

Date: Monday, March 12, 2007
Time: 3.00 p.m.
Place: Committee Room No. 1, City Hall

PRESENT:**Board**

F. Scobie Director of Development Services (Chair)
B. Toderian Director of Planning
D. McLellan Deputy General Manager of Community Services Group
T. Timm General Manager of Engineering Services

Advisory Panel

J. Wall Representative of the Design Professions (Urban Design Panel)
N. Shearing Representative of the Development Industry
J. Stovell Representative of the Development Industry
M. Braun Representative of the General Public
D. Chung Representative of the General Public

Regrets

S. Tatomir Representative of the Design Professions
H. Hung Representative of the General Public
C. Nystedt Representative of the General Public
K. Maust Representative of the Vancouver Heritage Commission

ALSO PRESENT:**City Staff:**

M. Thomson City Surveyor
A. Zacharias Assistant City Surveyor
R. Segal Senior Development Planner
A. Higginson Project Facilitator

1901 WYLIE STREET (MAYNARDS) - DE410693 - ZONE C-3A (PRELIMINARY)

M. Panzini Michelange Panzini Architect
I. Kent Interform Investments

Recording Secretary: L. Harvey

The Chair welcomed John Wall, Architect to the meeting. Mr. Wall is now Chair of the Urban Design Panel and represents the design professions on the Board's Advisory Panel. The Chair also welcomed David McLellan, Deputy General Manager of Community Services Group, to the Board as he was recently appointed by Council as a second alternate to Brent MacGregor.

1. MINUTES

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

THAT the Minutes of the Development Permit Board and Advisory Panel Meeting of February 12, 2007 be approved with the following amendments:

Amend page 7, in the Motion, February 7, 2006 to February 7, **2007**;

Amend page 7, under Amend Condition 1.8, change "southwest" to **southeast**;

Amend page 9, last paragraph, last sentence, change "rezoning" to **RFP**;

Amend page 14, third paragraph, 3rd sentence, delete "good" and change to read: He added that he was pleased no one seems to be using the time frame as an excuse for **anything but exceptional** design.

Amend page 14, fourth paragraph, 2nd sentence, delete "integrated" and change to read:

He found it interesting that the applicant had modified the two storey podium townhouse approach **by indenting it**.

Amend page 14, fifth paragraph, 3rd sentence, to read:

He added that he won't be raising it as a design development issue with the project **as such an approach has been permitted on other projects, and this** project shouldn't be held to a higher standard than anyone else.

Other minor typographical errors were also noted for correction before signature of the minutes.

2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

None.

3. 1901 WYLIE STREET (MAYNARD'S) - DE410693 - ZONE C-3A (PRELIMINARY APPLICATION)

Applicant: Interform Investments

Request: To retain, restore and rehabilitate the existing "B" listed heritage building (Maynard's Building) (referenced as Bldg. 'C') to provide retail and residential uses; and to construct two new residential buildings - a 12-storey building (with ground floor retail) fronting 2nd Avenue (referenced as Bldg. 'A') and a nine-storey building fronting 1st Avenue (referenced as Bldg. 'B'). The project would contain a total of 246 dwelling units and provide three levels of underground parking.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

Mr. Segal, Senior Development Planner, presented this preliminary application to retain, restore and rehabilitate the heritage building at the corner of West 2nd Avenue and Wylie Street. Reference was made to two models: the application model and the context model for South East False Creek showing the location of the subject site in relation to the Cambie Street Bridge and the rest of the developments in SEFC. Mr. Segal briefly described the proposal and the context for the site. This proposal seeks 3 FSR and in terms of density is seeking some additional heritage density to the extent of 10% of the permitted 3 FSR for a total 3.3 FSR.

Staff believe the applicant has struck the right balance between urban design, heritage and mitigation of neighbouring impacts. The Maynard's building and the nine storey building at West 1st Avenue and Wyle Street encompass a 25 foot set back from the Cambie Street edge which will allow for a double row of trees and pedestrian promenade. Mr. Segal noted that in terms of the public realm the development performs admirably and was one of the factors for the increased density being earned. A high degree of livability is provided in the dwelling units with the exception of a few units that require further design development. The amenity spaces lead to open spaces, for the most part, including those at ground level and at the roof levels, although additional private patios are being asked for in the recommended conditions. One other urban design factor that staff believe to be important is the response of the project to the Cambie Street Bridge.

