

CITY OF BURNABY
BOARD OF VARIANCE
MINUTES

A Hearing of the Board of Variance was held in the Council Chamber, City Hall, 4949 Canada Way, Burnaby, B.C., on Thursday, 2015 March 05 at 1:00 p.m.

PRESENT: Ms. C. Richter
Mr. B. Pound
Mr. S. Nemeth
Mr. G. Clark
Mr. B. Bharaj

STAFF: Ms. M. Malysz, Planning Department Representative
Mr. S. Cleave, Deputy City Clerk
Ms. K. O'Connell, Deputy City Clerk

1. CALL TO ORDER

The Secretary called the Hearing to order at 1:08 p.m.

2. MINUTES

MOVED BY MR. S. NEMETH:
SECONDED BY MR. B. POUND:

"THAT the minutes of the Hearing of the Burnaby Board of Variance held on 2015 February 05 be adopted as circulated."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

3. APPEAL APPLICATIONS

The following persons filed application forms requesting that they be permitted to appear before the Board of Variance for the purpose of appealing for the relaxation of specific requirements as defined in the Burnaby Zoning Bylaw 1965, Bylaw No. 4742:

(a) APPEAL NUMBER: B.V. 6147

APPELLANT: Joe Wong

REGISTERED OWNER OF PROPERTY: Tseng-an Chen and Chao Guo

CIVIC ADDRESS OF PROPERTY: [8276 Burnlake Drive](#)

LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY: Lot 94; District Lot 40; Plan 44446

APPEAL: An appeal for the relaxation of Sections 101.7(b), 101.9(1) and 101.10 of the Burnaby Zoning Bylaw which, if permitted, will allow for an addition to 8276 Burnlake Drive. The following variances are being requested:

- a) depth of the principal building is 92.3 feet where a maximum depth of 60.0 feet is permitted;
- b) north side yard setback is 5.9 feet to the foundation where a minimum side yard setback of 7.9 feet is required;
- c) sum of the side yard setbacks is 15.7 feet where a minimum sum of 18.0 feet is required; and
- d) rear yard setback is 17.4 feet to the foundation where a minimum rear yard setback of 29.5 feet is required.(Zone-R1)

A previous Board of Variance (B.V.6025 2012 December 6) allowed b) and c), but denied variances a) and d).

APPELLANT'S SUBMISSION:

Joe Wong submitted an application for relaxation of the Burnaby Zoning Bylaw to allow for construction of an addition to his client's home.

Mr. Wong and Mr. Tseng-an Chen, homeowner, appeared before members of the Board of Variance at the Hearing.

BURNABY PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENTS COMMENT:

An appeal for the relaxation of Sections 101.7(b), 101.9(1) and 101.10 of the Burnaby Zoning Bylaw which, if permitted, will allow for an addition to 8276 Burnlake Drive. The following variances are requested:

- a) a principal building depth of 92.3 feet where a maximum depth of 60.0 feet is permitted;*
- b) a side yard setback from the north property line of 5.9 feet to the foundation where a minimum side yard setback of 7.9 feet is required;*
- c) a sum of side yard setbacks of 15.7 feet where a minimum sum of 18.0 feet is required;*
- d) a rear yard setback of 17.4 feet to the foundation where a minimum rear yard setback of 29.5 feet is required.*

This property was the subject of an appeal before the Board on 2003 September 04 (BV#5157) and on 2012 December 06 (BV #6025).

In the 2003 September 04 appeal, a variance was sought to allow for the construction, to the rear of the existing single family dwelling, of a detached garage with a gross floor area of 1,048.8 sq. ft., where a maximum of 602.8 sq. ft. is permitted. While this Department did not support this request, the Board granted the appeal.

In the 2012 December 06 appeal, four variances were sought to allow for the construction of an addition to the existing single family dwelling.

- The first a) appeal was to allow a principal building depth of 92.3 ft., where a maximum building depth of 60 ft. is permitted.
- The second b) appeal was to allow a side yard setback from the north property line of 5.9 ft., where a minimum side yard setback of 7.9 ft. is required.
- The third c) appeal was to allow a sum of side yard setbacks of 15.7 ft., where a minimum sum of side yard setbacks of 18.0 ft. is required.
- The fourth d) appeal was to allow a rear yard setback of 17.4 ft., where a minimum rear yard setback of 29.5 ft. is required.

