

Date: Monday, November 17, 2008
Time: 3:00 p.m.
Place: Committee Room No. 1, City Hall

PRESENT:**Board**

C. Warren Director of Development Services (Chair)
B. Toderian Director of Planning
J. Ridge Deputy City Manager
T. Timm General Manager of Engineering Services

Advisory Panel

J. Wall Representative of the Design Professions (Urban Design Panel)
S. Tatomir Representative of the Design Professions
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
H. Hung Representative of the General Public
C. Nystedt Representative of the General Public

Regrets

K. Maust Representative of the Vancouver Heritage Commission

ALSO PRESENT:**City Staff:**

B. Boons Assistant Director of Processing Centre - Development
P. Storer Engineer, Projects Branch
R. Whitlock Senior Housing Officer
S. Black Development Planner
P. Cheng Development Planner
D. Autiero Project Facilitator
D. Robinson Project Facilitator

1190 HORNBY STREET - DE412359 - ZONE DD

M. Anthony Musson Cattell Mackey Partnership
B. Reid Musson Cattell Mackey Partnership
B. Breatson Concert Real Estate Corporation
A. Whitcelo Concert Real Estate Corporation
B. Hemstock PWL Landscape Architects

337 WEST PENDER STREET - DE412378 - ZONE DD

D. Jansen DYS Architecture
B. Gauthier Landscape Architecture Inc.
D. Burnham Coast Foundation Society

Recording Secretary: L. Harvey

1. MINUTES

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

THAT the Minutes of the Development Permit Board and Advisory Panel Meeting of October 20, 2008 be approved with the following amendments:

On page 8, amend Mr. Toderian's comments to read:

Mr. Toderian stated that the Board always listens to what the public has to say, but has to take into consideration Council's direction and policy. He noted that the restaurant is not *being considered as a new intervention on land that was anticipated for park space, but rather is being located in the site selected in the initial park master planning exercise*. Four years ago Council made the decision on the use of the site *for restaurant* and it is not the purview of the Board to *reconsider that Council decision*. Mr. Toderian said he would be curious to know if the developer had portrayed to the residents the plans for the *restaurant* as they had done for the Vancouver Convention Centre. Mr. Toderian *stated* that the Board's job was to discuss architecture and not use, and he was not inclined to defer the application.

Mr. Toderian commended the Park Board for its commissioning of this architect. He also commended the sustainability achievement and the architect for a beautifully designed building noting that it was an exceptional piece of architecture. Mr. Toderian thought the screen wall added to the view noting that it was important for the members of the public to understand that there isn't Council Policy that entitles them to an unobstructed view of the water. Mr. Toderian made a motion *to add a direction for the applicant to meet further with the residents of Harbour Green 2 before permit issuance, and also* added a number of *additional* amendments to the conditions.

On page 8, amend the second sentence in Mr. Dobrovolny's comments to read: He added that he supported the design and the recommendations in the Staff Committee Report but did not support a recommendation *to require a further meeting between* the applicant and the purchasers of Harbour Green 2 to discuss the design and Board conditions.

On page 8, amend Mr. Ridge's comments by adding the following line after the first line:

However, the intent of the multiple channels is to inform as many people as possible.

2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

None.

**3. 1190 HORNBY STREET - DE412359 - ZONE DD
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: Musson Cattell Mackey Partnership

Request: To add approximately 6,561 sq. ft. to the 8th and 9th level of this existing office / health care office / retail building. The application also includes exterior alterations to provide an additional glazed canopy located at the Hornby Street entry. This application requests the additional density through the transfer of heritage density from a donor site at 640 West Pender Street.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

Sailen Black, Development Planner, introduced the application for an addition to the existing building on Hornby Street which received a development permit in 1982. Mr. Black noted that the red brick portion on the architectural model represented the existing structure. The proposal is for the addition of about 6,500 square feet on top of the 7th level of the building. The addition will be clad in glass which will be a visual distinction from the brick on the existing building. Mr. Black noted that the addition adheres to the ODP and the downtown area guidelines with a couple of exceptions which are noted in the conditions in the Staff Committee Report. The overall width above the 70 foot mark is wider than the normal tower width, and as well the floor plate is a bit larger than normal. The guidelines suggest that for the purpose of landing heritage density, the guidelines can be relaxed. The major effects would be to the residential tower with some reduction in daylighting which has been noted in the Staff Committee Report. There are no major changes planned to the ground floor level where there is an open plaza area. The applicant plans to improve the landscaping for the plaza area and as well, a canopy is planned to better mark the entry.

