

Meeting: No. 479
Date: Monday, May 1, 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

P. Grant	Representative of the Design Professions (Urban Design Panel)
J. Hancock	Representative of the Design Professions
A. Gjernes	Representative of Development Industry
P. Kavanagh	Representative of Development Industry
J. Leduc	Representative of General Public
R. Roodenburg	Representative of General Public

Absent

M. Mortensen	Representative of General Public
R. Mingay	Representative of General Public

ALSO PRESENT:

R. Segal	Development Planner
N. Peters	City Surveyor
P. Pinsker	Parking & Development Engineer
J. Scholtz	Housing Centre

Item 3 - 1028 Nelson Street - DE404744

John Kinney	Hyland Turnkey Limited
Clifford Korman	Kirkor Architects
Rev. Gordon Turner	United Church of Canada

CLERK TO THE BOARD:

Carol Hubbard

1. MINUTES

Approval of the minutes of April 17, 2000 was deferred to the next meeting to allow Board and Panel members more time to review the minutes.

2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

None.

**3. 1028 NELSON STREET - DE404744 - ZONE DD/RM-5B
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: Hyland Turnkey Limited

Request: To construct a 19-storey, residential building containing 197 market rental dwelling units on top of a two-storey commercial podium connecting to the easterly heritage St. Andrew's-Wesley Church within the 'Downtown District' zoned portion of the site and a two-storey, townhouse development containing 6 dwelling units to the west of the residential tower, in the RM-5B zoned portion of the site. [The tower floor space ratio is based on a combined site area which includes the lots over which the existing church building is located.]

Development Planner's Opening Comments

The Development Planner, Ralph Segal, presented this application, referring to a scale model of the proposal. In addition, a small context model was passed around the table. The site, at the southwest corner of Nelson and Burrard Streets, is split zoned. The westerly, Nelson Street frontage (currently a parking lot) is in the RM-5B West End District and the remainder is in the Downtown District. The easterly DD portion at the corner of Burrard and Nelson Streets contains the St. Andrews-Wesley United Church, a designated heritage building, and the remainder of the DD portion contains a two-storey church addition which is to be demolished. The proposal is for a residential tower containing 197 dwelling units and six townhouse units, all of which is intended for (market) rental accommodation. Mr. Segal noted it is Council policy to encourage rental housing opportunities citywide.

Mr. Segal briefly reviewed the maximum height and density permitted in the two zones. In the DD portion of the site the proposed development together with the church totals just over 4.0 FSR and the height of the tower is just over 200 ft. to the main parapet. In the RM-5B portion of the site the proposed density is 1.1 FSR.

The main issues identified by staff relate to the massing of the tower with respect to its impact on the neighbouring westerly building, the architectural response to the heritage church, and parking. The issue of the massing has been particularly challenging and several alternatives have been discussed for this site. One primary conclusion reached was that the podium and tower form was preferred over a lower and wider development because building separation is a key component to livability in high density areas such as this where a separation of 80 ft. is normally sought. In this proposal, the separation between the property line of the neighbouring westerly building and the face of the tower is 82.7 ft. On the lower portions there is a side yard setback of approximately 28 ft. to the face of the townhouses, a 16 ft. setback on Nelson Street and about 20 ft. setback to the tower face on the lane.

Mr. Segal advised the 7,235 sq.ft. floorplate area is greater than preferred, noting that while there is no floorplate provision in the guidelines for this subarea of the Downtown, the maximum allowable in neighbouring Downtown South is 6,500 sq.ft. While acknowledging the applicant's need for net to gross efficiency for this proposed rental building, which is more achievable with a larger floorplate size, staff recommend a somewhat slimmer floorplate and a narrower north-south dimension, as called for in condition 1.1.

With respect to the architectural response to the heritage church, Mr. Segal noted the Heritage Commission was concerned about the impact of the tower as seen from Burrard Street. Condition 1.2 calls for design development to address this and other architectural issues.

The amount of parking being proposed is currently less than required by the Parking By-law. Although some allowance can be made for sharing some spaces between the uses, there is a shortfall of about 26 - 36 spaces. Condition A.1.2 requires that the Parking By-law regulations be met.

