Public
M. Mortenson Representative of General Public
R. Roodenburg Representative of General Public

Absent

A. Gjernes Representative of Development Industry
J. Leduc Representative of General Public

ALSO PRESENT:

R. Segal Development Planner
N. Peters City Surveyor

Item 3 - 1300 West Pender Street - DE404571- Zone DD

J. Bingham Howard Bingham Hill Architects
A. Hamilton Howard Bingham Hill Architects
J. Whittle Howard Bingham Hill Architects

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 June 12, 2000 be approved.

2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

None.

**3. 1300 WEST PENDER STREET - DE404571 - ZONE DD
(COMPLETE AFTER PRELIMINARY)**

Applicant: Howard Bingham Hill Architects

Request: To construct a 34-storey residential tower, containing 231 dwelling-units (including 5 townhouse units along Jervis Street), and a three-storey commercial building with an adjoining one-storey retail space with five townhouse units above and in behind, all atop three levels of underground parking.

The Chair noted this application was approved in principle on March 6, 2000. The Board's review of this complete submission will deal only with the applicant's response to the conditions that were established at the preliminary approval stage. Issues that were addressed at the preliminary stage will not be revisited.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

The Development Planner, Ralph Segal, presented this application, referring to a scale model of the proposed development and a larger context model. He described the site location and identified the buildings in the immediate area. He briefly reviewed the proposed development, noting it has a total FSR of 6.0, of which 0.5 FSR is commercial and the balance residential.

At the preliminary stage, the main concerns raised by neighbours at 1331 West Georgia Street (The Pointe) related to the proximity of the proposed tower to The Pointe and view blockage. At that time, the separation between the two buildings met the guideline minimum of 80 ft., which the Board concluded was sufficient. However, the Board asked that the floor plate of the tower be reduced in size from the proposed 7,250 sq.ft. (approx.). The floor plate of the complete submission is 6,950 sq.ft. While the broad objective had been to approach a floor plate size of 6,500 sq.ft., staff believe the current proposal satisfies the intent of the objective in that the tower dimensions have been reduced, resulting in some improvement to views for The Pointe. However, the reworking of the tower floor plate and its configuration has resulted in the southwest corner encroaching into the 80 ft. tower separation, to within about 76 ft. Staff believe the minimum 80 ft. separation should be maintained, as called for in condition 1.1 of the Staff Committee Report dated June 28, 2000.

In response to privacy concerns raised at the preliminary stage by residents of The Pointe, the Board directed the applicant to minimize the amount of clear glazing on the south elevation. While this has been done in the complete submission, staff are concerned that the painted concrete now on this elevation presents a rather blank appearance. Noting it will also be highly visible from Georgia Street, staff are recommending improvement to the treatment of this elevation (condition 1.7).

Staff also recommend a number of other conditions relating to the public realm and architectural design, with improvements sought to the sidewalk treatment, particularly at the Jervis/Pender corner, as well as improved public interface with the townhouses. Staff also recommended that the architecture of the townhouses be differentiated from that of the commercial space. Mr. Segal noted there is an existing mature maple tree on City

right-of-way which staff believe should be preserved. Staff are also seeking improvement to the blank wall at the rear of the landscape pool. With respect to the Broughton/Pender corner, staff believe the covered open space should be reconsidered in favour of bringing the commercial building closer to the corner, with a strong architectural expression.

Extensive and detailed response to notification has been received from residents of The Pointe. Staff response to the concerns is outlined in the report and, to the extent possible, they have been addressed in the suggested prior-to conditions. The Staff Committee recommendation is for approval of the application, subject to the conditions contained in the report.

In response to a question from Mr. Timm concerning condition 1.5, Mr. Segal noted the parapet of the two-storey townhouses has been raised by about a foot since the preliminary submission. Staff are concerned about this increase in height and its view impact on The Pointe plaza, and believe there are ways of addressing the entrance to the townhouses to create a more private interface without raising parapet height.

