

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: December 15, 2010

TIME: 4.00 pm

PLACE: Committee Room No. 1, City Hall

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:
Bruce Haden (Chair)
Robert Barnes
James Cheng (Excused Item #2)
Jeff Corbett
Jane Durante
David Godin
Jim Huffman
Oliver Lang
Alan Storey

REGRETS:
Steve McFarlane
Vladimir Mikler
Maurice Pez
Scott Romses

**RECORDING
SECRETARY:** Lorna Harvey

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING	
1.	Marine and Cambie Intersection
2.	Plaza of Nations Civic Plaza
3.	428 Terminal Avenue

BUSINESS MEETING

Chair Haden called the meeting to order at 4:15 p.m. and noted the presence of a quorum. There being no New Business the meeting considered applications as scheduled for presentation.

1. Address: Marine and Cambie Intersection
DE: Non-voting Workshop
Description: to seek input and advice as to the best options from an urban design perspective focusing on the Marine and Cambie intersection.
Zoning: N/A
Application Status: N/A
Architect: N/A
Owner: N/A
Review: First
Delegation: Derek Lee, PWL Landscape Architects
Walter Francl, Walter Francl Architects
James Cheng, James Cheng Architects
Ryan Bragg, Busby Perkins + Will
Staff: Jim Bailey and Scot Hein

EVALUATION: Non-Voting Workshop

The following panelists declared a conflict of interest as a design professional or owner: James Cheng, Jim Huffman, Maurice Pez, Bruce Haden and Jane Durante. Mr. Haden remained in the chair noting that the session was a non-voting workshop and acknowledged that these panelists can not vote on these proposals, or related yet to be determined initiatives, in the future. Their commentary is distinguished from those without conflict in these minutes.

- **Introduction:** Scot Hein, Development Planner, introduced the workshop noting there were a series of presentation materials in the room. The intersection is an emerging urban frame work specific to a local thematic branding called "Marine Landing". He noted that this was the first time the Panel would be able to look at a collective arrangement of all the sites. In addition he noted that the Buddhist site on the southwest corner could become part of the planning for the area but had not declared any interest in redevelopment at this time. He noted that the drawings were only an interpretation of the architecture and didn't fully represent the emerging architectural idea of the sites. The purpose of the workshop was that PCI had pulled their step form off the table largely due to some concern registered by the neighbourhood. As a result, Mr. Hein stated that they thought it would be a good time to rethink what's going on at the intersection in terms of collective massing impact and to look at new schemes. He added that the presentation would present that new scheme as a result of working with the neighbourhood. There are now three different and more refine schemes on the three sites (PCI, Intercorp and Wesgroup).

Mr. Hein noted that they will be moving forward to Council with a request for the necessary work and resources to develop a formal public realm plan for not only the corridor but as well specifically the intersection at Marine Drive and Cambie Street. There will be some systems with interpretive work, with some programming, with celebratory aspects working collegially with the four key sites assuming Council supports the plan. This would give a framework for a financial investment point of view as to what it will take to deliver and implement the plan.

Mr. Hein stated that the site is more of a local concern than regional. The idea that the development is looked at as a gateway is a concern to the community. The residents would like the development to contribute more locally. He noted that there are a few urban design ideas that are reemerging and he asked the Panel to comment on the slimness vs the bulk, the idea of having a distinctive hierarchy and authentic place. He added that there has been some discussion on having four distinctive responses but they have to be bound together at the ground plane by the public realm framework.

Derek Lee, Landscape Architect, noted that there were a set of principles that came out of a number of workshops with the community. They incorporate some of the approaches that they put forward along with the City. They also began to combine some of the ideas that came out of the Marine Landing document that was put forward by the resident's association. There was a desire amongst the community to look at the Cambie Corridor in the context of the neighbourhood. Mr. Lee noted that the first principle is to enhance pedestrian and cyclist's connectivity. Cambie Street is being looked at as a high street from the southerly point of the Heritage Boulevard and extending the experience down to Kent Street and possibly down to the river. The idea was to repair the urban grid and to have green streets as a way to address existing neighbourhood streets and also introduce new dedicated greenways and streets. They also looked at the ideas of normalizing intersections with signal pedestrian crossing. There is an existing bike way along 43rd Avenue and they are thinking about extending the bike network down Cambie Street and potentially hooking onto the south Kent Avenue connection that could go as far as East Fraser Lands.