With respect to response from the neighbourhood, Mr. Segal noted this has been a very contentious project. There was extensive notification and two public information meetings have been held. The project has been particularly troublesome for the residents of 1042 Nelson Street, the neighbouring building to the west whose concerns relate to view blockage, shadowing, light and air access, and the overall bulk of the building. Residents of the Electra have also expressed concern about view blockage. A number of ongoing problems have also been identified with respect to traffic and the general conditions in the lane. As well, concerns have been raised about structural impacts during construction. With respect to concerns that have also been raised about the potential use of the commercial podium, Mr. Segal noted the church has targeted this space for church programs and/or other community oriented functions. It is not intended to be rented as commercial office space. The applicant has also assured the City the building will be well managed.

In summary, Mr. Segal advised the Staff Committee recommendation is for approval of the application, subject to the conditions outlined in the report dated April 19, 2000. Staff consider the proposal is generally respectful and appropriate for this site.

General Discussion

In response to a question from Mr. Beasley concerning the alternative massing options considered for this site, Mr. Segal confirmed that a slab form was felt to be inappropriate because of the negative impact it would have on its westerly neighbours. There was also a desire for greater separation from the church. Mr. Beasley also questioned whether the lane setback was relaxable in the RM-5B zone, given the potential view impact on the front units of the neighbouring building. Mr. Segal confirmed these regulations could be relaxed and some sculpting of the townhouses could also be requested. Mr. Segal added, however, that the additional setback was considered beneficial in terms of softening the lane as well as improving livability of the townhouses. Some additional view would also be gained for the lower level rear units of the neighbouring building.

Given there are no major concessions being sought in this proposal, Mr. Beasley expressed surprise at the condition calling for a rental tenure agreement. John Scholtz, Housing Centre, explained this condition arose from the applicant's stated intent that this would be a rental building. He confirmed there is no Council policy that would require such an agreement. Mr. Scobie also confirmed that once the building is occupied as a rental building, Council approval would be necessary to later convert it to strata condominiums. However, in the absence of a specific condition, there would be an opportunity for the building to be strata titled without City approval before the building is occupied.

In response to a question from Mr. Beasley regarding street trees, Mr. Segal confirmed the existing street trees will be preserved. There are also three fairly substantial trees on the site that will need to be removed to accommodate the underground parking structure. The landscape plan includes new trees which staff believe will compensate for this loss.

Responding to a question from Ms. Leduc regarding the heritage aspects of the proposal, Mr. Segal confirmed staff's conclusions were based on balancing all the issues, and particular attention was paid to the separation between the church and the tower, noting the Heritage Commission would have preferred an even greater separation.

With respect to the floorplate, Mr. Segal confirmed Mr. Timm's assumption that if this proposal was for a full height, full density, market condominium building, the City would be pressing harder for a floorplate size closer to 6,500 sq.ft. Mr. Segal noted the applicant has already undertaken some reconfiguration to achieve a smaller floorplate and it has not been necessary to reduce the number of units per floor. Responding to a question from Mr. Timm regarding issues raised by the Heritage Commission, Mr. Segal advised the Commission reviewed this proposal twice and its concerns are addressed in the conditions, in particular 1.2.

Referring to conditions A.1.28 and A.1.29 dealing with the legal aspects of the site, Mr. Scobie questioned why the church site itself is not being consolidated with the balance of the site, noting it would eliminate the need for a single site covenant. Mr. Segal advised the applicant's preference is to keep the development site distinct from the church itself, notwithstanding the code issues that will need to be addressed as a result of the proposed physical connection between the church and the new development.

With respect to the Staff Committee's recommendation that the current conditions in the lane be independently reviewed, Mr. Scobie questioned how this would be undertaken. Paul Pinsker, Parking & Development Engineer, noted there have been ongoing problems in the lane caused by film crews and traffic associated with the nearby hotel. These and other problem areas in the city are dealt with routinely by Engineering Services. In response to a question from Mr. Beasley concerning the traffic report, Mr. Pinsker confirmed the study determined that this development will not exacerbate existing traffic conditions in the lane. He acknowledged it is difficult to exit the lane to travel northward.