While this Department objected to all of the requests, the Board denied the first a) appeal (building depth) and fourth d) appeal (rear yard setback) and allowed the second b) appeal (side yard setback) and third c) appeal (sum of side yard setbacks).

This Department's comments on the 2012 December 06 appeal, which also references the 2003 September 04 appeal, are included as Item 1 in the attached Supplementary materials.

Section 14 of Burnaby Bylaw No. 5843 (Board of Variance Bylaw, 1971) states:

"The Board shall not, within one (1) year of the date of the decision of the Board, re-hear an appeal previously denied covering the identical grounds or principals upon which the Board has rendered a decision."

The applicant requests the Board re-hear the appeal presented at the 2012 December 06 meeting, which occurred approximately two (2) years and three (3) months ago.

Since this proposal is identical to the 2012 December 06 appeal, this Department's comments remain unchanged.

In summary, it is difficult to find a hardship in this case. All four relaxations are the result of a design decision to connect the principal building to the accessory building, and are driven by convenience rather than necessity.

In view of the above, this Department cannot support the granting of either appeal.

ADJACENT OWNER'S COMMENTS:

An undated petition letter was received from homeowners and occupants of 8265, 8275, 8282, 8285 and 8288 Burnlake Drive. The petition read as follows:

“The following list of people below support the attachment between two buildings of 8276 Burnlake Dr.”

An email dated February 27, 2015, was received from Monika and Brian Bonney, 8306 Government Road, in support of this appeal.

An email dated February 28, 2015 was received from Mario Giardini, 8270 Burnlake Drive, in opposition to the appeal.

No further correspondence was received regarding this appeal.

DECISION:

MOVED BY MR. B. BHARAJ:

SECONDED BY MR. S. NEMETH:

“THAT based on the plans submitted part a) of this appeal be ALLOWED.”

FOR: MR. B. BHARAJ
MR. B. POUND
MR. G. CLARKE

OPPOSED: MR. S. NEMETH
MS. C. RICHTER

CARRIED

MOVED BY MR. B. BHARAJ:

SECONDED BY MR. S. NEMETH:

“THAT based on the plans submitted part b) of this appeal be ALLOWED.”

FOR: MR. B. BHARAJ
MR. B. POUND
MR. G. CLARKE
MS. C. RICHTER

OPPOSED: MR. S. NEMETH

CARRIED

MOVED BY MR. B. BHARAJ:
SECONDED BY MR. S. NEMETH:

“THAT based on the plans submitted part c) of this appeal be ALLOWED.”

FOR: MR. B. BHARAJ
MR. B. POUND
MR. G. CLARKE
MS. C. RICHTER

OPPOSED: MR. S. NEMETH

CARRIED

MOVED BY MR. B. BHARAJ:
SECONDED BY MR. S. NEMETH:

“THAT based on the plans submitted part d) of this appeal be ALLOWED.”

FOR: MR. B. BHARAJ
MR. B. POUND
MR. G. CLARKE

OPPOSED: MR. S. NEMETH
MS. C. RICHTER

CARRIED

(b) **APPEAL NUMBER: B.V. 6148**

APPELLANT: Steven Chen

REGISTERED OWNER OF PROPERTY: Yu Zhao

CIVIC ADDRESS OF PROPERTY: [5890 Empress Avenue](#)

LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY: Lot 190; District Lot 92; Plan 25859

APPEAL: An appeal for the relaxation of Sections 102.7(a) and 102.10 of the Burnaby Zoning Bylaw which, if permitted, will allow for construction of a new single family dwelling at 5890 Empress Avenue. The following variances are being requested:

a) depth of the principal building will be 42.0 feet where a maximum depth of 40.0 feet is permitted; and

b) rear yard setback will be 13.40 feet to the foundation where a minimum rear yard setback of 29.5 feet is required. (Zone R-2)

APPELLANT'S SUBMISSION:

Steven Chen submitted an application for the relaxation of the Burnaby Zoning Bylaw to allow for construction of a new single family dwelling.

No one appeared to represent the applicant before members of the Board of Variance at the Hearing.