Regarding the height, Mr. Segal noted the project exceeds the height maximum of 90 feet which is suggested in the C-3A Guidelines. The staff conclusion was to support some further height while strongly expressing a 90 feet demarcation line to give a sense of stepping down along Cambie Street which will maintain some on-site open spaces as well as contributing to the public realm by way of the 25 foot set back between the bridge and Building "A". An extensive view analysis was done that showed that by having the building next to the Cambie Street Bridge be higher than 90 feet, it opened up some view from surrounding buildings.

In terms of the loading requirements, Mr. Segal noted that three Class B loading bays are called for in the Guidelines and the applicant is requesting a relaxation of one Class B loading space for the retail in the new development, which is not supported by Engineering Services.

Mr. Segal reviewed the recommendations contained in the Development Permit Staff Committee report dated February 28, 2007. The recommendation was for support of the proposal, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Committee Report.

Questions/Discussion

Mr. Timm asked how much of the 10% heritage density contributes or equates to the height. Mr. Segal replied that it constitutes 2 ½ floors of the three floors that are beyond the 90 feet. Mr. Timm asked how the proposal relates to the considerations in the report regarding impacts on livability and environmental quality of the neighbourhood with the additional 10%. Mr. Segal stated that the testing of the overall massing, including a view analysis, concluded that the site can take the discretionary 3 FSR as well as the additional 10% in terms of those impacts. He added that even without the proposed heritage density bonus the project might likely have resulted in additional height on the site. Mr. Timm asked if an effort had been made to orient the building so as not to affect the private views. Mr. Segal replied that what had been attempted was the curving of facades to soften the edges and to try as much as possible to mitigate the loss of private views. Mr. Timm sought clarification on the pedestrian link. Mr. Segal stated that the promenade was identified in the South East False Creek master plan. Mr. Timm was concerned about safety and CPTED concerns with the pedestrian link as it

wasn't adjacent to any street. Mr. Segal replied that natural surveillance would occur from the residential units proposed, including several townhouses as well as retail units on Cambie Street. Mr. Segal added that lighting had also been addressed in the area.

Mr. Braun asked how much lower Building "B" would be without the .3 FSR heritage density. Mr. Segal replied that the Building "B" would come down by four storeys and would become a five storey building instead of nine storeys. Mr. Braun asked what the intention was for West 1st Avenue. Mr. Segal replied that the "Best Building" will have residential units and there will be townhouses on both sides of West 1st Avenue. Mr. Braun asked if the Maynard's building was currently being used for commercial. Mr. Segal, replied that currently it is all commercial and the proposal is for residential on the 2nd floor and the first floor would be maintained as commercial. Mr. Segal noted that although commercial is being lost from the Maynard's building it is being recovered in Building "A" which is predominately residential with commercial fronting West 2nd Avenue and Cambie Street. Mr. Braun inquired as to why staff recommended against green roofs due to height concerns. Mr. Segal replied that staff were torn on that matter but the feeling was that at 112 feet, which is twenty-two feet over the maximum height, it was best to not take the building up higher even by a few feet to accommodate soil depth concerns and requisite guard rails.

Mr. Stovell asked if the shadow study indicated any problems. Mr. Segal replied that the shadow analysis didn't prove to be a limitation on the height of the building. The greater concern was to get as much as possible of the late afternoon sun in the courtyard. Mr. Stovell asked if there was any consideration given for additional height to Building "A" so that the Maynard's building could be renovated without the additional two storeys. Mr. Segal replied that one of the primary considerations regarding public views was to maintain the dominant view of City Hall. The other factor was the amount of value that was being conveyed to the site by the additional .3 FSR density in terms imparting value to the site to allow for the heritage renovation.

Mr. Shearing inquired as to how much of the Maynard's building was being kept. Mr. Segal replied that the primary interest is in the façade. There is a lot of rehabilitation required including seismic upgrading. Mr. Shearing asked if any thought had been given to the potential success of the retail and if live/work spaces would be permitted in the retail space. Mr. Segal replied that live/work might be another use and that West 1st Avenue had some potential for retail. He agreed that Cambie Street might be more challenging but there was a planned streetcar stop and future development of the City lands so that over time the area would be more successful for retail. In response to a question from Mr. Shearing regarding West 1st Avenue, Mr. Segal advised that the road will be maintained under the bridge to the police parking lot. Mr. Thomson added that there is still some work to do around the Canada Line station.