Mr. Scobie sought clarification with respect to the parking requirements. Mr. Segal noted that additional information is being requested from the applicant to determine the optimum number of spaces for the church, and Mr. Pinsker confirmed that compliance with the Parking By-law is being sought, noting there are a number of provisions that would allow a reduction. The applicant has submitted the results of a traffic study which includes parking issues and it was determined that the church requirement was rarely more than 20-30 spaces on week days, and up to 60 spaces on Sundays only. Engineering Services therefore determined that an appropriate number would be 237 spaces, 26 more than proposed and 10 fewer than the 247 spaces that would be required by strict adherence to the Parking By-law.

With respect to the podium, Mr. Scobie questioned the permitted use in the small portion (5 percent) which is situated in the RM-5B zone. Mr. Segal confirmed that office use would not be permitted, however, the applicant has indicated that all of the podium space will be ancillary use to the church. A further condition of approval may be necessary to ensure compliance with the RM-5B regulations.

Applicant's Comments

Rev. Gordon Turner, United Church of Canada, began by explaining that it would be impossible for this development to be converted to condominiums. The land is owned by the United Church of Canada as a national organization and is held in trust by the local church, the St. Andrews-Wesley Congregation. Only if the congregation ceases to exist would the national church be able to dispose of the property. Reverend Turner explained the proposed development is necessary for the survival of the church and to prevent further erosion of their trust funds to maintain and operate it. As well, the asset base will ultimately provide for double the amount of mission work undertaken by the United Church in British Columbia, so the income has major significance to the church as a whole, not just this congregation. He added, the church will continue to reach out to the community and continue with its significant weekly feeding program for the needy, as well as its major involvement with the arts community. The church currently enjoys one of the largest congregations in Vancouver and has adult education programs that meet needs far beyond its own congregation. In summary, Rev. Turner said the goal of the church is to be a place that has an impact for moral and social good in the community and this development will enable the church to meet this goal.

Mr. Clifford Korman, Architect, noted the major constraints of this site, with the heritage church on one side and the midrise residential building on the other, as well as the significant financial constraints of the church. He described the various options that were considered for the location of the tower and the architectural design in terms of its relationship to the heritage church. Mr. Korman presented some concept drawings indicating how they intend to respond to the prior-to conditions and he explained the adjustments that have been made to the design as a result of input from staff and the Urban Design Panel. With respect to condition 1.2 (b), Mr. Korman said they believe the cornice line is correctly sited and would like this condition to be reconsidered. (Note: Mr. Korman later withdrew this objection after indicating he had previously misunderstood the intent of the condition. He confirmed they have no problem with staff's request.) With respect to condition 1.3, Mr. Korman noted they have deleted a studio unit on the third level and added a public lounge. Condition 1.6 will also be met in consultation with staff, as will condition 1.4.

With respect to management of the building, Mr. John Kinney, Hyland Turnkey Limited, advised the church has a business plan to engage a professional building manager to fully manage the building, independent of the church. There will also be a full time on-site manager. Site consolidation was discussed at length with staff, with the conclusion that the proposed single site covenant would be the best solution. Mr. Kinney said they are confident they will be able to address any Building By-law issues that may arise. With respect to the first and second floor podium uses, Mr. Kinney said the ultimate goal is that it will be all church use, although in the interim some of the space will be rented for compatible medical or education related uses. With respect to parking, Mr. Kinney noted the traffic study was done at a time when the hotel driveway was being refinished and out of use, which resulted in more traffic in the lane. He said they would like an opportunity to work with Engineering staff to try to keep the 211 parking spaces currently proposed, noting they believe a ratio of 0.7-0.8 cars per unit is appropriate for a residential rental building. Rev. Turner added the church uses less than a quarter of its current parking.

Ms. Leduc said she was concerned about the suggestion of non-cooperation between the church and the community, as asserted in a letter circulated to the Board. Rev. Turner stressed they have tried to be good neighbours, noting that input from the public information meetings had a major effect on the proposal and resulted in some substantial changes to the design.

In response to a question from Mr. MacGregor concerning the requested rental tenure agreement, Rev. Turner confirmed they have no objection to entering into this an agreement. He reiterated his church is not in a position to dispose of the property.