The second principle was to provide new amenities and to enhance existing amenities in the neighbourhood. This is defined as the four corners which would be a very dynamic mixed-use high density environment centered around the Canada Line Station. They also identified a neighbourhood hub potentially on the river that could be mixed employment, mixed activity and use. Extending the idea of mixed employment done the Cambie Corridor to the water to activate the area has also been discussed.

The residents have identified park improvement in the area, particularly Ash Street Park and they are looking at introducing new park space as Cambie Corridor builds out with the possibility of pocket parks. As well they may be looking at enhancement of the river's edge as a linear park experience.

Principles three and four have been combined; creating a social heart. This mirrors where the neighbourhood hubs are sited and are opportunities for dynamic, animated urban experiences. They see Marine Drive taking on one character and then extending the character of the river front up Cambie Street where it meets the Heritage Boulevard. There are also plans for a public art program that leads down to the waterfront to reinforce that sense of place.

Mr. Lee said they are working with the City to come up with their first steps to what the details might look like to create urban development parcels and a development form that is in character with the surrounding neighbourhood.

Walter Francl, Architect (on behalf of Wesgroup), noted that they don't have an application or letter of enquiry at this point for their site. The site fronts a very busy intersection and they want to recognize the asymmetry of the intersection as well as the passive nature of the school yard. They are also recognizing the connection through the site and will refine and develop the connection to the park and allow the activity from the intersection to come across the north edge of their site, landscape the area and allow the pedestrian traffic to migrate to corner. There are plans for a plaza at the intersection. The massing

of the project will likely be smaller against the park with a child care facility on the corner fronting onto the park and a green space around it with a four to six storey commercial base and residential or mixed residential commercial on top. There are also looking at a 286 foot tower on the corner and they are thinking of stepping the form of the tower to mitigate the shadows that it would cast on the neighbouring properties.

James Cheng, Architect, noted that their property is separated by the guideway that goes underground so there is some difficulty with the site in that there isn't any frontage or access on to Cambie Street. The urban design study started from the intersection and having the towers closer to the street and because of the narrowness of the site they wanted to pull back the massing to create open spaces. As a result, the four towers won't be jammed into the intersection and there will be a better sun angle to allow for more sunlight on the open spaces. In discussion with the applicant of the adjacent site, they agreed on a massing hierarchy because of being next to the transit station allowing for the most prominence and then stepping down to the neighbourhood. Another urban design move will be to taper down in all directions into the single family neighbourhood. The housing mix is an important issue as Marpole has mostly single family houses and two or three storey walkup apartment buildings. It is envisioned that the housing that will be provided will add diversity to the neighbourhood as well as social and affordable housing. Mr. Cheng noted that it will be important for the neighbourhood to come down to the water so there will be a series of terraces with public art to make the pedestrian experience more enjoyable.

Ryan Bragg, Architect, described the changes since the last review by the Panel. He noted that there are changes on the western façade of the residential tower, the massing of the office tower and potential shadowing impacts of the residential tower. One of the major issues that had come up from the community was the shadow their tower had created on the public spaces and the school. The issue with the form was the breath of the east west direction and they needed to narrow the plate in order to get the number of residential units they wanted to achieve. The current proposal is for two towers on the western podium and a revision to the massing of the office tower which is still under design. The towers are slender and small in their floor plates. He noted that the functional requirement of the office tower didn't lend itself to breaking it up into more towers. They have introduced a plaza along Marine Drive that responds to the plaza that occurs on the corner of the Intercorp site and addresses some of the connections to the community.

- **Related Commentary:**

The Panel agreed that generally the urban design framework was heading in the right direction. They thought all the basic topics were covered but they believed that what was critical to the plan was access to the water (Fraser River) and how that would work. They thought it might be a major challenge to take the Cambie Corridor successfully to the water's edge. One Panel member noted that those wayfinding routes needed to be carefully considered. It was noted that there are still some problems with Cambie Street, at Marine Drive, as there needs to be an atmosphere that will motivate people to want to go to the river.