Mr. Black reviewed the recommendations contained in the Staff Committee Report dated October 22, 2008. The recommendation was for support of the proposal, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Committee Report.

Questions/Discussion

In response to questions raised by the Board and Panel, the following clarification was provided by Mr. Black:

- Notification cards were sent out to residents within a block and a half of the application.
- 895 letter, were sent out to the owners including specific strata titled buildings.

Applicant's Comments

Mark Anthony, Architect, said the applicant team was in agreement with the conditions in the Staff Committee Report.

Questions/Discussion

In response to questions raised by the Board and Panel, the following clarification was provided by the applicant team:

- The architectural boards correctly show the shadow analysis for the application.
- There will be a lot of overlook from neighbouring buildings and the applicant team is willing to bridge the gap between what is in the application to something more sustainable for the roof.

- The plaza design is currently under utilized and the applicant team agreed that there was an opportunity to add more greenery to the plaza to make it more useable.
- Zoning doesn't allow for retail at ground level on the site. The space is planned for office use as well as a work-out area.
- A seismic upgrade will not be done on the current Jack Bell building.

Comments from other Speakers

None.

Panel Opinion

Mr. Wall noted that the application was not seen by the Urban Design Panel. Mr. Wall thought it was a benefit to add density to the project noting that the massing was well handled. He commended the applicant for considering the solar orientation of the building. The south-west façade is well handled but Mr. Wall said he would like to see the applicant go further. His major concern was the architecture and the colour choices. He thought the materials didn't compliment the brick palette on the existing building and would like to see the colours have a warmer or darker tone. Mr. Wall encouraged the applicant to do whatever was necessary to improve the plaza space and suggested adding a café on the ground floor to animate the space. Mr. Wall added that the canopy was appropriate in terms of scale and thought the project was supportable.

Mr. Shearing recommended approval of the application.

Mr. Stovell commended the applicant for taking heritage density for office use and recommended approval of the application.

Ms. Nystedt recommended approval of the application.

Mr. Chung recommended approval of the application and encouraged the applicant to improve the plaza space.

Mr. Hung recommended approval of the application and said he liked the addition of the canopy at the entrance.

Mr. Braun recommended approval of the application. He suggested the colour choices needed to either mimic or be totally different from the current Jack Bell building so it looks like a cohesive piece of architecture.

Board Discussion

Mr. Toderian stated that it was nice to see more office space being created. Regarding the notification process, Mr. Toderian stated that he trusted the effectiveness of the process and that the public had the opportunity to comment and they have chosen not to respond. Mr. Toderian said it was great to see heritage density being used for the development and noted that it was City policy to not have retail on non-retail streets. He added that it was an obligation of the applicant to enliven the plaza space and that some retail could help to animate the area. He added that it was at his discretion to consider the use of retail for this application and would work with the applicant to find a solution. Improving the plaza was not dependent on the use and that there were design improvements with the existing use that could make the space more useable.

Mr. Timm supported Mr. Toderian's amendments but suggested that Condition 1.4 (e) be made a consideration item so as to not hold up the permit process. Mr. Timm noted that there had

been zero response from the public regarding the application and was concerned that the normal process had been followed. Mr. Timm acknowledged the applicant for using heritage density which will have little impact on the area. He added that he couldn't remember any previous applications that had used heritage density for office space in the city.

Mr. Ridge said he was happy to see heritage density landing on the site. He was supportive of the amendment [Condition 1.4 (e)] to the Staff Committee Report being a consideration item. Mr. Ridge encouraged the applicant to rethink the choice of colour. He added that he was in support of the application.

Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DE412359, in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated October 22, 2008, with the following amendments:

Add a new Condition 1.3:

Consider design development to further refine the design appearance and usability of the street-fronting plaza;

Note to Applicant: Staff will work with the applicant to consider design approaches and adjacent uses that will enliven the public space.