Mr. McLellan asked if the streetcar station would be the closest one to the Canada Line station. Mr. Segal replied that the nearest station will be closer to Ash Street with another street car station at Heather Street. Mr. McLellan asked for clarity on the entry to the tallest building. Mr. Segal replied that the entry area from West 2nd Avenue is open to the sky with a trellis which has not been counted in the FSR. The entry sequence is for a courtyard and it was suggested in one of the conditions that it take on a landscaped treed form. Mr. Segal replied that it would be best to have the architect answer the question in their presentation. Mr. McLellan also inquired about the bicycle parking. Mr. Segal replied that bicyclists will be able to leave the mezzanine by the ramp.

In response to a question from Mr. Stovell regarding the entrance in Building "A", Mr. Segal advised that between the west end of the Maynard's building and the east end of Building "A" there is a recessed area or atrium which forms an entrance for Building "A". There is a concern that the area could have some security issues and staff are asking that the gateway with intercom be moved closer to West 2nd Avenue. Mr. Segal added that brick is proposed on the new building to wrap into that space and will reflect the Maynard's building.

Mr. Toderian noted that Condition 1.3 was asking to set back the upper two floors in Building "B" and asked where the density would be relocated. Mr. Segal replied that all the density can be recovered with a more efficiently configured floor plan. Mr. Toderian inquired as to how much the private view issue was driving the design. Mr. Segal replied that the private view matter was a secondary consideration. It's a combination of lessening the view impact but also improving the proportions of the building as seen as a backdrop to the proposed massing on the upper storeys of the Maynard's building.

Mr. Toderian noted that Condition 1.5 refers to "notably deep units in Building "A" on the second and third floors" and asked if they would be converted to studio units or would the floor orientation need to change. Mr. Segal replied that there are two types of units addressed in the condition. There are some deep units facing Cambie Street that could end up being studio units. He added that tweaks could be done to the units rather than a reorientation or loss of the units. Mr. Toderian sought clarity on Condition 1.9 regarding green roofs. Mr. Segal replied that green roofs are proposed. He noted that the condition was asking for the private roof patios to be incorporated within the green roof. Mr. Segal added that the condition does not require the developer to include green roofs. Mr. Toderian inquired about a comment in the Urban Design Panel's comments regarding the landscaping being "too residential and needed to be simpler and 'grittier' in character". Mr. Segal replied that there was a sense that the courtyard and some of the edge conditions could be taking on more of the attitude that reflects back to a warehouse or industrial expression.

Mr. Scobie, referring to Condition 2.2 and the "Heritage Designation Compensation Agreement", asked if that was the legal acknowledgment by the applicant for the extra density they are seeking and if it's granted by the Board constitutes compensation in exchange for that designation. Mr. Segal agreed that was the case. Mr. Scobie asked Mr. Segal to explain why the Staff Committee felt the need for the complete application to come back to the Board rather than the Director of Planning. Mr. Segal replied that staff thought there was still a lot of work to do on the project including legal matters and architectural details. Mr. Scobie noted that the complete application would nonetheless go back to the Urban Design Panel for its advice. Mr. Segal suggested that the Board could decide to send it to the Director of Planning instead of coming back to the Board. Mr. Scobie noted that there wasn't much latitude in the Guidelines to go past 90 feet. He inquired as to what analysis had been done, given the heritage bonus in exchange for the retention and restoration of the Maynard's building, or if any thought had been given to transferring the bonus off-site. Mr. Segal replied that in going through an array of alternatives, the conclusion was that the bonus did fit on the site. It wasn't necessary for any/all of this density increase to be "banked" for future sale and transfer off-site.

Mr. Scobie inquired as to what extent a 90 foot building would restrict the view of City Hall from the north shore of False Creek. Mr. Segal replied that at 90 feet the shoulders of City Hall would be maintained.