Several Panel members thought the building on the east side of the sites should be set back to create something interesting. One Panel member noted that it would be a good place for public art. It was also noted that the PCI site seemed to crowd the Canada Line Station. One Panel member noted that other areas in Vancouver and Burnaby have taller buildings around transit stations that are successful as a result of having a well planned ground plane.

Most of the Panel members thought the challenge would be to define the ground plane and the social spaces and that the project could be driven more from the cultural spaces. One Panel member noted that it was hard to theme a new community and needed to be treated with care or it would not be authentic. Another Panel member suggested the plan should be like a little town and incorporate amenities such as libraries, retail/shopping, restaurants, galleries, etc.

It was noted that the new buildings are very different from what is currently in the area and it will be important that they step down into the neighbourhood especially on the northwest side in order to make for a smoother transition.

Several Panel members noted that if the area was going to have mixed employment use then there needed to be more life in the planning and as well contribute over all to the neighbourhood. One Panel member would like to see other development types planned. Another Panel member suggested a more innovated housing mix within the industrial use.

The Panel supported incorporating a Neighbourhood Energy Utility (NEU) into the planning for the sites.

In conclusion the Panel felt that the intersection of Marine Drive and Cambie Street was only part of an emerging precinct and that the building topology needed to be distinct from other types that are common in the city.

Specific Commentary from Panelist without Conflict of Interest

- Urban design framework is heading in the right direction;
- What is critical is the access to the water;
- How do you take the Cambie Corridor and take it successfully to the water;
- Critical that the wayfinding are carefully considered;
- There needs to be an identity and new ideas coming into play at the intersection;
- It is important to set back the buildings on the east side to create something interesting;
- Public art is very important;
- PCI site seems to crowd the station;
- The buildings are very different from the rest of the neighbourhood;
- Should be more stepping down on the northwest;
- Transit hub creates a lot of potential;
- The challenge is to define the ground plane and the social spaces and start driving projects from cultural spaces;
- Has to be an exciting contribution to the neighbourhood;
- Besides mixed employment are there other development types planned - needs to have more life in it;
- Cascade of spaces all the way down to the waterfront is important;
- Increase in density is viable;
- Creating the density and bringing people will develop the social fabric;
- From a massing perspective, other areas in Vancouver and Burnaby have heights around transit stations and this is well within what has been seen elsewhere;
- Going to come down to the ground plane to make the development successful;
- Not a gateway but for people to head south to the river;
- The built form and urban approach will then be the gateway to the city which is better than a handful of buildings outside of the guideway;
- The integration of the side streets are important as it won't be successful as a single street;
- Don't support having a great deal of residential;

- In the broad scale the mixed employment without residential has a lot of potential;
- The corner adjacent to the station is unsuccessful until that it is addressed;
- Incorporating a NEU is essential. It was a lost opportunity that it wasn't included in the development of the transit station.

Specific Commentary from Panelists with Conflict of Interest

- Need a vision that is connected to the water;
- Could have innovated housing mixed in with industrial;
- Need to explore the potential of the waterfront;
- The intersection is only part of the emerging precinct;
- The plan should be like a little town and incorporate amenities such as libraries, retail/shopping, restaurants, galleries, etc;
- Should be a place where people can live and stay and if they want to go somewhere they can get on transit;
- No defined spot that suggests a high street;
- Southeast Marine Drive could be more than commercial;
- Street beside the station needs work;
- NEU will be an important addition;
- Look for a range of topology that will reinforce the centre;
- Hard to theme a new community, has to be treated with care or it won't be authentic;
- Need to create an atmosphere that people will want go to in order to get to the river.

2. Address:	Plaza of Nations Civic Plaza
DE:	Non-Voting Workshop
Description:	To seek input and advice as to the best options from an urban design perspective on the Plaza of Nations Civic Plaza.
Zoning:	N/A
Application Status:	N/A
Architect:	N/A
Owner:	N/A
Review:	First
Delegation:	N/A
Staff:	Garry Papers and Paula Huber

EVALUATION: NON-VOTING WORKSHOP

- **Introduction:** Paul Huber, Planner, gave an overview for the Northeast False Creek Directions. She noted the area and land owners and reminded the Panel that in November 2009 Council approved the directions for the future which will provide a high level policy framework for land use, density, open space and public benefits and amenities for the area. The directions include a Vision Statement for the area that will have a mix of uses that is a place to play, work and live; creates a great place to be an urban, high energy and fun hub for the city and region; has an active waterfront with a series of public open spaces for public celebration and opportunities for everyday use; and an advance sustainability in the city through mixed-use, high density development in a highly suitable location.