BURNABY PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENTS COMMENT:

An appeal for the relaxation of Sections 102.7(a) and 102.10 of the Burnaby Zoning Bylaw which, if permitted, will allow for construction of a new single family dwelling at 5890 Empress Avenue. The following variances are requested:

a) a principal building depth of 42.0 feet where a maximum depth of 40.0 feet is permitted; and

b) a rear yard setback of 13.4 feet to the foundation where a minimum rear yard setback of 29.5 feet is required.

The subject site, which is zoned R2 Residential District, is located in the Kingsway Beresford neighbourhood, in which the age and condition of single dwellings vary. This interior lot, which is approximately 80.0 ft. deep and 124.2 ft. wide, fronts Empress Avenue to the west. Abutting the subject site to the north, east and across the lane to the south are single family dwellings. Vehicular access is provided from the lane. The site observes a substantial downward slope of approximately 21.6 ft. from the southeast (rear) corner to the northwest (front) corner. The subject lot is unusual in that it is oriented laterally to its only road frontage along the western property line.

The subject site is proposed to be redeveloped with a new single family dwelling including an accessory detached garage, which is the subject of two appeals. The appeals are co-related.

The first a) appeal is for the construction of a new single family dwelling, observing a principal building depth of 42.0 ft. where a maximum building depth of 40.0 ft. is permitted based on 50% of the lot depth.

The Bylaw's intent in limiting building depth is to prevent the visual intrusion and sense of confinement that a long building wall can impose on neighbouring properties.

The second b) appeal is for the construction of a new single family dwelling observing a rear yard setback of 13.4 ft., with a further projection of roof eaves of up to 3.0 ft., where a minimum rear yard setback of 29.5 ft. is required.

The intent of the Bylaw is to mitigate the massing impacts of new buildings and structures on neighbouring properties and to ensure sufficient outdoor living area in the rear yard is provided.

Both variances are related to site orientation. Under Section 3 of the Zoning Bylaw, the front lot line of the property is the lot line that abuts Empress Avenue, resulting in a lot depth that is measured in the shallower west-east direction. City records indicate that the existing building on the subject site was constructed with all necessary approvals consistent with this orientation. However, the actual placement of the existing dwelling, which is at an angle to the front property line, differs slightly from these records. The existing dwelling observes an approximately 25.0 ft. setback from the west front lot line to the southwest corner; an approximately 12.0 ft. setback from the east rear lot line to the northeast corner; and a building depth of approximately 43.0 ft., as projected on the lot depth line.

The proposed dwelling, sited parallel to the front property line, would observe a west front yard setback of 24.6 ft., which is the minimum required front yard setback; an east rear lot setback of 13.4 ft., and a building depth of 42 ft.

With respect to the first a) appeal, although the allowable building depth is exceeded by 2.0 ft., given the orientation of the subject dwelling, the proposed additions would not result in a long wall effect as viewed from the neighbouring property to the north and south. In addition, the proposed building depth would be approximately 1.0 ft. less than the existing depth. The generous north side yard of approximately 40.12 ft. would further mitigate any impacts on the neighbouring property to the north. With respect to the neighbouring property across the lane to the south, although the proposed side yard setback is only 5.08 ft., as measured to the attached garage on the south side of the dwelling, the main body of the dwelling would be set back an additional 22.0 ft. This generous setback and the spatial separation provided by the lane would help alleviate any impacts on the neighbouring property to the south.

With respect to the second b) appeal, although the required rear yard is reduced by 16.1 ft., the proposed setback is 1.0 ft. less than the existing rear yard setback. Also, two existing large trees would be maintained within the rear yard, which would partly screen the proposed dwelling. Further, the neighbouring property to the east observes higher grades than the subject property and is generally orientated towards Walker Avenue to the northeast. Therefore, a relatively low impact would be expected with respect to the neighbouring property to the east.

With respect to outdoor living area, although green space would be reduced within the rear yard, plenty of green area would be provided in the generous north side yard.

In addition, this Department will pursue a text amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to address the hardship encountered on lots, such as the subject site, where the only abutting street is parallel to the longest lot line. This should help resolve concerns about the develop ability of the lot over the long term.

In summary, because the shallow depth of the subject lot represents a hardship and limits design options, and considering this proposal's limited impact on neighbouring properties, this Department does not object to the granting of the first a) and second b) variances.

ADJACENT OWNER'S COMMENTS:

No correspondence was received regarding this variance.

