

The City of Lake Forest
Plan Commission
Proceedings of the September 24, 2019 Special Meeting

A meeting of the Lake Forest Plan Commission was held on Tuesday, September 24, 2019, at 6:30 p.m., at City Hall, 220 E. Deerpath, Lake Forest, Illinois.

Commission members present: Acting Chairman Douglass and Commissioners Michael Freeman, John Dixon and Jamie Moorhead

Commissioners absent: Chairman Kehr and Commissioners Monica Ruggles and Susan Athenson

Staff present: Catherine Czerniak, Director of Community Development

1. Introduction of Commissioners and staff and review of meeting procedures.

Acting Chairman Douglass asked the members of the Commission and staff to introduce themselves and reviewed the meeting procedures followed by the Commission.

2. Public Hearing and Action: Continued consideration of a request for approval of the tentative plat of the Margaret M. and Hampden M. Swift Memorial Subdivision. Four single family lots are proposed. The property is currently addressed as 770 Washington Road and is located on the west side of Washington Road between Westminster and Walnut Avenue.

Property Owner: Swift Family

Presented by: Michael Adelman, attorney

Acting Chairman Douglass introduced the agenda item and asked the Commission to declare any conflicts of interest or Ex Parte contacts. Hearing none, he swore in all those intending to speak. He invited a presentation by the petitioner and swore in all those intending to speak.

Mr. Adelman introduced the petition and thanked the Commission for holding a special meeting to hear this petition. He stated that the parcel is 3.8 acres in size and is zoned R-3 with a minimum lot size of 40,000 square feet. He stated that a conventional subdivision is proposed and no variances or exceptions to the Code are requested. He stated that the owners tried to sell the parcel as a single property but were not successful due to a combination of the current market climate, trends in real estate and people's tastes. He stated that one of the proposed lots is under contract and the other three are being marketed pending approval of the subdivision. He pointed out that someone could buy more than one lot and build a home on two or more consolidated lots. He stated that the petition was first presented to the Commission in June of this year and various ideas were discussed including shared driveways, the appropriate amount of impervious surface, the

location of curb cuts, preservation of trees and groups of trees, preservation of views of the south lawn from the streetscape and the possibility of rezoning the property to allow for higher density, clustered housing. He stated that the staff report addresses each of the issues well. He stated that the property is in the Historic Residential and Open Space Preservation Overlay District and therefore must be considered as a Planned Preservation Subdivision and approved through a Special Use Permit. He noted however that the Code allows a conventionally configured subdivision to be approved if the City determines that is the best approach for a particular site. He reiterated that a conventional, fully conforming subdivision is proposed. He reviewed the modifications that were made to the plat in response to the comments offered at the June meeting. He noted that the north and south lot lines for Lots two and three were adjusted slightly and the northeast corner of Lot 4 was shaved off and added to southeast corner of Lot 3. He noted that Lot 3 is now configured to locate the stone fireplace and the stone surround entirely on a single parcel. He stated that although there is no requirement that the stone fire place be preserved, but noted that the lot configuration as now proposed provides the opportunity to do so and to incorporate the feature into a plan for the property. He stated that the stone surround feature at the pond is identified for preservation in the notes on the plat however, there is no requirement to preserve the concrete bottom pond itself, adding that the pond can be filled in or used as a landscape feature. He stated that the front yard setbacks on Lots 2 and 3 were extended and now range from 90 to 100 feet, instead of 40 feet, the minimum required by the Code. He reviewed the notes on the plat pointing out that the number of curb cuts on Lots 2 and 3 are limited to one each to minimize disruption of the trees along the streetscape. He noted that no solid fencing is permitted within the front yard setback. He reiterated that the pond itself may be filled in, however the rock and landscape features near the southeast corner of the overall site are required to be preserved. He stated that originally, the plan was to locate the sanitary sewer along the west edge, in an easement however, at the direction of the City Engineer, the sanitary sewer will be constructed in the City right-of-way since it is intended to be dedicated to the City after construction is completed. He stated that all of the lots exceed the 40,000 square foot minimum and all of the setbacks meet or exceed the requirements in the R-3 zoning district. He reiterated that no variances are requested. He spoke to the conditions as recommended in the staff report. He questioned why a 30 foot setback is recommended on Lots 1 and 4, rather than the standard 15 foot setback side yard setback. He noted that he is not aware of any requests from the neighbors for an extended setback in that area. He questioned why a tree preservation area is needed on the plat noting that the Historic Preservation Commission will have purview over the site plan when a house is proposed and can require trees to be preserved. He noted that the vegetation on the site, other than some trees and grouping of trees, is of a low quality. He stated that policing a tree preservation area is problematic. He stated that prohibiting fences in the front setback, in his opinion, is overly restrictive. He noted that the plat already prohibits sight obscuring fences in front of the homes. He provided photos of fences in the front yards of properties in the neighborhood. He stated that an

open wrought iron fence can be tasteful and allow views into the property from the public street.

