

MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT APPEAL BOARD
of the Town of Banff in the Province of Alberta
Town Hall Council Chamber
Thursday, March 9, 2005 at 9:00 am

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT

Philip Carmody	Public Representative – Vice Chair
Neil Tanner	Public Representative - Chair
Greg Thompson	Parks Canada Representative
Peter Watts	Parks Canada Representative
Ossi Treutler	Council Representative

BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT

Diana McRoberts	Public Representative
Chip Olver	Council Representative

ADMINISTRATION PRESENT

McKay, Randall	Secretary to the Development Board
Ann Kjerulf	Senior Planner/Development Officer
Cheryl Hyde	Municipal Clerk (Recording Secretary)

1.0 CALL TO ORDER

The Chair called the meeting to order at 10:02 a.m.

This is a continuation of the March 7, 2006 hearing to consider Appeal #01-06. Appeal 01-06 represents four separate appeals of a decision of the Municipal Planning Commission made January 18, 2006 to approve Development Permit Application 05DP51 for an addition and renovation to the YWCA located at 102 Spray Avenue subject to conditions of approval and variances to Land Use Bylaw 31-3.

Board members Diana McRoberts and Chip Olver declared a conflict of interest on March 7, 2006 and thus were not present at the continuation of the hearing.

The Chair reported that, at the March 7, 2006 meeting, the board came out of camera to ask for additional information from administration. A number of members of the gallery were not present at this time, so copies of the unapproved minutes have been distributed to the appellants for review and comment.

Hugh Ham, spokesperson for the YWCA (Appellant #1), provided the following comments:

- The YWCA could make some changes to the front entrance of the building to allow commercial buses to pull in if they so choose. Installation of a bus lay-by is the responsibility of the municipality, not of a private owner.
- The YWCA is amenable to entering into a development agreement that would cover the use of the whole of, but objects to entering into a restrictive covenant for the following reasons:
 - Restrictive covenants are difficult to change.

Minutes approved by: _____

- o A room by room restrictive covenant would prevent the YWCA from having flexibility to change the use of individual rooms within the 60/40 split to meet seasonal and emergency requirements.
- o A development agreement would provide greater flexibility, such as allowing the YWCA to calculate the 60/40 split as an annual average rather than a day by day number.
- o Under a restrictive covenant, individual room could not be changed into kitchens or lounges, nor could they be temporarily converted to help provide public facilities. A development agreement would allow such changes of use to take place.

Motion to Continue Discussion In-Camera

DAB05-12 Moved by Treutler to go in camera at 10:15 a.m.

CARRIED

Motion to Leave In-Camera Discussion

DAB05-13 Moved by Carmody to leave in-camera at 10:49 a.m.

CARRIED

Verbal Decision Announced

The decision of the Development Appeal Board with respect to Appeal 01-06, representing four separate appeals of a decision of the Municipal Planning Commission made January 18, 2006 to approve Development Permit Application 05DP51 for an addition and renovation to the YWCA located at 102 Spray Avenue subject to conditions of approval and variances to Land Use Bylaw 31-3, is as follows:

- (1) That Development Appeal Board deny appeal number 1 and 2, and uphold appeal number 3 and 4;
- (2) That the Development Permit be approved subject to the original conditions of approval imposed by the Municipal Planning Commission and the following amendments:
 - a. The proposed bus parking area as shown on the Site Development Plan is hereby deleted;
 - b. The YWCA shall provide a new parking plan which must be to the satisfaction of (and approved by) the Town of Banff Planning and Development Department;
 - c. The YWCA shall prepare plans for and construct, at its own cost, a bus lay-by area which must be to the satisfaction of (and approved by) the Town of Banff Planning and Development Department.

REASONS FOR THE DECISION:

From the evidence presented, the Development Appeal Board found the Banff YWCA applied for a development permit to construct 42 apartment housing units to be added on to their existing facility located at 102 Spray Avenue. The Municipal Planning Commission (MPC) granted that permit subject to conditions. The YWCA now appeals some of those conditions, while various area residents have appealed against the development permit, or certain aspects of it.