DECISION:

MOVED BY MR. S. NEMETH:

SECONDED BY MR. B. POUND:

"THAT based on the plans submitted part a) of this appeal be ALLOWED."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MOVED BY MR. S. NEMETH:

SECONDED BY MR. B. POUND:

"THAT based on the plans submitted part b) of this appeal be ALLOWED."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

(c) **APPEAL NUMBER:** B.V. 6149

APPELLANT: Krishan Anand

REGISTERED OWNER OF PROPERTY: Krishan and Raj Anand

CIVIC ADDRESS OF PROPERTY: [7495 Whelen Court](#)

LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY: Lot 2; District Lot 86; Plan 24141

APPEAL: An appeal for the relaxation of Sections 101.6(1)(b) and 101.8 of the Burnaby Zoning Bylaw which, if permitted, will allow for the construction of a new single family dwelling at 7495 Whelen Court. The following variances are being requested:

a) principal building height will be 31.98 feet measured from the rear average elevation and 23.82* feet measured from the front average elevation where a maximum building height of 24.3 feet is permitted; and

b) front yard setback will be 17.17 feet to the post where a minimum front yard setback of 29.5 feet is required based on minimum front yard. The roof will project 3.0 feet beyond the post. (Zone R-1)

*It should be noted the front average elevation was corrected to read 23.82 feet instead of the originally noted 24.48 feet. The revised elevation complies with the bylaw requirement.

APPELLANT'S SUBMISSION:

Krishan Anand submitted an application for relaxation of the Burnaby Zoning Bylaw to allow for construction of a new home.

Mr. Anand appeared before members of the Board of Variance at the Hearing.

BURNABY PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENTS COMMENT:

An appeal for the relaxation of Sections 101.6(1)(b) and 101.8 of the Burnaby Zoning Bylaw which, if permitted, will allow for the construction of a new single family dwelling at 7495 Whelen Court. The following variances are requested:

- a) a principal building height of 31.98 feet measured from the rear average elevation and 24.48 feet measured from the front average elevation where a maximum building height of 24.3 feet is permitted; and*
- b) a front yard setback of 17.17 feet to the porch post where a minimum front yard setback of 29.5 feet is required. The proposed roof projects 3.0 feet beyond the post.*

The subject site, zoned R1 Residential District, is located in a stable single-family neighbourhood in the Morley-Buckingham area. This irregular interior lot, approximately 91.7 ft. wide and 121.3 ft. deep along the southwest property line, fronts Whelen Court to the southeast. The front lot line reflects the irregular alignment of Whelen Court, which jogs to the east in front of the subject property. Abutting the site to the southwest and the northeast are single family dwellings. A wooded ravine within the Haszard Trail and Conservation Area borders the subject site to the northwest. A 25.5 ft. wide sanitary right of way is located along the northwest property line. Vehicular access to the property is from Whelen Court; there is no lane access. The site slopes downward approximately 24.4 ft. towards the north.

A new single-family dwelling with attached garage is proposed on the subject site, for which two variances are requested.

The first appeal a) proposes: 1) a building height of 31.98 ft., measured from the rear average elevation, where a maximum height of 24.3 ft. is permitted for flat roofs; and 2) a building height of 24.48 ft., measured from the front average elevation, where a maximum height of 24.3 ft. is permitted for flat roofs.

The intent of the Bylaw is to mitigate the massing of new buildings or structures and their impacts on neighbouring properties.

In reference to part 1) of the appeal, the height calculation is based on the proposed natural grade at the rear elevation. A substantial grade difference contributes to the excess height. The proposed dwelling would extend further to the northwest by approximately 12 ft. as compared

to the existing dwelling. Accordingly, the rear of the proposed dwelling, where the grades are lower, is where the excess height would occur. The proposed height encroachment of 7.68 ft. would occur over the entire upper floor, from approximately 1 ft. above the window sill level, as viewed from the rear property line. This area of encroachment would be set back from the rear outermost building face, which is at the north corner of the dwelling, by approximately 9.5 ft. The remaining approximately 2/3 of the upper floor would be set back further by approximately 22 ft.

Although the height encroachment is substantial in this case, the foliage of the Haszard Trail and Conservation Area, located to the immediate northwest of the site, in combination with the generous rear setback would mitigate any massing impacts on the neighbouring residences further to the northwest.