Ms. Czerniak provided some background on the discussions to date on this property. She stated that the Historic Preservation Commission gave careful consideration to the request presented by the petitioners to demolish the family home that was previously located on the 3.8 acre property. She stated that after lengthy deliberations, the Historic Preservation Commission determined that the criteria for demolition were met and that due to various additions and modifications made over time, the house had lost its historic integrity. The Historic Preservation Commission approved the demolition and the house was removed and the debris cleared from the site. She stated that the family marketed the property in various ways, first with the house, then as a vacant large parcel. She stated that after many months, a decision was made to seek approval for subdivision of the property as permitted by the zoning on the property. She stated that in early discussions about subdivision, the petitioner, staff and the Plan Commission appropriately considered potential development options for the property given its location between properties zoned for higher densities to the west and the R-3 zoning to the east. She added that the location of the property near the Central Business District also factored into the early discussions about potentially seeking a rezoning of the property to allow increased density, clustered housing units or townhomes. She stated that although the consideration of the best long term use for the property was very appropriate, in the end, the family decided to pursue a four lot subdivision in full conformance with the current R-3 zoning on the property. She stated that all of the lots exceed the required minimum lot size in the R-3 zoning district of 40,000 square feet, and all lots met or exceed the minimum required lot frontage. She stated that based on discussions to date and input received, the staff report recommends three conditions which are intended to help preserve the unique character of this property and those around it. She pointed out that Lots 1 and 4 as proposed are pie shaped, with only three sides. She stated that 15 foot side yard setbacks are applied to the west property lines of those lots, rather than the 40 foot setback required for rear yards. She noted that the 40 foot rear yard setback is applied to Lots 2 and 3. She explained that staff recommends consideration of a 30 foot setback from the west property lines of Lots 1 and 4 to provide an appropriate separation distance from the smaller lots and homes to the west and for more consistency with the setbacks from the west property line on Lots 2 and 3. She clarified that the 30 foot setback would only apply to the principal structure on each property, not to accessory structures which would need to conform to the 15 foot setback requirement. She said that as noted by Mr. Adelman, the plat reflects greater front yard setbacks on Lots 2 and 3 than required. She stated that the petitioner established those setbacks in response to requests from neighboring property owners to preserve the character of the streetscape. She stated that the staff report recommends three tree preservation areas as requested by the City's Certified Arborist. She explained that the Arborist visited the site on several occasions and found that many of the trees on the property are in failing condition and will not likely survive construction activity. She added that the Arborist

recommended that three groupings of trees be preserved noting that the groupings are located away from the buildable areas and include healthy trees of significant species that warrant preservation. She stated that the tree preservation areas do not preclude removals of trees or vegetation in the defined areas so long as the removals are first reviewed and approved by the City's Certified Arborist. She stated that the third condition recommended in the staff report would prohibit fences of any type, within 20 feet of the front property line in an effort to preserve the character of the streetscape. She acknowledged that other properties in the area have fences in the front yard. She stated that at a minimum, if fences are permitted in the front yards, staff recommends that they should be open to allow views into the property. She requested Commission input on the three conditions recommended in the staff report. She added that the other conditions noted in the report are standard conditions and relate to the preparation of final documents, payment of fees and other procedural matters. She stated that the action requested from the Commission is a recommendation in support of tentative approval of the plat of subdivision. She explained that tentative approval will give clear direction to the petitioner to proceed with detailed engineering plans. She stated that the final plat will be presented to the Commission for review and approval and will need to be in compliance with any conditions of approval endorsed by the Commission. She confirmed that the City Engineer requires that infrastructure, sewer lines and water mains, that will be dedicated to the City be located in public rights-of-way, rather than in easements that extend across private properties, to minimize disruption to private properties when repairs or replacement is needed.