Ms. Huber noted that the land use recommendations for the area include 1.8 million square feet of job space, up to four million square feet of residential, provides previously approved or committed items such as the extension of Creekside Park, seawall and Carrall Street Green Way and new open spaces totaling 200,000 square feet.

Ms. Huber noted that the Council Motion states that in approving the recommendations, Council passed a resolution noting that the following will be considered when determining the appropriate amount of residential floor space to be permitted in an area: Environmental performance; urban design and architectural excellence; the provision of ample amenities; and the compatibility of housing adjacent to event noise. Further Council asked that staff look for ways to find additional open space.

In 2010 staff have been working on "bridging work" so that key decisions can be made to allow the developers to make rezoning applications. Mr. Huber noted that highlights of areas of work over the past year include noise mitigation measures (Council recently approved measures requiring building design to respond to event noise. A performance criteria target of between 40 to 50 dBC for the interior noise level within dwelling units in North East False Creek [NEFC]); the Directions acknowledge the possibility that Creekside Park and the adjacent Concord lands may be reconfigured subject to a full assessment. In spring 2010 the City initiated a public process to explore options and retained a facilitator to help a group of City staff and as well Concord reps and area residents worked together to jointly develop an option; the Georgia Pedestrian link proposed along the east side of the stadium will provide a critical connection between downtown and the waterfront. Conceptual design options and associated costs for the Georgia Pedestrian Link have been completed and shared with a number of groups at the City (including the UDP) most recently in May of 2010; Council approved a public benefits proposal for NEFC to provide the needed amenities over time in conjunction with rezoning applications. A general theme is that larger sites will need to provide the items which require space such as child

care, the civic plaza and affordable housing sites; screening level study in spring 2010 showed that a renewable district energy system for NEFC is economically viable. Further recent study has confirmed the cost competitiveness and environmental benefits of a District Energy System (NEU). The studies strongly support the expectation that there will be a future renewable district energy system in NEFC and all developments will be required to connect.

Garry Papers, Senior Architect/Development Planner, further described the proposal noting that the overall goal was about creating a special destination and unique sense of place. This proposal will also complete the False Creek Basin and respond to and reinforce the emerging large scale public realm plan for Creekside Park. The proposal should complete the pedestrian cycling circulation network and improve connections to the downtown street grid. The plan is to have sensitive massing without shadow impacts and appropriately accommodates the proposed density without undue adjacency impacts. The building forms should address the waterfront and public overview opportunities and reinforce and capitalize on the major event plaza. The plan for sustainability is for passive design building orientation, green roofs, mix of uses, a naturalized shoreline and to significantly raise the bar with sustainable initiatives.

Advice from the Panel on this application is sought on the following:

1. Completing the False Creek Basin, respecting the "big move" of the circulation arc thru the park, recently agreed to.
2. Eliminating shadow impacts on major plazas and the seawall walkway
3. Strong and complete circulation loops on site, and connections back to downtown grid.
4. Creating a sense of place, with buildings shaped by the context and public realm, not simply maximized footprints with public realm "leftovers". Multiple public places and scales, along the seawall path, and serving the residential needs adjacent.
5. Innovative building forms that provide public water & plaza overlooks, and a more interesting, vertical public realm.
6. Overall: does proposal promise an exceptional place, cohesive design in context, and a great example of waterfront placemaking that meets/exceeds Council's ambitious vision for this specific, unique area?

Ms. Huber and Mr. Papers took questions from the Panel.

- **Related Commentary:** This was a non-voting workshop and the Panel thought it would be a very exciting context within the city.

Some of the Panel noted that for years the plaza has seemed cut off from the rest of the city and that very little sun gets into the area. They thought it would be the right place for a plaza and suggested there be some intimate spaces for people to sit and enjoy the space. A couple of Panel members suggested having the sports related community centre along the edge and that it should be fairly glassy and open to the site so people could see into the building. A couple of Panel members were still worried that there might be too much shading on the plaza and on the Georgia Steps from the proposals towers, while another Panel member was concerned that there would be too much shading on Pacific or that the new towers might shade the stadium.