**4. 337 WEST PENDER STREET - DE412378 - ZONE DD
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: DYS Architecture

Request: To construct a 9 storey mixed-use development containing one retail store on the ground floor and 95 housekeeping units (low cost housing) with associated amenity space above one level of underground parking.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

Paul Cheng, Development Planner, noted that the application was not on the list of the 12 social housing sites that were discussed in the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the City of Vancouver and BC Housing. The project has been dubbed "site #13" by staff since the same principles apply with respect to staff's evaluation of the project. Mr. Cheng noted that the zoning for the site was in the Downtown District sub-area known as Victory Square. The height limit for the area is 70 feet but relaxable up to 100 feet for any application where at least two-thirds of the building is for social/supportive or low-cost housing. Mr. Cheng reminded the Board in order to consider the relaxation, the location and size of the site along with the intent of the zoning policies and guidelines must be taken into consideration as well as the overall design of the building, the provision of pedestrian amenities and public realm requirements as well as the preservation of the character of the area. Mr. Cheng described the Victory Square historical precinct noting the dense urban building forms, commercial ground level frontages and low to mid-height buildings. Most of the buildings in the area are either heritage designated or are registered buildings. Mr. Cheng said that it was unlikely that there would be any new development in the area. He described the application noting that it will be a 9-storey mixed-use development containing one retail store and 95 housekeeping units and associated amenity space. The units are smaller than the usual 320 square feet but their small size will be compensated for by adequate amenity and lounge areas. Mr. Cheng added that through careful consideration of the building mass, the project succeeded in achieving a large amount of social housing on the site while formally fitting in with a historically low-height streetscape. Further design development will be required to achieve increased liveability of the suites, and to achieve an architectural expression that will visually integrate with the surrounding neighbours.

Mr. Cheng reviewed the recommendations contained in the Staff Committee Report dated November 5, 2008. The recommendation was for support of the proposal, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Committee Report.

Mr. Whitlock, Senior Housing Officer, noted that the project brings forward an additional 95 units of supportive housing to be developed on City owned property to serve people who are homeless, or at risk of homelessness. In this respect the project is exactly the same structure as the 12 supportive housing sites, several of which have been dealt with by the Board. This project along with another on Station Street and the 12 sites will result in a total of over 1,400 units being achieved. This project broadens the continuum of supportive housing by providing units which are slightly smaller. People will live here for a fixed period of time and then move to independent housing. The Coast Foundation will provide management for this building and for a site the Board had previously dealt with at West 16th Avenue and Dunbar Street. Staff has recommended the submission of an augmented Operation Management Plan before the final approval of the application.

Questions/Discussion

In response to questions raised by the Board and Panel, the following clarification was provided by Mr. Cheng and Mr. Whitlock:

- All of the other buildings on the block are heritage designated or are on the Heritage Registry.
- There won't be any other redevelopment on the block.
- Staff are striving for a building that doesn't look out of place on the block face and relates to the heritage nature of the area.
- The project will be managed by Coast Foundation Society and is intended to house people who are on the street, with the goal of providing health, recovery, social and recreational rehabilitation, food, clothing and life skills training.
- The extra ceiling height (9 feet) makes the small units more comfortable and helps with respect to air circulation.
- The site was purchased by the City of Vancouver for the purpose of social housing and the funding was made available through BC Housing.
- The applicant tried several different massing notions and staff believe they have come up with the right approach.
- All the amenity and outdoor spaces are exempt from the FSR calculation.
- A detailed Operational Management Plan will be provided.
- There is not enough space in the building envelope to add another floor.
- There will be a major lounge on the ground floor with amenity rooms on most of the other levels.
- Prevailing policy calls for ground floor retail and the applicant is being asked that the uses at grade are open and visible and contribute to the sidewalk experience.
- The operator has a desire to have a retail space open to the public whereby crafts and other items made by the residents can be sold to the general public. Also there would be space to sell core needs items to the residents of the building.
- A separate application would be necessary to change the retail space to another use.
- The building could move forward on the property line but the entry alcove could remain in the same location thereby giving more room for bicycle storage.
- The units are smaller than the standard social housing units and will be augmented with a large amount of amenity space.
- One meal a day will be served to the residents.