In response to questions from Commissioner Freeman, Ms. Czerniak confirmed that the subdivision must be reviewed as a Planned Preservation Subdivision because it is located in the Historic Residential and Open Space Preservation Overlay District. She stated that although the overlay district allows for a conventional subdivision with lots at or about the minimum lot size required by the applicable zoning district, conditions of approval should be put in place as the Commission determines is appropriate to preserve and protect natural and historic resources on the site which can include streetscapes, trees and views to or from the property. She stated that conditions can be added to subdivisions of property not located in the overlay district but the overlay district mandates protection of historic and natural features. She stated that the R-1 zoning district requires a 10 foot side yard setback adding that she is not certain whether or not the homes to the west of the site conform to that setback. She noted that a vicinity map reflecting the approximate locations of the homes to the west is included in the Plan Commission packet. She stated that a detached garage located at least 10 feet from the main house is considered an accessory structure. She stated that conditions limiting curb cuts are not currently recommended by staff however, she noted that a condition is recommended directing the Historic Preservation Commission to carefully consider driveway configurations and curb cut locations are part of the review of the site plan for each house as it comes forward.

Commissioner Freeman recalled that there was a great deal of discussion around curb cuts on Lots 1 and 4 and questioned whether some restrictions or limitations are needed.

Ms. Czerniak noted that based on discussions with various City departments, from public safety and engineering perspectives, staff raised no concerns about the addition of a limited number of curb cuts to serve three additional single family properties in this neighborhood. She clarified that it would be unusual for the Plan Commission to specify exact curb cut locations and perhaps premature since a curb cut is often part of the site plan development process. She reviewed that tentative approval of a plat sends a message to the petitioner that the density and lot configurations are acceptable and clears the way for the petitioner to proceed with having more detailed engineering plans prepared and a final plat. She confirmed that the final documents will need to comply with any conditions of approval endorsed by the Commission. She stated that the final plat will come back before the Commission as more of a procedural matter for final Commission action but will not specify specific curb cut locations or site plans.

In response to questions from Commissioner Dixon, Ms. Czerniak reviewed the various development alternatives that were considered for the property. She explained that because the property is located between properties zoned R-1 with a minimum lot size of 9,375 square feet, and the R-3 district with a 40,000 square foot minimum lot size, consideration was given to whether R-2 zoning, with a 20,000 square foot minimum lot size would be appropriate for the parcel as a transition between the two zoning districts. She stated that with R-2 zoning, the property could potentially accommodate six or seven new dwelling units. She added that consideration was given to the possibility of clustered residences and townhomes as a way to achieve a higher density on the property while also preserving open space. She noted however that after study of the established development pattern in the area, and recognizing the location of the property within the historic district, the petitioners decided to move forward with a four lot subdivision that fully conforms to the current R-3 zoning on the property. She stated staff support for the four lot subdivision generally as presented.

In response to comments by Commissioner Moorhead, Ms. Czerniak confirmed that the pond does not have historic significance, has a concrete bottom and does not have a natural spring source. She confirmed that the stone fireplace does not have any historic significance. She confirmed that a final engineering and grading plan will need to be submitted for review and approval before any permits are issued for development on any of the lots. She stated that the Code does not allow sites to be cleared of vegetation and trees prior to approval of a specific site plan. She stated that the condition recommended by staff identifies three significant groupings of trees and suggests that special measures should be taken to protect these areas. She noted that removing some trees within the identified areas will likely cause others to decline potentially eventually impacting the entire grouping. She confirmed that the Historic Preservation Commission will require updated tree

surveys at the time plans for homes are presented and will consider which trees to preserve and determine how to increase the likelihood that those trees will be preserved. She stated that the condition about fences is presented in direct response to comments heard throughout the process about preserving the streetscape and views into the property. She stated that an open fence on or near the front property line could achieve those goals. She stated that curb cuts are not usually located on the final plat. She noted that taking that step at this early point in the process could restrict the options for siting a home on a lot. She confirmed that ultimately, the Historic Preservation Commission and City Engineer will have review and approval authority over the curb cut locations. She confirmed that the Code requires that curb cuts must be a minimum of 20 feet from a corner.

John Bilski, 403 E. Westminster, stated that his property backs up to the proposed Lot 2. He stated support for the subdivision as proposed. He stated that he opposes any increased density or multi-family development on the property.