Most of the Panel supported the removal of the Enterprise Building and thought the space could be better used although one Panel member thought it was a shame to lose a symbol of Expo 86.

They liked the curve of the seawalk and thought as an idea it was a great way to link the waterfront to Creekside Park. One Panel member noted that the notion of making the

waterfront walkway more diverse with some gathering spaces was exciting. Several Panel members thought it would be important to have a place where people could sit right on the water in a restaurant setting. This could be achieved by having the seawall path route set away from the water's edge for part of the route. In particular, the bike path could go inland of the new major public space. Another Panel member suggested expanding out the curved area behind the first set of waterfront buildings so it has a circulation right around the waterfront.

The Panel thought it would be important to have something unique on the waterfront. They noted that there should be spots where pedestrians could go and separate places for bikes. It would be important to have places where people could experience the water and as well as being able to sit or have something to eat, without the "bicycle highway" effect. One Panel member suggested having a big floating area on the water for another type of experience.

Another Panel member suggested a larger public function and program that is driven from the interface and the seawall that could be wider in places.

Three of the Panel felt that the additional density for the project site could be accommodated, especially along Pacific in light of the scale of the stadium. One stated additional density should be job space. They also supported the idea of having the massing stepping down to the waterfront. One Panel member noted that the general massing looked bulky in the model and thought that if the tower shapes were narrow they could look elegant along the water. If there was a narrow face to the water the buildings wouldn't have to step down to the waterfront. Another Panel member would like to see more retail and restaurants on the ground floor of the new towers as a way to enliven the streets.

A couple of Panel members suggested adding a public art program with theatre space or performance space.

Noting that there will be a streetcar along Pacific Boulevard in the future, one Panel member suggested that it would be critical to have stations where there is strong access coming into the space.

The Panel supported the addition of a Neighbourhood Energy Utility. Some panelists encouraged active uses or a varied form on the community center roof.

The Panel agreed that it would be important to offer a unique experience along this part of False Creek as this was the last opportunity to plan the waterfront and have it be something different from what is already in place.

3. Address:	428 Terminal Avenue
DE:	Rezoning
Description:	The purpose of the rezoning is to permit a broader range of office and other compatible uses than is currently allowed. The proposed FSR is 3.0 and the proposed height is 30.5 m (100 ft.).
Zoning:	I-3 to CD-1
Application Status:	RZ
Architect:	Bunting Coady Architects
Owner:	Rize Alliance (Terminal Building) Inc.
Review:	Second
Delegation:	Robert Church, Bunting Coady Architects Oskar Winnat, Bunting Coady Architects Jeff Cutter, Space2Space Chris Vollan, Rize Alliance
Staff:	Dale Morgan and Karen Hoese

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (7-0)

- **Introduction:** Karen Hoese, Rezoning Planner, introduced the proposal for a rezoning application located in the I-3 "high-tech" zone in the False Creek Flats. The purpose of the rezoning is to rezone the site from I-3 to CD-1 to allow an increase in the amount of General Office space beyond what is permitted under the current zoning. The request is consistent with existing area policy.

Ms. Hoese noted that in the late 1990's, the area of the False Creek Flats near rapid transit was rezoned to I-3 to accommodate high tech firms. Under the I-3 zoning, the maximum density permitted was 3.0 FSR. General Office use was restricted to 33% of the floor area or a maximum of 1 FSR. However, the "high-tech" sector did not grow as quickly as anticipated and in 2009 Council adopted the False Creek Flats Rezoning Policy. The intent of this new policy was to allow for a broader range of office uses, providing opportunities to intensify employment near rapid transit. As such, the policy allows for General Office use up to the maximum overall density permitted in I-3 as well as compatible uses that are supportive of the needs of area employees such as local area serving restaurants and other relevant services.

In terms of the form of development, the False Creek Flats Rezoning Policy intends that any resulting developments would remain within the built form parameters of the I-3 District Guidelines. These guidelines call for a maximum height of 100 feet, large floor plates and a strong urban design and pedestrian realm. Ms. Hoese noted that as this is a rezoning, the Green Buildings Rezoning Policy applies. Since the application came in prior to August 1, 2010, a minimum of LEED™ Silver is required.