With respect to the northeast (side) elevation, the height encroachment would include a triangular area in the middle portion of the upper floor, above the bottom sill of a high window. This encroachment would occur approximately 8 ft. from the northeast property line, as measured to the building face. The height encroachment would also occur at the rear portion of the upper floor, from the top of the upper deck railing. This portion of the proposed northeast elevation is set back further 9.5 ft. from the outermost face of the northeast elevation, which is a mitigating factor.

With respect to the southwest (side) elevation, the height encroachment would be essentially limited to the small roof area at the front portion of the upper floor, starting approximately at the fascia board level. The encroachment would occur approximately 10.4 ft. from the southwest property line, as measured to the building face. The rear portion of the upper floor would be set back a further 47.25 ft. from the outermost face of the southwest elevation. Although encroachment in this case would be larger, up to approximately 3 ft. below fascia board level, the generous setback would mitigate any potential visual impacts.

In summary, considering the limited scale and distant siting of the encroachment areas at the rear and side elevations, few impacts to neighbouring properties are expected.

With respect to part 2) of the appeal, the proposed dwelling would observe a height of 24.48 ft. when viewed from the Whelen Court front property line, which is 0.18 ft. more than the maximum height of 24.3 ft. allowed by the Zoning Bylaw. This minor height encroachment would be limited to the small area of the highest peak of the roof, which would occur approximately 23.5 ft. from the outermost face of the front elevation.

In summary, given the site's topographical constraints, and the proposal's limited impacts on neighbouring properties and the existing streetscape, this Department does not object to the granting of the first a) variance.

The second b) appeal is for a front yard setback of 17.17 ft., measured to the front porch posts of the proposed single family dwelling, with a further projection for roof eaves of 3.0 ft., where a minimum front yard setback of 29.5 ft. from the Whelen Court property line is required.

The intent of the Bylaw in requiring a minimum front yard setback is to mitigate the massing of new buildings or structures and their impacts on neighbouring properties and the existing street frontage.

This variance request is related to the irregular alignment of the front lot line of the subject site. As the front lot line nears the east corner of the property, it turns 90 degrees inward and forms a notch that extends approximately 12.53 ft. towards the rear of the property. The front yard setback is measured from the point of the notch, which is approximately 12.53 ft. inward of the remainder of the front lot line. If measured from the more uniform portions of the front lot line, which more closely conform to those of neighbouring properties, the proposed dwelling would observe a front yard setback of 29.7 ft., which is slightly more than the minimum required.

The irregular alignment of the front property line presents a hardship with respect to the front yard setback requirement. With the exception of the irregular indentation, the proposal meets front yard setback requirements.

In view of the above this Department does not object to the granting of this second b) variance.

ADJACENT OWNER'S COMMENTS:

Judith Robertson, 7485 Whelen Court, appeared before members of the Board opposing the appeal. Ms. Robertson provided a power point presentation, a copy of which is on file in the Office of the City Clerk.

No further comments were received regarding this appeal.

DECISION:

MOVED BY MR. B. BHARAJ:

SECONDED BY MR. S. NEMETH:

“THAT based on the plans submitted part a) of this appeal be ALLOWED.”

FOR: MR. B. BHARAJ
MR. B. POUND
MR. G. CLARKE
MS. C. RICHTER

OPPOSED: MR. S. NEMETH

CARRIED

MOVED BY MR. B. BHARAJ:
SECONDED BY MR. B. POUND:

“THAT based on the plans submitted part b) of this appeal be ALLOWED.”

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

(d) **APPEAL NUMBER:** B.V. 6144

APPELLANT: Vikram Tiku

REGISTERED OWNER OF PROPERTY: Zhuting Wu

CIVIC ADDRESS OF PROPERTY: [5824 Burns Place](#)

LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY: Lot 6; District Lot 93; Plan 21802

APPEAL: An appeal for the relaxation of Section 104.9 of the Burnaby Zoning Bylaw which, if permitted, will allow for the construction of a new single family dwelling at 5824 Burns Place. The front yard setback will be 36.08 feet to the foundation where a minimum front yard setback of 41.86 feet is required based on front yard averaging. (Zone R-4)

APPELLANT'S SUBMISSION:

Vikram Tiku submitted an application for relaxation of the Burnaby Zoning Bylaw to allow for construction of a new home.