Appeal No. 1 is by the YWCA. In their written letter of appeal the YWCA appealed the following conditions:

1. The removal of parking stalls located within the Spray Avenue Right-of-Way and their relocation to the rear of the site (Glen Avenue Right-of-Way) and the resulting requirement of additional parking is inconsistent with the recommendations of the Banff YWCA expansion parking stay final report is not based on planning or transportation criteria.
2. The fee of \$250.00 requested for the "legal costs" of registering a development agreement is contrary to the Supreme Court of Canada decision in Re: Eurig Estate as such an agreement costs only \$10.00 to register at the Land Titles office.
3. The fee of \$250.00 requested for the "legal costs" of registering an encroachment agreement is contrary to the Supreme Court of Canada decision in Re: Eurig Estate as such an agreement costs only \$10.00 to register at the Land Titles office.
4. The registration of a restrictive covenant on title to secure and/or designate permanent long-term accommodation shown on drawings AOR1, A1R1, A2R2, A3RA, and A4R1 (received January 5, 2006 by Planning and Development) with a change Room 329 on Plan A2R1 from permanent to nightly accommodation, to the satisfaction of the development officer unduly fetters the operations of the Banff YWCA and is not based on planning principles.

However, at the hearing of the appeal, counsel for the YWCA did not pursue the \$250.00 fees being charged for legal costs related to the development agreement or the encroachment agreement, and indicated that the only conditions that there being appealed were the conditions identified as numbers 1 and 4 above.

Appeal No. 2 was filed by Mr. Bernard Gould who resides at 13 Riverview Court, Banff, Alberta. Mr. Gould's appeal related to the variance granted to the YWCA by the MPC allowing the YWCA to construct an addition to their existing building which is higher than otherwise allowed by the Land Use Bylaw.

Appeal No. 3 was filed by Sydney and Holly Wilcox of #3 Riverview Court, Banff, Alberta. They appealed against the density of the development, which they did not believe to be in keeping with the residential character of the neighbourhood, the bus parking allowed for by the development permit, the lack of access from an approved bus route, and because they felt that bus use of Glenn Avenue was not appropriate given the characteristics of that street.

The fourth appeal was filed by Byron Tarchuk and Ken Waterhouse. Mr. Tarchuk and Mr. Waterhouse appealed against 5 conditions identified in the MPC permit approval, which they say are not strong enough to address the need for better bus facilities in front of the YWCA. Most particularly, they indicated that ski busses and other commercial bus operators currently use the transit zone in front of the YWCA, which they say is illegal, blocks traffic, and creates a safety hazard. They requested more stringent conditions to address that issue, and suggested a bus lay-by be built, at the cost of the developer, so that busses could pull out of the traffic lane while they are waiting, loading, or unloading passengers in front of the YWCA.

Background Facts

The YWCA is an existing facility located at 102 Spray Avenue in Banff. It is within the Public Service (PS) Land Use District, which, according to the Banff Land Use By-Law contains schools, churches, and other institutional uses such as hospitals, administrative buildings, etc. The purpose of the district is to provide for a wide variety of uses of an institutional, government, educational, or community service nature.

Counsel for the YWCA pointed out that the YWCA is a registered charity which has existed in Banff for a long period of time and that the YWCA provides affordable short-term and long-term accommodation which is badly required within the Town of Banff.

Section 12.11.6 of the Land Use By-Law provides as follows:

- a) Developments in this district shall comply with the regulations and guidelines of the most restrictive adjacent district, except a development approving authority may vary those regulations in response to characteristics fundamental to the nature of the use where there is an identifiable community benefit.
- b) Where development is allowed which does not comply with the most restrictive requirements of the adjacent districts, its design, siting, landscaping, screening, and buffering shall minimize and compensate for any objectionable aspects of potential incompatibility with development and adjacent districts.

The primary use of the YWCA is as a “hostel” which is a discretionary use within the PS district. The proposed addition to the YWCA is intended to provide long-term “dormitory” or “university” style accommodation consisting of single or double bed rooms with shared washrooms, kitchen, and lounge facilities. Given that this style of accommodation is not specifically defined or listing within the Land Use By-Law, the YWCA previously submitted an application for a determination of use to the MPC, a process which is contemplated by the Banff Land Use Bylaw. The MPC made a determination that the proposed development was consistent with “apartment housing” which is defined in the Land Use By-Law as “one or more dwellings contained within a building in which the dwelling or dwellings are arranged in any horizontal or vertical configuration which does not conform to the definition of any other residential use class.”

Apartment housing is also discretionary within the PS Land Use District.