Applicant's Comments

Mr. John Bingham, Architect, said they believe all the issues are resolvable. He noted they have paid considerable attention to massaging the envelope to cause minimum impact on The Pointe. This has been achieved by increasing volume at the lower levels, introducing townhouses on Jervis Street and maximizing the townhouses along the lane. Mr. Bingham acknowledged the 80 ft. tower separation has been breached. However, he noted the area of encroachment is only in the order of 2,700 sq.ft. and they were able to achieve the narrowing of the building and minor view improvement for The Pointe. Mr. Bingham agreed that alternative treatment could be considered for the rear elevation. He also noted the massaging of the tower has resulted in a small area on the Pender Street side being overheight, by 2 ft. 8 in. He noted they raised the parapet on the west side but have since been informed that height is measured to the top of the parapet, which is impacting the overall height measurement.

With respect to the issues raised by the Development Planner, Mr. Bingham agreed they can provide greater animation in the pool area. With respect to the height of the townhouses off the lane, Mr. Bingham advised of a dimensional error on the drawing which should read 8 ft. 7 in. and not 10 ft. 2 in. He agreed they can rework this area if it has been raised by a foot since the preliminary submission. The landscaping issues can be dealt with.

Discussion

With respect to the building height, the Chair noted condition A.1.2 calls for compliance with Section 4 of the DODP, which will necessitate a lowering of 9 ft. 6 in.

Mr. Beasley sought clarification from the applicant with respect to how the 80 ft. minimum separation can be achieved. Noting they have looked at the options, Mr. Bingham said they believe their response is reasonable and he asked the Board to relax this condition. Mr. Segal reiterated that staff think the 80 ft. separation can be achieved. With respect to the height of the building, Mr. Segal advised the height limit in this area is 300 ft., relaxable up to 450 ft. Staff believe the height of the parapet can be reduced without any negative impact on the aesthetics of the building. View and shadow impact of a modest (about 5 ft.) overheight would be minimal and terracing back the uppermost floor would have a negative impact on the architecture. In discussion, Mr. Scobie said, if the Board agrees to a height relaxation, it should be acknowledged in the conditions in addition to deleting condition A.1.2. Mr. Bingham explained the higher parapet on the west elevation was to provide a more substantial cornice to the top of this prominent façade.

Responding to a question from Mr. Beasley regarding the major maple tree, Mr. Segal said it would appear that its preservation could be easily achieved in the redesign called for in condition 1.2. Mr. Bingham added, they believe it would be appropriate and desirable to retain the tree.

Some discussion took place with respect to raising the lane townhouse entrances (condition 1.5). Mr. Timm suggested rewording this condition to indicate that the entrances should be raised to the extent possible without compromising the overall height.

With respect to the façade facing The Pointe, Mr. Timm questioned the retention of glazing at the upper storeys. Mr. Bingham said the earlier privacy concerns related to bedroom spaces, whereas these south facing rooms are living rooms, noting also that the glazed area has been reduced from the preliminary design.

Comments from Other Speakers

Mr. Roman Rubicek, Strata Council Chair of The Pointe, first commented on what he considers an inappropriate time for this meeting, given there are a number of people who are unable to attend due to work commitments. Mr. Rubicek said the proximity of the proposed development to The Pointe is still a significant issue and remains a major concern for residents of The Pointe. He noted that many of the other issues raised previously have been satisfactorily addressed. Height is not a major concern, but the width of the building and the blandness of the façade facing The Pointe are serious concerns. Questioned by the Chair about the treatment of the south façade, Mr. Rubicek said he would prefer a better quality material than the proposed concrete.

Mr. Frank Santesso, #2103, The Pointe, said he thought the building was too big for the lot. It obstructs the view and is very ugly. The south façade could be improved with better quality materials, but the building is still too big and too close to The Pointe. He thought a better alternative would be a narrower building although not necessarily lower.

Ms. Arlene Anardu, #2909, The Pointe, noted that neighbouring buildings, The Lions and The Residences, are below the 6,500 sq.ft. floor plate size called for in the guidelines. While 6,950 sq.ft. is better than 7,200 sq.ft., it is still considerably over the limit. Ms. Anardu said she was very concerned about the look and quality of the development compared to neighbouring buildings. She noted the landscape plan is still unresolved. As well, there is no other development on such a small lot that has commercial, retail, townhouses and a tower. It raises concern about accessibility as well as appearance. Ms. Anardu was also concerned about the appearance of the townhouses on Jervis Street and how they address the street. Stating she believes the development is too big for this particular lot, the Chair pointed out that this issue was addressed by the Board at the preliminary stage and staff indicated they believed the site was large enough to achieve the maximum density.