Referring to neighbours' concern that the podium space would remain vacant, Mr. Beasley sought clarification regarding the intended use. Mr. Kinney confirmed they are in discussion with some of the research departments at St. Paul's Hospital which have expressed serious interest in renting the space. Mr. Segal explained that since retail is not an indicated use, retail would require a change of use application to the City, noting that retail is permitted in the DD zone. Mr. Kinney pointed out that the location of the commercial space would be quite inappropriate and unworkable for retail use. Responding to a question from Mr. Beasley concerning impact on neighbours during construction, Mr. Korman confirmed they intend to fully comply with regulations concerning construction and will ensure the neighbouring building is not negatively impacted during this period. The Chair confirmed the developer cannot intrude on the neighbouring building without the owners' permission. Responding to Mr. Beasley's suggestion to reduce the setback at the lane to about 3 ft. and sculpt the northwest corner of the first townhouse, Mr. Korman pointed out the corner townhouse is actually set back about 30 ft. He agreed it would be possible to sculpt some of the mass, although it could compromise the desired architectural effect. With respect to the lane setback, Mr. Segal confirmed it would be possible to achieve some landscaping within a 3 ft. setback.

Members of the Board and Advisory Panel then took a few minutes to review the model and posted drawings.

The Chair acknowledged receipt of letters from J.E. Dobbs and Brian Hampel, copies of which were distributed to Board and Panel members before the meeting.

Comments from Other Speakers

Ms. Del Mather and Ms. Elyn Dobbs attended on behalf of the Strata Corporation of 1042 Nelson Street, and Ms. Dobbs addressed the Board on behalf of the 49 residents in their building (26 strata units). She began by noting they were first made aware of this proposal on January 18, 2000. Their concerns about this proposal relate to parking and traffic, rear yard and side yard setbacks, and the tower massing and siting. Ms. Dobbs described their concerns in detail and provided the following comments and recommendations. She also distributed photographs to illustrate her points.

Parking:

- additional parking should be required;
- that their Strata Council meet with Engineering staff regarding conditions in the lane with a view to modifying the current signage to address current congestion issues.

Front and Rear Yard Setbacks:

- that the Board revise condition 1.5 to reflect that the townhouses and underground garage ensure the preservation of the maple trees and eliminate the rear yard. Their preference would be for a wall at the lane.

Tower Massing:

- it is unsightly and still too big for the site; it is anomaly on this block and its prominence is even greater because this is also highest point of land in the Downtown;
- with respect to sun and shadow, their preference is to preserve the section closer to Nelson Street;
- the tower should be located as far south on the property as possible;
- amend condition 1.1 to mandate that the tower floorplate be no greater than 6,500 sq.ft. and that the north-south dimension be between 80 and 85 ft.;
- meet with the developer and City staff in a workshop format, to discuss shadow impacts.

In closing, Ms. Dobbs stressed they want to achieve a balance for the neighbourhood - a balance between who sacrifices what and who gains what, which they do not believe is adequately achieved with the current proposal.

Questioned by Mr. Beasley concerning traffic management during the construction period, Mr. Pinsker agreed this aspect could be added to the traffic study. The applicant also confirmed he would have no objection to this addition. Referring to Ms. Dobbs' recommendation to eliminate the rear yard setback, pulling back the massing as far as possible from Nelson Street, Mr. Beasley requested staff's comments as to whether this would enable the preservation of the two large trees on the site. Mr. Segal said this would probably involve reconfiguration of the townhouses and possibly entail the loss of one of the townhouse units. In response to a question from Mr. Beasley concerning communication between the developer and the neighbours, Mr. Kinney confirmed they would be willing to continue collaborative arrangements as they move into construction, to deal with the issues that are of major concern to the neighbours.

Mr. Rick Fuller, 1042 Nelson Street, stressed the residents of his building are not opposed to development of this site but want one that will not destroy the livability of their homes. He said the church is sacrificing the livability of 26 families for economic reasons, and a more creative way to raise money for the church should be found, possibly involving development of another piece of property. Mr. Fuller said while all parties have made every effort to make the project as inoffensive as possible, it is still an offensive proposal that should be reconsidered. In response to a question from Mr. Beasley, Mr. Fuller said a taller, narrower building would have less of an impact on their homes, and possibly siting it elsewhere on the property.