Mr. Scobie asked how the impact on livability and environmental quality criterion in Section 3.2.5 of the By-law are specifically being addressed so that the Board can consider the heritage

density increase. Mr. Segal replied that if the .3 FSR wasn't included, there would be some compromise to the heritage objective of conserving the Maynard's building. He noted that the applicant is providing open spaces, good interface with sidewalks, and a high level of livability and is trying to minimize neighbouring impacts and enhance the public realm in the proposal. Mr. Scobie noted that the relaxation the Board was being asked to consider under Section 3.2.5 of the Zoning and Development By-law may be open to appeal at the Board of Variance and he wanted to ensure the Board satisfies the required considerations before reaching a decision.

Mr. Scobie inquired about the intent of "inconspicuous landscaping" as noted in the Vancouver Heritage Commission comments in the report. Mr. Segal replied that one of the items the Commission noticed on the landscape drawings was proposed landscaping around the edges of the Maynard's building and the Commission thought it was too "frilly" and not in keeping with a warehouse environment.

Applicant's Comments

Michelange Panzini, Architect, noted that it was an important site and considered the site as a gateway to the city. The design of the site was driven by the Maynard's building and became an important heritage component. There was a balancing act between three forms, three shapes and three masses while taking into consideration the important heritage component. Mr. Panzini stated that the industrial factor was also taken into consideration resulting in the red brick treatment to the three buildings. He noted that the first proposal went to the Urban Design Panel a few months ago and was not supported. With the second proposal there were still a number of comments from the Panel that were taken into consideration. Mr. Panzini stated that they agreed with the conditions recommended in the Staff Committee report. He noted that they are still exploring design development to the atrium style entry between Maynard's and Building "A". He added that it will be an open space and will be treated as an exterior space.

Questions/Discussion

Mr. Stovell inquired as to the amount of heritage being retained. Mr. Panzini advised that the interior structure would be removed and/or replaced and upgraded as needed. The underground parking would extend below the Heritage Building. The roof would be reinforced to carry the load of the extra two storeys proposed.

Mr. Toderian asked what sustainable initiatives were planned considering the proximity to South East False Creek. Mr. Panzini replied that they are sensitive to sustainable initiatives however the building will not register for LEED™ as it is not an obligation. They will use materials which are not using too much energy to produce, as well as introducing green roofs and green walls. The roof of the Maynard's building will be a garden space. Mr. Kent directed the Board to Appendix E, page 9, regarding sustainability and added that they would be close to the requirements for LEED™ Silver.

Regarding Condition 1.5, Mr. Toderian asked if the applicant was confident in improving the livability in the deep units in Building "A". Mr. Kent replied that they would be setting back the units and creating some open space in front of the unit. Mr. Panzini added that they will be creating open loges with a terrace and a trellis on top and some brick treatment to keep the alignment of a strong façade on Cambie Street.

Mr. Toderian inquired as to the strength of the retail on Cambie Street. Mr. Kent replied that the retail use only extends along a portion of this frontage. One of the factors for attracting retail will be the Maynard's building which should create a lot of interest. The intent is to have a covered pedestrian walkway in front of the retail.

Mr. Shearing asked if the retail would be for long-term holding or would the developer be selling the retail units. Mr. Kent replied that the commercial space would be a long-term holding.

Mr. Timm noted in the appendix regarding sustainability there was a reference for connecting to the energy utility being proposed for South East False Creek and asked if it was a viable proposition for the site. Mr. Kent replied that their mechanical consultant was in the process of evaluating the possibility.

Mr. Chung sought clarity on the ceiling design for the atrium style entry. Mr. Panzini replied that it will not be a ceiling but an architectural element and was part of the structure that will cover the space.

In response to a question from Mr. Scobie, Mr. Kent confirmed the items raised by Processing Centre - Building, Fire and Rescue Services (Appendix C) are resolvable without substantively affecting the proposed building design. Mr. Scobie reminded the applicant that there will be a new Building By-law in affect as of May 1st and if the building permit has not been issued by then the proposal will have to comply with the new By-law.

Comments from other Speakers

None.