With respect to the floor plate size, Mr. Segal explained the 6,500 sq.ft. does not apply specifically to this area of the downtown but is a guideline from Downtown South. However, it has been applied to other residential towers nearby. While The Lions, The Residences and The Pointe are all within 6,500 sq.ft., there are others at about 6,900 sq.ft. The 80 ft. tower separation recommendation is also from the Downtown South guidelines. In response to a question from Mr. Beasley regarding the townhouses on Jervis Street, Ms. Anardu agreed that condition 1.4 could address her concerns.

Mr. Jan Halvarson, #1601, The Pointe, showed some view diagrams to illustrate his concerns about proximity and view blockage. In summary, he said the project is inappropriate, it does not follow the City's guidelines and should be stopped and investigated; accountability and liability for the failure of the development should be established.

The Chair noted the Board approved the application in principle on March 6, 2000, after hearing from a number of delegations from The Pointe as well as staff's assessment and the advice of the Advisory Panel. The Board is unable to now revisit that decision.

Mr. Beasley expressed serious concern about one of Mr. Halvarson's illustrations which was reported to be from the marketing brochure for The Pointe. He noted that, at the time The Pointe was being marketed, the fact of there being a guideline for a tower in this location was not only known but quite explicitly dealt with. Mr. Beasley indicated the Planning Department will pursue the matter with the Real Estate Board.

Mr. Marco Bock, owner of two suites in The Pointe, said he was surprised this complete submission is being considered because it does not meet the preliminary conditions. He urged that the application be rejected. With respect to the south façade, Mr. Bock said he thought glass would be better than concrete.

Questioned by Mr. Beasley about information provided at the time of investing in The Pointe, Mr. Bock said he was advised that this site could be developed and he was aware the zoning permitted a high rise tower. He added, it had been suggested to him the site could not be developed due to major utility problems.

Ms. Gina Cutts, Realtor, 1331 West Georgia Street, thought the design of the building should be more in keeping with its irregular lot configuration. Her concerns related to view impact and resulting loss of property values, proximity and privacy. Commenting on the presale of The Pointe, Ms. Cutts noted that at that time the developer was able to employ unlicensed sales people. She stressed that licensed realtors are supposed to know exactly what is going on around a property in terms of what can and cannot be developed. With respect to the south façade treatment, Ms. Cutts said reflective glass would be preferable.

Ms. May Lau, #1601, The Pointe, presented a number of signatures in opposition to the application (on file). Concerns expressed relate to the bulk of the building, its proximity to The Pointe and view blockage. Ms. Lau said their preference would be for a very slim, elegant tower that does not obstruct their views. She also thought the tower should be set back behind the townhouses. Ms. Lau added, a sales agent told her there could not be a high building on this lot because of its small size and triangular shape. She was advised the developer of The Pointe planned to construct a multi-storey parkade on the site.

Mr. Dean Curley, #1101, The Pointe, noted the rear façade is unlike anything else in the neighbourhood. He would prefer something that is like a normal façade; glass would be better.

Mr. Alan Roberts, #1209, The Pointe, said the design of the building does not work, visually, and the whole project represents quantity, not quality. Mr. Roberts urged that the existing maple tree be preserved and incorporated into the overall landscape. In response to a question from Mr. Beasley concerning the City street trees, Mr. Segal confirmed they will not be removed.

Ms. Kitty Chui, #2102, The Pointe, expressed concern about the height of the building, its proximity to the The Pointe and the lack of open space on the site. She also thought it was unnecessary to have commercial space in this area. She felt the lot should not be built to the maximum density.

In response to a request for clarification from Mr. Timm regarding the floor plate size, Mr. Segal confirmed the Board's direction at the preliminary stage was that the floor plate be reduced to close to 6,500 sq.ft. However, staff felt the overall dimensional change to the floor plate was coming quite close to the intent of the Board's instruction and was comparable to many other towers that are at 6,500 sq.ft. While the floor plate size is now only 300 sq.ft. less than the preliminary, staff felt it was satisfactory.