Mr. Graham Peat, 1042 Nelson Street, said he could tolerate the disruption on this site to see a development that is really worthwhile for the neighbourhood. However, the size and scale of the current proposal is uncomfortable and will have a major impact on the livability of their homes.

Panel Opinion

Mr. Grant advised the Urban Design Panel reviewed this proposal twice and he noted it has been both difficult and gratifying to see it evolve. He said he was heartened to see the 'for reference' drawings produced by the applicant today which address many of the issues raised by Panel members, although the Panel would still like to see a more slender tower. He said the Panel would be pleased to see the simpler top and the more honest use

of masonry extending to the top of the building. As well, the Panel thought the residents of 1042 Nelson were relatively well served by the introduction of high quality landscape and townhouses as neighbours. While noting the slenderness of the tower remains an issue, Mr. Grant acknowledged that many of the other issues in terms of the horizontal expression and the context with respect to the church and material, have been improved considerably through the process.

Mr. Hancock agreed with most of the Staff Committee recommendations. He had some concern with 1.2(b), noting the cornice is now set at a level which corresponds to the ridge of the church whereas the real perception, at pedestrian level, is more at the eave level. He therefore felt that raising the cornice would be counter productive. With respect to the floorplate, Mr. Hancock noted this is an 11-suite per floor building and he suggested it might be more efficient to reduce the floorplate size and add more floors. He felt that careful analysis of the suite layouts could easily reduce the floorplate to below 650 m². He therefore urged that condition 1.1 be strongly pursued, noting also that the north-south dimension is critical. He also recommended pulling the tower back more to the south, opening up more light for the neighbours facing north.

Mr. Kavanagh concurred with his Advisory Panel colleagues' comments. He recommended deletion of 1.2(b) and to make 1.5 a consideration item. He said, if it is possible to reduce the rear setback to zero, it would be an improvement.

Mr. Gjernes said he would encourage the church to develop this site, but expressed some concern that the application was a complete submission rather than a preliminary which would have helped to resolve many of the issues. He noted there is still a fair amount of work to be done. He felt the massing and the configuration needed to be reworked, and the floorplate size reduced. The building should be taller and slimmer, recognizing the concerns of the neighbours. Mr. Gjernes said he was concerned about the economic viability of the townhouses and their impact on the neighbourhood, preferring to see this massing transferred to the tower. Mr. Gjernes also recommended that the City allow the amount of parking proposed, noting that rental buildings generate about two-thirds of the parking demand of market buildings. He suggested the Board give approval in principle only at this time, given the amount of rework required.

Ms. Leduc agreed with the previous comments concerning the massing and stressed the building needs to be reconsidered in terms of its floorplate size. She urged the setback at the lane be reduced as much as possible. She also felt this application should have been submitted as a preliminary, and urged greater discussion with the neighbours in the form of workshops so that they are kept fully informed and their concerns about shadowing are addressed.

Mr. Roodenburg concurred with the recommended conditions and said he supported the project in principle. He felt the issues raised in conditions 1.2 and 1.5 would be better worked out between the applicant and staff. With respect to condition 1.1, he agreed the floorplate should be minimized. He said, if there is a way the building could be narrower and higher to reduce impact on the neighbours, he would encourage it.

Board Discussion

The Chair tabled an additional condition suggested by Mr. Segal, dealing with use of the RM-5B portion of the commercial podium (B.2.6), as discussed earlier.

Mr. Beasley said he felt there has been a good attempt by the applicant to act in good faith and be neighbourly; however, he acknowledged some of the neighbours' concerns and encouraged discussions to continue as this project moves forward. He urged both parties to be proactive in these discussions. Mr. Beasley pointed out that another development on this site, even with less density, could be quite intrusive to the neighbouring building, remembering also the important heritage church on this site which it is in the public interest to preserve. Commenting on the suggestion that the townhouses might be eliminated and the density incorporated into the tower, Mr. Beasley strongly disagreed that they are a liability because experience to date has proven townhouses in the downtown to be very popular and easy to rent or sell. They also encourage families with children to locate in the downtown, as well as providing gardens that are beneficial to the neighbourhood in general. In this instance, the townhouses are very much in the interest of this building and the neighbouring building. Mr. Beasley felt every effort should be made to save the two large trees in the front.