Panel Opinion

Mr. Wall advised the Urban Design Panel reviewed the project twice and on the second review the Panel was more in favour of the massing and density. There were minor comments from some Panel members regarding the distribution of mass but the consensus was for support of the proposal. In terms of the landscaping, one Panel member from the landscape profession thought the scheme should be "grittier". He suggested Condition 1.2 include some of the public spaces being provided and not just the streetscape. The Panel also thought the improvement to the public realm interface was germane to the project. Mr. Wall noted that Conditions 1.1 and 1.6 will greatly improve the public realm treatment. The Panel also requested improvement to the livability of the units and that was addressed in the conditions recommended by the Staff Committee. A number of Panel members brought up the need for further design development to the additional floors in the Maynard's building that could better relate to the upper floors in Buildings "A" and "B". The conditions put forward by the Staff Committee generally answer all the commentary from the Panel. From a personal perspective, Mr. Wall thought it would be an improvement to the massing if there was a general strategy for the penthouse tops to the buildings. Mr. Wall suggested Condition 1.10 could also reference Condition 1.3 which would offer a sympathetic relationship between the three buildings.

Mr. Stovell thought the project was well handled. He had some concerns regarding the differentiation of the Maynard's building along West 2nd Avenue as it relates to the introduction of new masonry on the base of Building "A". He liked the glazed element between the Maynard's building and the new masonry on Building "A". He wondered if there was a missed opportunity and to keep going on the height and put some additional massing on Building "A" that could pay for the cost of restoring the Maynard's building with a less dramatic intervention required to that building. Another benefit would be to improve the views from the surrounding buildings.

Mr. Shearing was happy to hear that the retail would be retained by the owner as a long-term holding. He noted that Vancouver suffers greatly from retail spaces that have been stratified

with no controls and they end up being not well looked after. He noted that there are conditions regarding livability in the residential units and suggested the same attention should be given to retail. He was concerned about the viability of the retail along the Cambie Street frontage and that it might not survive. Mr. Shearing thought the promenade at the north edge of the site needed to be resolved at an Engineering level with a simple set of crossings to ensure its use. He added that stepping the building back and adding the 25 foot setback would be a great way to provide a public amenity but that further investigation needed to be done to ensure it was properly used. Mr. Shearing commended the applicant for a great job in assembling the pieces which had resulted in an interesting collection of mass and forms. Mr. Shearing felt the application deserved density relaxation for the heritage purposes because of the attention given the Maynard's building. He thought the work the architect had done with staff was a clever compromise in mitigating the negative aspects of the additional density. He added that he supported the additional height. Mr. Shearing thought Building "B", with the articulation of brick at the appropriate height to correspond to the surrounding heritage buildings, was enough and didn't need to be stepped back. He suggested deleting Condition 1.3. Mr. Shearing didn't think the proposal needed to come back to the Board as he felt the Director of Planning could resolve any issues with staff and the applicant.

Mr. Chung commended the applicant on their progress on the project. Mr. Chung particularly liked Building "A" with the red brick face strongly expressing a 90 feet demarcation line to give an alignment with other buildings on Cambie Street. He also liked the relief of the red brick on all three buildings. Mr. Chung was concerned that the Maynard's building might blend in too much with the new buildings and suggested using a different colour brick on the new buildings or something to ensure that Maynard's stands out. In terms of Condition 1.3, Mr. Chung would like to give flexibility to the architect to make Building "B" an even better building. With regards to the downtown streetcar, Mr. Chung suggested making the whole pedestrian realm more pleasant with proper pathways and looking after any possible CPTED concerns.

Mr. Braun felt the massing in terms of the site and public realm was well handled. He thought Building "B" significantly compromised the view from the "Montreux" but was well handled from a public realm perspective. He thought it was disappointing that there was a loss of commercial on the second floor of the Maynard's building. He realized there was a gain of retail but the space could have been used for offices since there are concerns about the loss of commercial space in Vancouver. Mr. Braun would like to have seen more consideration by staff in terms of the interface with the bridge as the building seems extraordinary close. He would like to have seen a LED light scheme introduced to the façade as it could be a public art piece. He suggested coloured blinds might be another solution. Mr. Braun was disappointed that green roofs were not recommended. Mr. Braun thought the Director of Planning and staff could resolve any issues with the applicant and thought the proposal didn't need to come back to the Board as a complete application. Mr. Braun recommended approval of the proposal.

Board Discussion

Mr. Toderian moved approval of the application with several amendments to the conditions.