Applicant's Comments

Mr. Burnham of Coast Foundation Society, said the Society has over 30 sites in Vancouver that house people with mental illness and complex social issues. They are a well established organization and expect to operate the building with BC Housing. There will be 11 wheelchair suites with one floor designated for young people, a women's floor and affiliated amenity areas. Residents will be referred to the project through BC Housing. Mr. Burnham said they anticipate the residents will come mostly from SRO's. The units are not intended for long term housing but residents may live there up to two years. They see the project as a feeder facility for the other sites that are being built throughout the city. Regarding the retail use, Mr. Burnham noted that they haven't developed a business plan for the retail as yet. He added that they will probably work with Coast Landscape with Heart to develop the business plan, and as well, operate the retail and give the residents opportunities for employment.

Mr. Jansen, Architect, spoke to issues regarding specific conditions. Regarding Condition 1.1, Mr. Jansen noted that throughout the other 12 social housing sites, the units have been designed with 9 foot ceilings to improve the liveability of the units. He was concerned with Condition 1.2 noting that currently the site is a parking lot and is a story lower than the

sidewalk. They want to retain the alcove at the front to mitigate the slope at the entrance. He asked the Board to consider changing the wording. Mr. Jansen was also concerned with Condition 1.3, noting the trellis raised the façade up to the 70 foot height and as well the amenity space needs to be taken into account. Regarding Condition A.1.1., Mr. Jansen asked the Board to consider softening the wording noting that the mechanical penthouse encloses the fixed elements of the elevator and the stairs. Regarding the bike stalls, Mr. Jansen said they would be able meet Condition A.1.2 without having to add another floor underground. He was also concerned with Condition A.1.18 asking for a 5 foot high screen noting that the screen is eight feet away from the exterior wall and they want to get as much transparency as possible for the unit. Mr. Jansen added that he didn't have an issue with the addition of metal cladding to the blank wall to match the back façade of the building.

Questions/Discussion

In response to questions raised by the Board and Panel, the following clarification was provided by the applicant team:

- The solar panels will be used for domestic hot water.
- The applicant is confident that they will provide what is shown in the presentation regarding the solar panels although they have yet to do their energy modeling.
- The applicant has a strong commitment to LEED™ Gold equivalent.
- The vertical fins on the front façade don't offer much shading but acknowledge the history of West Pender Street and all the neon signs.
- Staff are recommending the removal of the trellis and don't recommend a height increase although they expect the height to be raised slightly. They would like the height maintained up to or at the 100 foot mark which is essentially the height of other buildings on the street.
- The rear façade is not a concern as the guidelines suggest the building should come to the lane.
- There are a number of other supportive housing projects in the area including Covenant House which offers transitional housing for young people.
- The project will be a feeder facility for other sites in Vancouver and will help the residents prepare for independent living.
- The daily meal will be for the residents in the building only.
- The unit size starts at approximately 230 square feet.

Comments from other Speakers

Ron Fisher, owner of the building to the east (Victory Building) which was built in 1910. He said he was concerned about the scale of the building and that no parking would be provided to replace the current parking lot on the site. Mr. Fisher wanted the Board to require the applicant to provide parking spaces and as well to provide retail uses on the ground floor. He felt that they were losing too much retail space in the area.

Mark Abedi, Astalt Holding, was concerned that the City can put social housing on any property in the city. He said he was against the social housing use on the site and asked the Board to consider the business people in the area.

Vincent Fodori, owner of Backpackers Hostel, was concerned about the financial impact of the project on the neighbourhood. He asked the Board for 5% (\$10M) of the cost of the project to be given to the neighbours by way of compensation. He said he was concerned that he would have to turn the hostel into a low income place too and was worried about the loss of income.

Questions/Discussion

In response to questions raised by the Board and Panel, the following clarification was provided by staff:

- The construction value of the project will be a maximum of \$20,000,000.