The Section 8.16.9 of the Land Use By-Law provides that “where a proposed use is not listed, the parking requirement shall be determined by the development approving authority, who may either determine that the proposed use is similar to one which is listed, or, if that is not the case, make its own determination as to the requirement.”

When considering the determination of use application, the MPC indicated that “a deviation in parking requirements may be considered pending receipt of a parking impact analysis to the satisfaction of the

development approving authority. The YWCA has submitted such an analysis which indicates, among other things, that “the Banff YWCA existing parking lot of 58 spaces can comfortably accommodate the proposed expansion”. However, under the Land Use By-Law, the “apartment housing” use would be most analogous to “bed-sitting-room dwelling” which has a requirement of .75 parking stalls per unit. Notwithstanding this, “bed-sitting-rooms” contain kitchen facilities and the proposed dormitory style units do not contain individual kitchen facilities. Administration has therefore recommended that the parking requirements be reduced to .5 stalls per unit for this style of housing. This would mean that a total of 21 new parking stalls would be required.

The YWCA proposed to add 16 new stalls through the reconfiguration of existing parking areas, as indicated in the plans submitted, and including 1 bus parking area, which under the Land Use By-Law is the equivalent of 15 vehicle parking stalls (at the discretion of the development approving authority). This still required a variance of 5 parking stalls, which administration recommended and the MPC granted.

The development which is proposed is somewhat unique in that it is located within a PS District which adopts the regulations of the most restrictive adjacent district. In this case, that would be the Glen Avenue (RGA) Land Use District. However, the PS District regulations also provide that where apartment housing is permitted, the regulations of the RBA District shall apply.

In order to facilitate the expansion contemplated by the development proposal, the YWCA must add an additional story onto their existing facility. That facility, for the most part, is characterized by a flat roof line. As such, it is out of keeping with the current design guidelines contained in Schedule B of the Land Use By-Law. The YWCA therefore proposes to construct pitched roofs which will be in keeping with those guidelines. Administration has also indicated that such construction would be an improvement to the overall scale of the development and would be consistent with adjacent properties, including Riverview Court. However, the overall proposed height of the roof ranges from 11.4 metres (2½ stories) to 14.4 metres (3½ stories) whereas the maximum height allowed in the RBA regulations is 9 metres or 2½ stories.

Appeal No. 1

Counsel for the YWCA indicates that the YWCA operates as a hostel and, as a matter of policy, provides 60% of its facilities for long-term use, and 40% of its facilities for short-term use. He indicated that this was originally a condition of the Crown Lease and a restrictive covenant was registered against title in that regard. However, when the Town of Banff was incorporated, the condition was removed, as was the restrictive covenant, presumably because it was now within the town’s jurisdiction to determine land use matters. Nonetheless, as a matter of policy, the YWCA has maintained accommodation facilities in accordance with this ratio.

Mr. Ham emphasized that the YWCA is a charitable organization attempting to provide affordable accommodation which is badly needed within the Town of Banff. He also pointed out that, in accordance with the Land Use By-Law, variances could be granted where there is an identifiable community benefit as was the case here. He indicated that there is definitely an identified need, particularly in regard to providing accommodation for young entry level workers within the town who

come to take part in the Banff experience, and who often obtain entry level employment while they are doing so. Mr. Ham also pointed out that there was a benefit to employers in that regard.

Mr. Ham indicated that the YWCA applied for and obtained grant funding in regard to their expansion. That grant requires, as a matter of contract, that rents charged by the YWCA for long-term accommodation must be 34% less than market value. However that is not the case with short-term accommodation. The YWCA utilizes the revenues it receives from its short-term accommodation program to fund its long-term accommodation program, and other programs operated by the YWCA.

Mr. Ham indicated that the YWCA is opposed to the condition imposing a restrictive covenant requiring that the short-term and long-term usage of the facility be fixed indefinitely. He submitted that restrictive covenants are forever, and do not provide the YWCA with the flexibility required to change on a seasonal basis, or in accordance with night to night, or special event requirements. He indicated that as an alternative to a restrictive covenant, the YWCA would be willing to enter into a development agreement with the Town of Banff, and to caveat the development agreement on title. He suggested however that there should be some flexibility built in to such a document, whereby the requirement was not an absolute requirement on a night to night basis, but rather would be effective over a long period of time.