At Mr. Beasley's suggestion, the Chair advised the members of the public present that they were welcome to remain until the conclusion of the proceedings on this application.

Board and Advisory Panel members took a few minutes to review the model and posted drawings.

Comments from the Development Planner

Mr. Segal summarized the discussions vis-a-vis the recommended prior-to conditions, suggesting the following amendments:

Add (v) to Condition 1.2:

incorporate into the landscape design the existing maple tree on the City right-of-way;

Amend 1.5 (i):

where the lane elevation allows, maintain the preliminary parapet height to preserve views from The Pointe plaza;

Note to Applicant: Treating the lane entrances to provide better privacy from the lane, including reversing the entrances and garages to take advantage of the slope, should be investigated.

If the Board is prepared to relax the height slightly, delete A.1.2 and add Condition 1.11:
design development to lower the tower height to as close to 300 ft. as possible, but not to exceed 305 ft.;

Panel Opinion

Mr. Cheng advised the Urban Design Panel saw this project three times and recognized it is a very difficult site with many challenges. Mr. Cheng supported retention and protection of the maple tree. He noted the Panel struggled with the lane entrances to the townhouses. He suggested the applicant be directed to not exceed elevation 164 ft.-7 in. to the top of the roof parapet, which would leave 18 ft.-7 in. which is sufficient for a two-storey townhouse. The Panel's concern was how to achieve an attractive entrance to the townhouses at the second level without relying on the lane as the major entrance. The Panel also supported 80 ft. minimum separation and would not support a relaxation. Mr. Cheng said the Panel believed this could be achieved without substantial modification to the project. The Panel believes that towers in Vancouver should be designed to be seen from all façades. As well, it should be left to the architect how to treat it rather than dictating a solution, noting there should be a consistent vocabulary throughout all four façades of the building. Mr. Cheng suggested the applicant work with the Development Planner to reach an acceptable solution. With respect to the floor plate, Mr. Cheng said he was not as concerned about the exact square footage but rather to work with the overall design to facilitate the maximum view angle for the residents behind, adding there are many ways to massage a floor plate. The Panel was more concerned with the geometry of the floor plate. Mr. Cheng said he felt the applicant should be given some flexibility to work with staff to arrive at a satisfactory solution. With respect to the quality of some of the design details, Mr. Cheng said the Panel agreed with staff's recommended conditions.

In response to a request for clarification from Mr. Beasley as to whether or not the proposed floor plate size is adequate, Mr. Cheng said he does not believe the architect has done all that is possible, noting the 80 ft. separation has not been achieved. The tower need not be perfectly symmetrical. The parapet is the only asymmetrical component and is not consistent with the design. Rather than allowing the floor plate to determine how it should be, Mr. Cheng suggested the architect consider the best solution to shape the tower to maximize the view for people behind as well as orientation for residents of the building. He said he would support a small increase in height (approximately 5 ft.) but would question whether the parapet wall on the west side needs to be as high as indicated, given it is a totally symmetrical building.

Mr. Hancock agreed it is a difficult challenge to fit this building on the site and noted it impacts on other people in the area as well as residents of The Pointe. Mr. Hancock said he believes the prior-to conditions address most of the issues. The 80 ft. separation should be achieved and it should not be difficult to do so. Mr. Hancock said his overall concern is that this is a very generic tower form on quite a unique site. There is an opportunity to redistribute the floor plate density in a different way: to narrow the back and further reduce the width, pulling the west façade further to the east. He suggested it has not yet been fully explored and questioned whether it should be approved with extensive conditions or sent back for further work. The rear elevation is not acceptable: the addition of spandrel glass would go a long way to unifying the expression of all four sides. However, he agreed with Mr. Cheng that it should be left to the applicant to arrive at an appropriate solution. Mr. Hancock said he was not concerned so much about the height because the overage is on the north side and its impact is minimal. He agreed with Mr. Cheng that it seemed inappropriate for the parapet to be asymmetrical on an otherwise totally symmetrical building. He agreed the maple tree should be preserved, and agreed the area around the pond needed more work. The townhouse heights should be restricted as suggested to preserve views from the plaza. Mr. Hancock agreed more work needs to be done on the overall quality of the details.