Panel Opinion

Mr. Wall noted that the Urban Design Panel had supported the project. The Panel had a few concerns regarding how the building integrated with the street. Mr. Wall felt the prior-to conditions had addressed the Panel's concerns. He felt that the setback on West Pender Street would be stronger if the building were brought out to the property line with the recessed entry remaining in the proposed location. Mr. Wall said there should be some design development to the overall massing to better integrate the building with its neighbours. He thought the vertical elements break the reading of the building and make it more like a modern project that is not complementary to the adjacent heritage buildings. Mr. Wall noted that one concern which had not been mentioned in the prior-to conditions was how the brick meets the street. He said he liked the rear elevation and the use of brick noting that most of the interest at the West Pender Street side was at the top of the building. He added that it would be nice if the brick found its way to the ground floor and suggested putting a condition forward as a consideration item. Regarding the 9 foot ceiling height, Mr. Wall suggested putting some flexibility into that condition and let the staff and the applicant work out the issue. Mr. Wall also suggested that if the project pursued more of a dumbbell shape it might be possible to take one floor off the building height.

Mr. Tatomir noted that it was important to have the architect, owner, engineer and staff give their input at the beginning of a project in order to affect the design regarding sustainability rather than trying to amend the design later. He said he thought the design was responding to the Victory Square Guidelines and thought the applicant should be asked to reduce the vertical fins. Mr. Tatomir said he recommended approval of the application.

Mr. Shearing thought the building didn't hang together as a piece of architecture in the existing neighbourhood. He thought it was overly complex and could have been a much simpler design. Mr. Shearing thought it was a good idea to move the building out to the front of the street. He also suggested removing the trellis on the 7th floor and would like to see the building reduced in height. Mr. Shearing suggested separating the ground floor use from the upper floor with a strong cornice line that would tie in with the Victory Block and the neighbour to the west. Mr. Shearing said he was in support of the rest of the conditions in the Staff Committee Report.

Mr. Stovell thought the building did not fit into the neighbourhood noting that most of the surrounding buildings are a lower form. Also, most of the buildings go straight up from the street for the first 8, 10, 12 storeys without any kind of modulation. He suggested having the first 6 floors go straight up without any setbacks. He said he would also like to see the building take up the full width across the site which could add an additional five units. Mr. Stovell said he supported having the retail on the ground floor adding that retail had been lost in the area because of the addition of institutional uses in the neighbourhood. Mr. Stovell said he was in support of the application.

Mr. Chung thought the façade was too complicated and said he preferred the north elevation which was a simpler design. Mr. Chung said he thought the building was trying too hard to fit into the neighbourhood and recommended the applicant make the façade simpler and also delete the trellis and the vertical fins. Mr. Chung said he thought the design was not truly a sawtooth and would like to see the façade reworked to be similar to the north elevation.

Mr. Hung said he welcomed the social housing project and thought it would improve the area. He said he supported retail on the ground floor which he felt would help to revitalize the neighbourhood. Mr. Hung thought the ceiling heights didn't need to be nine feet and suggested expanding the top portion of the building to make it span from property line to property line. Mr. Hung recommended approval of the application.

Ms. Nystedt said that after reviewing the material she was in support of the recommendations in the Staff Committee Report.

Mr. Braun suggested a new condition be added to improve the finish on the blank wall. He recommended retail space on the ground floor noting that what was proposed would be serving a small niche market. Mr. Braun was concerned about the architectural quality of the project and questioned whether the Board would approve the application if it wasn't a social housing project.

Board Discussion

Mr. Toderian thanked the members of the public for their comments. He also thanked BC Housing for every project they have funded in the city and he hoped there would be more to come. He also commended BC Housing for their continued emphasis on sustainability and said he hoped the design survives value engineering. Mr. Toderian said he appreciated the leadership the province was showing regarding sustainability.

Mr. Toderian thought there were some serious comments from the Advisory Panel members regarding the architecture. Architecturally speaking, he thought the project was a "pattern building" that respected the surrounding buildings and was not expected to stand out. He added that he did however agree with the general tone of the Advisory Panel's comments but didn't think there needed to be a fundamental redesign in order to address the issues. Although he liked the simplicity of the rear elevation he didn't like its apparent height and he thought the approach to stepping back the upper levels to have it read better was the right thing to do. He suggested taking the simplicity of the rear elevation and applying it to the front. He thought this had been addressed in the conditions in the Staff Committee Report. Mr. Toderian thought the major problem with the front expression was that it accentuated the verticality which is one of the negatives of the building. If there had been an approach that extenuated the horizontal nature, then the building wouldn't necessarily need to be as tall. Since there wouldn't be much of an energy performance from the fins, then clearing up the clutter would be important in simplifying that expression. On the other hand, Mr. Toderian acknowledged the gesture of the central fin relative to what was a more historic pattern, in a contemporary context. Mr. Toderian encouraged the applicant to work with staff to find a solution.