In regard to the facility's parking requirements, the YWCA submitted that the Finn Transportation Consultants traffic study should be accepted. It indicated that there tended to be vehicles in the YWCA parking facilities which were not associated with the YWCA facility. Mr. Ham suggested that those vehicles may have come from the adjacent residential area, but in any event, suggested that, in accordance with the Finn study there was adequate parking for this facility. He further submitted that a high percentage of those persons who utilize the facility, particularly in regard to long-term accommodations, do not drive vehicles.

A number of people spoke against Appeal No. 1. Among other things, they denied that the parking facility was used by nearby residents, and also indicated that at times there were vehicles parked at the YWCA for long periods of time, which the YWCA seemed to permit. It was also indicated that the 15 parking stall credit received for the bus parking area was inappropriate, and in fact, the bus parking area should not be allowed due to the interference it would cause with neighbouring residents. In that regard, it was pointed out that the bus parking area was adjacent to neighbourhood residences, and that in the result, residents of the neighbourhood could expect idling buses for long periods of time, contrary to both the wishes of local residents, and the residential character of the neighbourhood. Residents also indicated that it would not be physically or safely possible for full size motor coaches to access Spray Avenue from the proposed bus parking area. This they felt would lead to large motor coaches backing up into Glen Avenue, which would create an obvious traffic hazard.

Many people also felt that the YWCA was really a hotel, which charged normal, entry level hotel rates, at least for its short-term accommodation. It became clear that the bus activity at and in front of the YWCA facility was a major issue for the residents. A number of residents also spoke strongly in favour of retaining the restrictive covenant on title to ensure that the YWCA would do as they had indicated they would do, and to ensure that the nature of the development as proposed be maintained. They also expected that adequate parking would be provided for the additional vehicle traffic which would result from the intensification being proposed. In that regard, it was also pointed out that existing parking was sometimes inadequate leading to overflow conditions most particularly on Glen Avenue.

Having regarding to all of the above, the other oral submissions made, the Banff Land Use Bylaw, and the written materials submitted in respect to this appeal, the Development Appeal Board denies the appeals of the YWCA.

In regard to the parking issue, we agree with administration that parking should be provided for on the basis of the Land Use Bylaw at the rate of .5 stalls per unit for the dormitory style accommodation, and .75 stalls per unit for other accommodations. We believe that this is reflective of the number of vehicles which are likely to be utilized by the different classes of persons which are likely to utilize this accommodation. Although the Finn study does indicate that a lesser amount of parking would be sufficient, we are not convinced that this is the case. Most particularly, we noted that, according to counsel for the YWCA, the study was based upon surveys taken over 2 single days during May and June. We are therefore conscious of the fact that the surveys may not be a representative sampling of the YWCA's overall parking requirement. We also believe that the parking requirements suggested by administration are generous and already represent a reduction of the normal parking requirements which would be required. Having regard to the residential character of the neighbourhood, and the evidence of over-flow conditions in the past, we do not believe any further reductions are appropriate.

In regard to the restrictive covenant, we also believe that it should be maintained.

As indicated above, we believe that the parking requirements for this facility are directly related to the type of usage within the facility. It is therefore important to ensure that the usage will remain constant so that appropriate parking is provided for. Although a development agreement could possibly satisfy this requirement, in essence, the YWCA was quite clear that they wanted the flexibility to alter the usage in accordance with their daily requirements. We do not think that is appropriate. We note that Section 4.8.2 of the Land Use By-Law authorizes a development officer to impose conditions to ensure compliance with the *Municipal Government Act* and the Land Use By-Law. We also note that Section 4.8.3(b) and (c) of the Land Use By-Law provides the municipal planning commission with authority to impose conditions regarding development standards which are more restrictive or onerous than the regulations found within the by-law, or such other conditions as it deems appropriate to the circumstances. We also note that restrictive development regulations are generally contemplated within the PS District. We therefore believe that this condition is not only appropriate having regard to the parking issue previously referred to, and the general characteristics of the immediate neighbourhood, which is primarily residential, but that the proposed intensification of use should not be allowed without this condition.