Dale Morgan, Development Planner, further described the proposal noting that the application had been reviewed by the Panel previously. At that time it was a development permit application but with the policy change the applicant decided to withdraw the application and apply as a rezoning. The original application was mixed use with some office use as well as some warehousing. Mr. Morgan described the context for the area. The primary use for the proposal is office with a mews area. There will be a ramp entry to a parking structure that is accessed through the pedestrian mews. There is also a secondary ramp mid site. Mr. Morgan noted that the original application had a more dynamic massing which has become more conservative with the rezoning application. The roof use that is being proposed is for an amenity/fitness area with a rubber surface for jogging. The streetscape includes a double row of trees. Mr. Morgan described the

materials and colour palette being proposed. He also noted the comments from the previous Panel's review.

Advice from the Panel on this application is sought on the following:

- General comments on height and density;
- Is office use appropriate for this site including office use at grade;
- Comments on the mews as to whether the site is properly animated;
- Comments on the public realm, street edges and semi public views;
- Comments on the massing, materiality and expression; and
- How the building has addressed sustainability.

Ms. Hoese and Mr. Morgan took questions from the Panel

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Robert Church, Architect, further described the proposal noting the scheme had changed from the previous design. There has been some effort in breaking up the monolithic type of development that is happening along this street to produce a dynamic building that is broken down in both plan and elevation section. The strength of the mews is helping to break up the width of the building.

Jeff Cutter, Landscape Architect, described the landscape plans noting that the plans haven't changed that much since the previous scheme. The ramp has been added but the treatment between the two buildings is similar. They are trying to add a layer of visual interest with the addition of a double row of street trees along the front of the building giving a strong spatial component to Terminal Avenue. The roof will have a fitness centre with some seating areas. Although it is not a green roof, planters will be located around the seating clusters.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Relocate the ramp away from the mews;
 - Consider a higher degree of architectural variety at grade including consideration of some active uses if possible;
 - Consider increasing sustainability objectives;
 - Consider a brighter colour palette;
 - Reconsider the Terminal Avenue façade; and
 - Consider increasing daylight penetration whether through plan, section or a combination of both.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal.

The Panel supported the height, density and use and thought the location was exactly the right place for high density employment as it is near the SkyTrain Station. They also thought the floor to floor height should be increased to allow for more light penetration into the interior of the building. Most of the Panel thought it was unfortunate that there was such a large setback that would preclude any weather protection on the sidewalk. One Panel member thought the façade should be broken up as it is a long straight line. While another Panel member thought the front façade was a little bland and lacked any articulation or refinement. Another Panel member thought the building design could be simpler and include one great piece of public art to make it memorable.

Most of the Panel was disappointed that the Silver logo was removed from the design. One Panel member was disappointed that the applicant couldn't capture more of the form from the past design into the new one. Considering that the area has been used as light industrial, a Panel member would like to see some working space for artists provided for in the area. A couple of other Panel members thought there should be some retail on the ground floor with one Panel member suggesting a coffee shop to create a bit of a social gathering space.

The Panel supported the lower parking rationale since it the site is near transit and thought the area would be more pedestrian friendly in the future as more development takes place in the area. Several Panel members noted that the ramp location and the mews didn't work together and thought the ramp should be moved.

Several Panel members thought the landscaping was well done across the railway tracks. One Panel member appreciated the effort in the landscape design to upgrade Terminal Avenue. The Panel supported the mews and thought it was an interesting idea. One Panel member noted that it brought a moment of publicness to the street. Another Panel member suggested adding a double row of trees on the street. Also, the way finding needed to be improved and some trees could be added to the courtyard. A couple of Panel members thought the roof top fitness could be programmed to accommodate more people.

The Panel thought the colour palette could be differentiated between the two buildings with one Panel member suggesting a third colour could be added. One Panel member noted that in the next stage of development the signage strategy was going to be important and could be the most interesting thing about the building.

The Panel was disappointed with the sustainability strategy noting that the applicant wasn't optimizing energy points and wasn't doing anything to make the building perform well. One Panel member noted that there was an opportunity to add green roofs and expressing storm water.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Church thanked the Panel for their comments.

Adjournment

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 8:46 p.m.