Mr. Kavanagh suggested 1.5 (i) be expanded to add "where the lane elevation allows". With respect to the Note to Applicant in Condition 1.7, Mr. Kavanagh suggested that rather than being prescriptive the requirement be that there should be an attempt to achieve some consistency in vocabulary on all elevations of the building. He supported deletion of A.1.2 and agreed with the Development Planner's suggested new condition 1.11 regarding height. Mr. Kavanagh also supported retention of the maple tree.

Mr. Roodenburg said the 80 ft. separation should be maintained. With respect to the floor plate, it should be as close as possible to 6,500 sq.ft. provided it results in a narrower building to the benefit of The Pointe. He agreed with the suggested amendment of 1.5 and stressed the importance of 1.7. He also supported a height relaxation because it does not appear to obstruct views.

Mr. Mortenson noted the Board indicated at the preliminary stage that the floor plate should be closer to 6,500 sq.ft. However, it is a guideline and the architect has attempted to shape the building in such a way as to minimize impact on The Pointe. Ultimately, the owner has the right to develop a building on this site, regardless of the floor plate size. Mr. Mortenson said he believes the treatment of all sides of the building should be more consistent. He was not particularly concerned about the height but suggested everything be done to bring it as close as possible to 300 ft. He supported the preservation of the trees on the site and encouraged the developer to pay some attention to the greening of the roof areas.

Ms. Mingay sympathized with the neighbours' loss of views and commented the proposal does feel very large and like it is being "stuffed in" on the site. She said she would support it being slimmer. She agreed the 80 ft. separation should be maintained, and agreed with the discussion on façade development. She also questioned whether the application should be brought back to revisit some of the issues.

Board Discussion

Mr. Beasley said the proposal has come a long way and in the right direction since the preliminary stage but a number of concerns remain and the advice of the majority of Advisory Panel members is that there is still much work to be done. The building is overheight, although part of the solution may well be more height in the interests of a slimmer building, it is over FSR, it has only come a third of the way towards the kind of size of floor plate specified at the preliminary stage, and it intrudes into our normal separation standard of 80 ft.

The Chair said the Board could refuse the application, which would require the applicant to submit a new application. He suggested it might be better to defer the application and have it brought back for further consideration.

Mr. Timm said the preliminary condition he thinks has not been very well met is the floor plate size. The other issues seem relatively minor and can be dealt with in design development. Given the response of the Advisory Panel, Mr. Timm wondered if the condition had been misdirected because what the Board was trying to achieve was a more slender tower and to do more to protect views. Reducing the floor plate to 6,500 sq.ft. might not necessarily achieve view improvement for The Pointe. Perhaps the applicant should be directed to do further design development to rearrange the floor space within the 6,950 sq.ft. floor plate to narrow the cone of obstruction. Mr. Timm noted, however, that such a condition would be more than is usually applied as a condition of final approval. Mr. Scobie added, the more deviation there is in the footprint, the greater the need to look at impacts on buildings other than The Pointe.

Mr. MacGregor said he found the complete submission disappointing because it does not go as far as the Board wanted at the preliminary stage. However, it should be clear to the residents of The Pointe that there will be a high rise tower on this site and some views will be lost. The Board's responsibility is to minimize that view loss within the regulations. The floor plate size should be closer to 6,500 sq.ft., as indicated at the preliminary stage. The tower separation should be at least 80 ft. The FSR is over the maximum. Mr. MacGregor noted that everything is being pushed to the absolute limit. The developer needs to give it further consideration in terms of the input from the public, noting the Board's design advisors have indicated there is opportunity to deal with

some of the floor plate issues. The applicant's response to the south façade is also not satisfactory. Mr. MacGregor said he would be reluctant to approve the application at this stage, even with major amendments to the conditions, because the issues are fairly significant. He recommended deferral rather than refusal so that the application can be brought back as soon as possible.

The Chair sought clarification of the Board's expectation with respect to whether the maximum 6.0 FSR can be achieved on this site. Mr. Beasley said if the Board felt the project was not viable at the maximum density it should be refused, but he did not believe this to be case. There are some issues that need significant reworking. The concern is that such reworking may cause impacts in other areas that will need to be addressed and may not be covered by the conditions. He therefore recommended deferral, but stressing that the applicant and the Development Planner should note the nature of today's discussion which is to either, bring the floor plate down and/or achieve a performance in terms of view impacts that is much more responsive to the views from The Pointe, noting also that height may be increased a little. Treatment of the façades is also a major issue involving not only materials but suite layout.