Mr. Tiku appeared before members of the Board of Variance at the Hearing.

BURNABY PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENTS COMMENT:

An appeal for the relaxation of Section 104.9 of the Burnaby Zoning Bylaw which, if permitted, will allow for the construction of a new single family dwelling at 5824 Burns Place. The proposed front yard setback is 36.08 feet to the foundation where a minimum front yard setback of 41.86 feet is required based on front yard averaging.

The subject site, which is zoned R4 Residential District, is located in the Windsor neighbourhood, in which the age and condition of single and two-family dwellings vary. This corner lot, approximately 59.3 ft. wide and 115.9 ft. deep, fronts onto Kisbey Avenue to the west. Abutting the subject site to the east, south and across Burns Place to the north are single family dwellings. Vehicular access to the subject site is proposed to be relocated from Burns Place to Kisbey Avenue; there is no lane access. The site observes a downward slope of approximately 5.3 ft. to the north.

The subject site is proposed to be redeveloped with a new single family dwelling including an accessory detached garage, which is the subject of this appeal.

The appeal requests a front yard setback of 36.08 ft., measured to the foundation of the proposed single family dwelling, with a further projection for cornices of 0.5 ft., where front yard averaging requires a minimum setback of 41.86 ft.

In 1991, Council responded to public concerns regarding the bulk and massing of newer and larger homes that were being built in existing neighbourhoods. Several text amendments to the Zoning Bylaw were adopted to address these concerns, including a requirement to set new construction back from the front property line based on an average of the two dwellings on either side of the subject site. The intent was to help to ease new construction into existing street frontages with minimal impact.

In this case, the front yard averaging calculations are based on the front yard setback of the existing dwelling at 6436 Kisbey Avenue immediately south of the subject site, which is 41.86 ft. The subject block consists of only three lots; the third lot fronts Bryant Street and therefore is not included in front yard averaging calculations.

The proposed front yard setback is measured to the foundation of the northern portion of the front elevation. The southern portion of the front elevation is proposed to be set back further by 3.0 ft. The proposed siting would place the subject dwelling 5.78 ft. in front of the neighbouring dwelling to the south, or 2.78 ft. if the southwest corner of the subject dwelling is considered. In addition, the upper floor at the southwest corner of the dwelling is proposed to be set back a further 6.33 ft. With respect to the south side, the subject dwelling would observe a south side yard setback of 5.0 ft. which is just over the required minimum width (4.9 ft.). However, the upper floor at the southwest corner is proposed to be set back an additional 9.18 ft. Considering these upper floor setbacks in addition to a relatively minor reduction in the proposed front yard depth, little massing impact is expected on the neighbouring property to the south.

In addition, the siting of the proposed dwelling would be approximately 19 ft. further away from the front property line in comparison to the siting of the existing dwelling on the subject site. The existing dwelling observes a front yard setback of 17 ft. which was the subject of a successful appeal to the Board of Variance in 1978. The Board permitted the 17 ft. front yard setback where a front yard setback of 25 ft. was required at that time. In view of the above, the existing massing relationship between the proposed dwelling and the adjacent properties, and particularly to the south, would be substantially improved.

Further, it is noted that the siting of the proposed dwelling would provide for a rear yard setback of approximately 29.83 ft., where a minimum rear yard setback of 29.5 ft. is required. As such, there is little room for modifying this proposal.

In summary, since this request would improve the existing conditions in relation to the neighbouring property to the south and the existing streetscape in general, this Department supports the granting of this variance.

ADJACENT OWNER'S COMMENTS:

No correspondence was received regarding this appeal.

DECISION:

MOVED BY MR. B. POUND:

SECONDED BY MR. S. NEMETH:

"THAT based on the plans submitted this appeal be ALLOWED."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

5. NEW BUSINESS

No items of new business were brought forward at this time.

A D J O U R N M E N T

MOVED BY MR. B. POUND:

SECONDED BY MR. S. NEMETH:

"THAT this Hearing do now adjourn."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

The Hearing adjourned at 1:58 p.m.

Ms. C. Richter

Mr. B. Bharaj

Mr. G. Clark

Mr. S. Nemeth

Mr. B. Pound

S. Cleave
Deputy City Clerk