Mr. Toderian commended staff and the applicant for a good job. He was glad to see a Montreal architect on the project as fresh eyes can bring fresh approaches. Mr. Toderian thought the 3.0 discretionary density was deserved as the various aspects of the public realm interface and other requirements of earning that discretionary density had been addressed. The architecture and the building resolution have earned it. He agreed with the commentary of the Advisory Panel members regarding the way the various building masses had been worked out and Mr. Toderian thought they had been clearly resolved. He thought the two dimensional drawings did a disservice to the architecture as it tends to present a flat image that didn't show how the

buildings work with each other. Mr. Toderian thought the heritage density relaxation had been earned but didn't think the height should go any higher. He thought the density on top of the Maynard's building was well done and he thought it was one of the stronger points of the design. He added that the density and massing was well resolved. Mr. Toderian encouraged the staff team and the applicant to continue improving the landscaping as it should read as a warehouse district.

Although Mr. Toderian commended the applicant for their green roof proposal and noted it would be disappointing if the applicant moved away from their proposal for green roofs, he felt it important to emphasize that green roofs were not required by any condition. Mr. Toderian also shared the general concern regarding the challenge of the site for retail at grade and thought activating the street was a positive move and suggested the applicant do what they can to make it highly visible. Mr. Toderian encouraged the applicant to add light and colour to the façade adjacent to the Cambie Street Bridge noting it would need to be done sensitively.

Mr. Timm thought the development proposal presented a good job of earning the 3 FSR. He thought the pedestrian connection through into South East False Creek was not being recognized as to its significance for the future of the residential neighbourhood. He thought it would become an important pedestrian link on a day-to-day basis which relates to the viability of the retail which may be difficult today but hopefully will be significantly different in the future. Mr. Timm noted the importance of treating the access road to the north and this was something that Engineering will need to take a closer look at as the +area is developed.

With regards to the .3 FSR relaxation for the heritage, Mr. Timm thought the Maynard's building was the most significant building in SEFC, with the possible exception of the Salt building, and had earned the heritage bonus in accordance with the provision in the By-law. Mr. Timm liked the way the Building "A", located closer to the Cambie Street Bridge, had brought some of the brick and industrial feel closer to the bridge and brought an industrial sense to the corner of the neighbourhood. Mr. Timm was in agreement that the complete development application be dealt with by the Director of Planning rather than coming back to the Board. Mr. Timm seconded the motion for approval.

Mr. McLellan supported the motion. He felt that staff and the applicant had done a good job in getting the massing right and being sensitive to the views. Mr. McLellan liked the modern architecture and the way it reflects the heritage. He thought the Maynard's building was well handled with the lighter architectural element added to the top and it will be a prominent building in the area. Regarding the promenade, Mr. McLellan supported having the streetcar station move further west to get closer to the Canada Line and under the bridge. Mr. McLellan thought that by getting the promenade right and with the site being at the south end of the Cambie Street Bridge, there will be a fair amount of traffic that will help the retail on the site and presents some interesting opportunities. He noted that there is already a lot of commercial space on the street frontage. With regards to the landscaping, Mr. McLellan liked the direction and would like to see some sculptural elements that reflect the industrial and heritage in the area as a way of making it more interesting and "grittier".

Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE IN PRINCIPLE, Development Application No. DE410693, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Report dated February 28, 2007, with the following amendments:

Amend Condition 1.2 by adding at the end of the paragraph "*as well as the public and semi-private at grade spaces*";

Amend Condition 1.3 by deleting "east and";

Amend Note to Applicant in Condition 1.3 by deleting "east and";

Amend the first sentence in the Note to Applicant in Condition 1.3 by adding to the end of the sentence "*relationship to the "Best Building" to the east*";

Amend Condition 4.0 by changing "Development Permit Board" to *Director of Planning*.

Mr. Scobie noted that if this was a complete application he would have suggested the Board incorporate a condition encouraging the applicant to consider the development of an integrated sign concept for the new buildings so the signage in the retail components are part of the fabric. However, a condition was not necessary as this was a preliminary application and the applicant would hopefully respond to this suggestion in moving toward a complete application. He also suggested the applicant give similar consideration to development of a sign concept for the Maynard's building, before it is designated a heritage building, and that staff should work with the applicant in working out the details to facilitate approval of appropriate signs after designation.

4. OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Scobie noted that staff is working on finding a way to have the applicants submit extra copies of their brochures to give to the Advisory Panel and the Board with the staff report.

5. ADJOURNMENT

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

L. Harvey
Assistant to the Board

F. Scobie
Chair