With respect to traffic management, in addition to whatever is required of this developer, Mr. Beasley said it is evident there is a responsibility of Engineering Services to have a second look at the conditions in the lane and to do so in concert with the neighbours and the developer to arrive at an appropriate solution. He also felt there should be a lot more consideration in the traffic study to traffic management during the construction period. Mr. Beasley agreed the size of the floorplate should be reduced, but urged caution before concluding that pushing the building back to the lane is the

best solution. Efforts should be made to help the neighbours understand the shadow analysis that has been done so that they are comfortable with the recommendations.

Mr. MacGregor agreed the townhouses help create a viable solution that the Board can approve. He noted the neighbours' comments have been very thoughtful and helpful in looking at how to accommodate the development. Mr. MacGregor said he also had concern about the floorplate size.

Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. 404744, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated April 19, 2000, with the following amendments:

Amend 1.1, to add:

, as a minimum, with consideration to move to a target floorplate of 604 m² (6,500 sq.ft.) and a north-south dimension of approximately 25.9 m² (85 ft.), with an increase in building height, subject to economic viability;

Delete 1.2 (b);

Delete 1.5 and replace it with the following:

design development to the setback of the townhouses along the lane to reflect CPTED principles, even if this means elimination of the lane setback;

Add 1.7:

investigate redesign of the townhouses and the underground parking structure to attempt to preserve at least one of the maple trees on the site along Nelson Street;

Amend A.1.2 to read:

compliance with ~~Section 4 (Off Street Parking Space Regulations)~~ with the Parking By-law;

Amend the Note to Applicant after A.1.2:

1st paragraph, last sentence:

The number of parking spaces required for the church use shall be ~~the greater of this number or the~~ number determined using the Parking By-Law;

3rd paragraph:

Consideration may be given to some shared use of spaces which may reduce the by-law requirement slightly, *to approximately 237 parking spaces*, subject to Condition A.2.2 (Please refer to comments from Engineering Services on p.12).;

Amend A.2.1:

provision of a traffic study, *including consideration of traffic impacts during construction*, done to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Engineering Services and the Director of Planning, with the intent that the recommendations of the study, if accepted by Engineering Services and Planning *following input from nearby residents*, will be implemented fully at the owner's expense;

Amend B.1.2 to change the date for compliance to *August 25, 2000*;

Add a new B.2.6:

the use of the portion of the second floor within the RM-5B District must be ancillary to the church;

Note to Applicant: Commercial is not a permitted use in the RM-5B District.

Re-number B.2.6 to B.2.7;

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Mr. Beasley put the following motion with respect to traffic which was not seconded:

FURTHER THAT the Board urges the City Engineer to review the traffic circumstances in the lane, in consultation with residents and property owners.

- LOST

(Mr. MacGregor and Mr. Timm opposed)

Mr. MacGregor was unwilling to second the motion because he considered it to be redundant in view of the amended condition A.2.1 which now requires the traffic study to be discussed with the residents. He said, Engineering Services will deal with the matter as it does on any other construction project. Mr. Beasley countered that he felt it was important for the residents that, with this new development creating additional traffic in the lane, the Board be on record as urging a review to be undertaken, including input from nearby residents and property owners. Mr. MacGregor said he believed this would be going beyond the authority of the Development Permit Board which is to review the impacts of the subject development application. He did not disagree with the residents that a problem exists currently in the lane, but that the problem should be addressed by Engineering Services in the usual way. He said he was confident Engineering Services would act on the matter. Mr. Timm was also not prepared to second Mr. Beasley's motion. He agreed with Mr. MacGregor's remarks, noting the message to Engineering Services is clear and will be dealt with expeditiously. Mr. Scobie added, he did not believe such a motion to be inappropriate in order that higher priority might be given to the issue and to ensure the involvement of the local residents.

Responding to a question from Mr. Gjernes concerning the suggestion of relaxing the parking requirement in exchange for the rental covenant, Mr. Scobie noted that while this was not implicitly acknowledged by the Board, the amended condition A.1.2 now refers to *approximately 237 spaces*, which does provide some opportunity to further discussion between Engineering Services and the applicant.

4. OTHER BUSINESS

None.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7.00 pm.

Carol Hubbard
Clerk to the Board

F.A. Scobie
Chair

/ch