Appeal No. 2

Mr. Gould appeals the proposed addition on the basis of its proposed height. He pointed out that the variance granted equates to an increase over the height allowed by the Land Use By-Law of approximately 60%. He further noted that when Riverview Court was constructed, the design was changed due to complaints from neighbours in regard to the variance that had been proposed for that development, which was much less than what was contemplated here. He submitted that the proposed variances would block the views of the mountains for adjacent neighbours and would reduce the sunlight in the summer by 1 to 2 hours per day. Mr. Gould also presented a petition signed by a significant number of people which reiterated the same points.

At the Board's hearing an architectural model of the proposed development was available. Mr. Gould felt that the model was not to scale and did not represent the true proportion of the buildings. However, counsel for the YWCA submitted to the contrary. He indicated that the model was prepared by an architect and was to scale. He also pointed out that there would be a significant distance between the rooflines in issue, and the Riverview Court Apartments, or any other residences, and that due to that distance there would be very little, if any, impact. He suggested that there would be no shadow on the Riverview Court complex at all.

Despite those comments, as was pointed out by Mr. Thorton who spoke in favour of the appeal, there was no sunshade study done in regard to the proposal.

It was also suggested that the effect of the increased roof height would lessen the value of neighbourhood properties, due to the shading effect which was alleged, and any restrictions created in regard to the views in the area.

Having regard to the above, the other oral submissions presented, the Land Use By-Law and the documents submitted in respect to this appeal, the Development Appeal Board denies this appeal. In doing so, we put particular emphasis on the model of the proposed facility, which also included a representation of the Riverview Court complex. We accept that the model is to scale, and that due to the scale and massing of the buildings, that there would be little, if any, shading effect on the Riverview Court buildings.

While the increased height of the roofline proposed for the YWCA may have some impact upon the views in the area, we find that those restrictions would be minimal, and that they will not unduly interfere with the amenities of the neighbourhood, or materially interfere with or affect the use, enjoyment or value of the neighbouring parcels of land. In regard to the issue of value, while some suggested that the value of their properties may be lessened, there was no expert opinion evidence submitted in regard to the issue. We find that it is just as probable that property values could be enhanced given the design of the proposed roof, which we feel will enhance the appearance of the building, make it appear more consistent with the other buildings in the neighbourhood, and also bring it into line with current design guidelines for the Town of Banff.

Appeal No. 3

Sydney and Holly Wilcox also presented a petition signed by a number of persons indicating general support for their appeal. They feel that the increased size and resulting density of the proposed development will adversely affect the character of the neighbourhood. In their view, the intensification of the development would not be in keeping with the character of the neighbourhood, and they were most specifically concerned about the bus parking area which was provided for. There was no bus route which gave access to the property, and the use of Glen Avenue by buses was problematic given the narrow residential character of the roadway. Ms. Wilcox also felt that the YWCA should not have received a 15 parking stall credit for the bus parking area. Ms. Wilcox also pointed out that this is a heavily used area, given its proximity to the Bow Falls and the Banff Springs Hotel. This creates safety concerns, and it was also pointed out that buses would run the risk of getting hung up on the sloping

driveway giving access to Glen Avenue which they felt was obviously not designed with bus traffic in mind.

Mr. Thorton, who also spoke in favour of this appeal, agreed that the bus parking area was not appropriate given its proximity to the residences in the area. It was also felt that the inevitable idling of buses in this area would cause a significant disruption to the area residents.

The YWCA pointed out that buses currently access the property, and that there does not seem to be any problem in regard to that bus access. It was also suggested that bus traffic is extremely important to the Town of Banff, and certainly was not unusual for the Town or the Town's residents.

Having regard to the above, the other oral submissions presented, the Town of Banff Land Use By-Law, and the written submissions in respect to this appeal, the Development Appeal Board upholds this appeal to the extent that the decision of the MPC is varied to remove the bus parking area provided for by the plans which have been proposed. We do not feel it is appropriate that bus parking of this nature be provided for in such close proximity to the residences in the area. We accept that idling buses will be present in a bus parking area, including during morning and evening hours and that this will cause adverse effects for area residents. This is not appropriate having regard to the characteristics of this neighbourhood, or the detrimental effect it will have upon the use and enjoyment of properties in the area. We also accept that large motor coaches will not be able to physically and safely access Spray Avenue from this location, and that large motor coaches are likely to back up on to Glen Avenue thereby creating an unacceptable traffic hazard.