Mr. Beasley commented that, before The Pointe was built it was very clear that there was going to be a tower on this site. At that time, it was envisaged as hotel or office, bigger than the building now being proposed. He reiterated his concern that purchasers in The Pointe were misled by real estate sales people. He added, it is not the City's position to play a policing role in this situation, but rather is the responsibility of the Real Estate Board with whom he intends to pursue the matter.

Mr. Kavanagh left the meeting at this point in the proceedings.

Mr. MacGregor stressed the applicant has to do better in terms of performance. In discussion, it was noted there is no requirement to meet maximum density and there is no minimum. The Board considers that 6.0 FSR can be achieved on this site but it will require a much more careful and creative approach without violating the maximum permitted height or displacing floor space in an unacceptable way elsewhere on the site.

Motion

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

THAT the Board DEFER Development Application No. 404571 for further consideration of the various matters discussed at the Development Permit Board meeting of July 10, 2000, with the intent of bringing the floor plate more in line with the 6,500 sq.ft. indicated at the preliminary stage, especially having tested that against performance on view implications for The Pointe. In addition, that there be further architectural treatment of the façade facing The Pointe as well as other refinements discussed. The conditions set out in the Staff Committee Report dated June 28, 2000 should also be taken into consideration.

4. OTHER BUSINESS

2995 Wall Street (Lafarge) - DE404056

This application was considered by the Board on June 28, 1999. The Board resolved:

THAT this matter be referred to Council for advice on the parameters for exercise of the Board's discretion on height over 30 ft. in the context of Council's consideration of the overall form of development;

FURTHER THAT, if Council's decision on the form of development leads to the Board's further consideration of the height, that staff bring back, in consultation

with the developer and the community, further clarification and solutions to the following, as related to buildings over 30 ft. in height:

- environmental and noise assessment;
 - signage and lighting assessment;
 - timing for the operation of the facility in the tower; and
 - design development to minimize the visual impact of the tower;
- together with the conditions itemized in Item 1 recommended in the Staff Committee Report dated June 2 & 16, 1999.

The Chair advised the review process by the Port of Vancouver is now nearing conclusion. The Board has committed to Council to wait until the Port process is finalized before dealing with the application. However, if the Port rejects the proposal and the Board then refuses the application based on the Port's decision, it may leave the City vulnerable if there is an appeal of the Port's decision.

Mr. Scobie said he had anticipated reporting to Council to seek direction with respect to height, at the same time asking Council to look at the form of development. The "form of development" is a requirement of CD-1 zones where the jurisdiction is with Council. In this case, we would be asking Council to begin to exercise its jurisdiction while the matter is still under the Board's jurisdiction with respect to the development application. The Law Department has advised not to confuse these jurisdictions. The wording of the Board's resolution makes it difficult to ask Council to consider criteria for height, looking at the overall form of development, but asking Council not to formally deal with the form of development. Council has committed to allowing the public to speak when it considers the form of development. The concern expressed by Mr. Scobie is to avoid having two Council meetings at which the public will wish to address Council, first when it considers the height and then when it considers the form of development.

Mr. MacGregor said, if the Port refuses the proposal the applicant will then have to withdraw the development application. He noted, the site is unique in that it is part City regulated and part Port regulated. If the Port approves the proposal, the Port's deliberations will be forwarded to Council before it formally deals with it. Mr. Beasley noted it would be similar to an Issues Report. The report will go forward to Council (from the Director of Planning with input from other relevant departments) once the Port's decision is known. If the proposal is supported by the Port, Council will then establish some criteria for the Board to consider the development application. If the application is approved, it would then be forwarded to Council for formal consideration of the form of development.

In discussion, the Board agreed it is preferable to wait until the Port's decision is known before proceeding. It will be Council's decision whether or not to hear delegations at both meetings, possibly making it clear at the first meeting that further delegations will not be heard later when it considers the form of development. The Board agreed that no amendment to its earlier resolution is necessary.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6.45 pm.

Clerk to the Board

Chair

/ch