Mr. Toderian said he was not going to propose any changes regarding the approach to the at-grade retail. He noted that the city does not have enough social housing sites and while there is a tendency to make the most of the application, he said he was unsatisfied that the project wasn't being more respectful of the pattern in the neighbourhood.

In answer to a member of the public's comments on the loss of property values, Mr. Toderian said it was not the City's approach to compensate in the context of construction. He also noted that it wasn't his experience that there was a drop in property values where social housing is located and in fact, not addressing social conditions has a greater impact on the neighbourhood. Mr. Toderian added that having homeless people on the street was also not good for property or societal values.

Mr. Timm thought another step should be taken to simplify the front façade. He suggested bringing the two shoulders on the sides forward and not having any setback so as not to accentuate the vertical height of the building. Regarding the unit height, Mr. Timm thought the units would be more liveable with a 9 foot ceiling height. Mr. Timm was concerned with the lack of a provision for viable retail space on the ground floor to support the commercial aspirations of the neighbourhood. He suggested that there needs to be a balance between providing supportive housing and keeping commercial viable in the city. He noted that the project is in keeping with Council policy and neighbours are invited to comment on development at rezoning hearings, at Council when zoning guidelines are adopted and when there are civic elections. He added that it is the Board's job to administer the policies that Council established to address City issues. Unfortunately in this case, retail is going to lose out to a greater extent than he would like to see. Mr. Timm pointed out that the project couldn't compensate its neighbours for their property taxes because part of their taxes went towards paying for the project. He added that he thought it was an important project and was pleased to support the motion.

Mr. Ridge said he had some angst regarding the project noting that the Board had come a long way with the amendments. He noted that the Board had seen so many of the social housing sites that have been extraordinary and he felt the Board had a higher expectation for the architecture. Mr. Ridge said he shared the concern regarding the balance between the retail and social housing and didn't think the project was there yet and hoped there could be a solution for other social housing projects.

Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DE412378, in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated November 5, 2008, with the following amendments:

Amend Condition 1.1 to read:

design development to achieve a clear ceiling height of 9 ft. (2.74 m) for all housekeeping units;

Note to Applicant: See discussion on Page 8 related to the staff recommendation for an increase in the maximum allowable building height under the "hardship" clause of the Interpretation Section of the DODP. In this case, a strict enforcement of the height limit on the severely sloping site is considered a hardship. A modest increase to the overall calculated building height above 100 ft., ***in order to achieve 9 ft. clear ceiling heights***, is therefore permitted.

Amend Condition 1.2 to read:

design development to physically move the principle building facade at the ground level, forward to align with the front and rear property lines respectively;

Amend Condition 1.4 a) to read:

Elimination of the proposed vertical fins and all trellises that are viewable from the street. Consideration maybe given to the retention of the central fin or similar expression once other changes are made.

Amend Condition 1.4 by adding a new e) to read:

Consideration of moving the use of brick material, lowering the building, as with the rear façade.

Amend the first sentence in the Note to Applicant in Condition 1.4 to read:

Note to Applicant: While the proposed vertical fins and trellises are effective as shading devices, their employment *accentuates the vertical height of the building, and* produces a visual “softening” of the building outline . . .

Amend Condition A.1.13 to read:

provision of 6 Class B bicycle parking spaces (bike racks) *within the alcove at the main entry to the building*, to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Engineering Services;

Amend Condition A.1.18 by changing “5 ft.” to **3.6 ft.**

5. OTHER BUSINESS

End of Term Thank You: the Board will look at options for a site visit on applications seen by the Board followed by a lunch or dinner. It was suggested that a March date be selected and the Urban Design Panel members be included.

Minutes Approval by Board by email due to length of time between meetings. Agreed to approve the minutes through email and conference call.

6. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6:30 pm.

L. Harvey
Assistant to the Board

C. Warren
Chair