With the deletion of the bus parking area, we also note that either another bus parking area or 15 additional parking spaces will be required. The YWCA must therefore submit a new parking plan for the approval of the Town of Banff Planning and Development Department in that regard. If a new bus parking area is to be utilized it may not be located along either Glen Avenue, or the lane where the proposed bus area was to be located.

We also feel that the increased density which will result from the proposed development will create further planning issues in the predominantly residential neighbourhood. However, it is our feeling that rather than prohibiting the development itself, those issues can be dealt with provided that appropriate conditions are attached to the development permit, as discussed herein.

Appeal No. 4

Mr. Tarchuk and Mr. Waterhouse appealed condition 1(a) of the development permit. They felt that the condition did not adequately address the issues related to the bus loading area in front of the YWCA building. They noted that commercial busses utilize the transit zone immediately in front of the YWCA building, which was illegal, created a hazard, and needed to be addressed within the development permit. They pointed out that this was an extremely busy area of town having regard to its proximity to the Bow Falls and the Banff Springs Hotel. It was also a highly used area by tourists, who both walked and drove in this area. They suggested the area experienced the second highest usage in the Town of Banff for both pedestrian and vehicle traffic. Safety was their main concern and they indicated that the busses

stopping in front of the YWCA building created a serious traffic hazard. They also noted that the corner itself was very dangerous having regard to the nature of the street, and its slope.

The appellants also made it clear that they were not opposed to the YWCA building itself, or the proposed addition, but felt it was necessary to address the bus situation if the proposal was to proceed. Mr. Waterhouse submitted pictures of busses utilizing the transit zone which clearly demonstrated that those buses did in fact block the lane of traffic in this area. Mr. Waterhouse also explained that this had the dangerous effect of blocking a driver's view of oncoming traffic further down the street.

Mr. Tarchuk also indicated that other hotel facilities in the Town of Banff were required to provide bus "lay-by" areas where buses could pull over out of traffic. He suggested that this should be done, and that the cost of doing so should be borne by the developer.

Pictures were also submitted showing groups of people entering the YWCA property after being dropped off by a bus. Mr. Waterhouse indicated that he telephoned the YWCA and they specifically promoted to potential guests the convenience of being picked up at the front door of the YWCA by these buses.

The YWCA on the other hand, indicated that if buses are stopping in front of their doorstep, this was not their problem. They pointed out that roads were the jurisdiction of the Town of Banff, and, if it was illegal for commercial buses to utilize the transit zone, as had been indicated by administration, that the town should enforce their by-laws by ticketing the buses. In fact, the YWCA indicated that they would be happy if the transit zone was moved away from their front door, as in their view, it was not necessary for their operations.

Having regard to the above, the other oral submissions presented, the Banff Land Use By-Law, and the written materials submitted in respect to this appeal, the Development Appeal Board upholds the appeal and varies the MPC decision by requiring that the YWCA construct, at their cost, a bus lay-by area to the satisfaction of the Town of Banff's Department. The lay-by must meet the current standards established by the Town for other lay-bys constructed in the Town of Banff. In that regard, we encourage the YWCA to work with the Town of Banff to determine whether or not the lay-by area can be constructed in the area of the transit zone, and also encourage the YWCA and The Town of Banff to work together in regard to any operational details which may be required.

While we agree with the YWCA that roads are within the Town's jurisdiction, we also accept the evidence that the YWCA specifically promotes itself on the basis of the convenience and proximity of buses to their facilities. While we certainly encourage the Town of Banff to enforce its traffic by-laws, it is contradictory for the YWCA to promote itself in such a fashion, and then indicate that it is not their problem. As indicated by one of the other speakers, as a restaurant operator she specifically makes the rules known to bus operators stopping at her facilities, and also makes it known to the operators that they are not welcome if they do not adhere to those rules.

As was also pointed out, other hotels in town have been required to construct bus lay-by areas in conjunction with their developments. Although these other facilities are located in a different land use district, the reality of the situation is that there are significant traffic and safety issues created by the lack of a lay-by area in front of the YWCA. In our opinion, the intensification of this development should

not be allowed unless such a facility is constructed. Otherwise the traffic and safety hazard would simply be too great for this Board to approve such a development.

2.0 ADJOURNMENT

DAB05-14 MOVED by Treutler to adjourn the meeting at 10:54 a.m.

CARRIED

Neil Tanner
Chair

Cheryl Hyde
Recording Secretary