Jeff Torosian, 401 E. Westminster, stated that he lives directly west of Lot 1. He stated that he and his wife are in favor of the petition and are looking forward to getting to know the new neighbors. He stated that he is very much against any changes to the zoning, shared driveways, cluster development or multi-family development on the site. He stated support for the petition as presented.

George Spertzel, 1523 Estate Lane, stated that he and his wife have a contract to purchase the northernmost lot if the subdivision is approved. He stated that they have lived in Lake Forest for 19 years, first in the Everett Farm development and currently in a house they built near the Lasker Estate. He stated that they are interested in downsizing but do not want a town home or a home in a cluster development. He stated that they just want a smaller home, with a backyard. He stated that they love living in Lake Forest and are active in the Historical Society and the Garden Club and value what Lake Forest does to manage development in the community. He stated that as a larger parcel, the Swift property was not marketable, but as four lots, each with a custom built home, it fits perfectly into the neighborhood. He noted that the petitioner is not asking for any variances or special approvals but instead, has presented a subdivision that fully meets or exceeds the Code requirements. He stated support for Mr. Adelman's request that the 15 foot setback from the west property line remain. He noted that that Lot 1, the property he intends to buy, is a pie shaped lot and has high quality trees on the eastern portion of the property. He stated that in order to preserve the trees, it may be necessary for the house to encroach closer than 30 feet to the west property line and the staff recommendation would not allow that to happen. He noted that the current driveway on the Swift property is located toward the west property line, near the Torosian property. He stated that the driveway for his new home will likely be in the same location. He stated that the driveway will provide a buffer between his house and the house to the west. He stated that he spoke with the Torosians, the neighbors to the west, and learned that they have no objection to retaining a 15 foot setback. He noted that there is currently a wood stockade fence on the west

property line extending out to the front property line. He noted that based on the staff discussion, that fence will need to be an open fence and as a result, will provide less screening between the homes than exists today. He stated that since the June meeting, he has been driving by the property four to five times a week and has never seen anyone come in or out of the driveways along the street. He stated that adding three driveways will not negatively impact this area, in his opinion. He acknowledged that the site plan and architectural plans for his house will be subject to review by the Historic Preservation Commission, He asked for the Commission's support for the subdivision so they can close on the property and get to work designing and building their homes.

Hearing no further public comment, he closed the public hearing and invited additional questions from the Commission. Hearing none, he invited response to public comment from the petitioner.

Mr. Adelman stated that he understands that the 15 foot setbacks on Lots 1 and 4 look small in comparison to the 40 foot setbacks on Lots 2 and 3. He suggested increasing the proposed 15 foot setback to 20 feet to achieve a better balance between the lots. He acknowledged that at the June meeting, the Plan Commission spent an inordinate amount of time discussing curb cuts. He stated that in his time on the Plan Commission he does not ever recall curb cuts being established on the plat of subdivision. He noted that all of the proposed lots have 250 feet of frontage or more, adding that the Code allows two curb cuts on lots with 120 feet of frontage or more. He stated that the petitioner recognizes the importance of saving the grouping of trees along Washington Road and in support of that effort, has voluntarily restricted Lots 2 and 3 to one curb cut each. He stated that the street frontage on Walnut Road is extensive and could support two curb cuts if desired. He stated that he was told by the Police Department that traffic volumes on Walnut Road do not warrant a stop sign. He reiterated that the four lot subdivision as proposed meets or exceeds the applicable Code requirements. He stated that his clients have no desire to pursue a zone change that would allow increased density or clustering of homes on the site. He suggested that rather than establishing tree preservation areas on the plat of subdivision, a note could be included putting prospective purchasers on notice that site plans for individual homes will be scrutinized to ensure that significant trees are preserved.

Ms. Czerniak agreed that from the staff perspective, a 20 foot setback from the west property line is workable acknowledging that there are different interpretations of whether the west property line is a rear yard which would require a 40 foot setback, or a side yard which would permit a 15 foot side yard setback. She stated that both interpretations have merit. She stated that the language in the conditions relating to photograph documentation of the tree preservation areas is left over from the earlier staff report that proposed conservation areas in those location instead of the less restrictive tree preservation areas, and should have been removed. She stated that the tree preservation areas as proposed will inform prospective buyers that those three groupings of trees are important and should be preserved.

Chairman Douglass noted that Commissioner Ruggles provided comments on the petition in her absence and in summary, stated agreement with the staff recommendation and the conditions as presented in the staff report. He invited final comments from the Commission

Commissioner Dixon noted that the discussions about redeveloping this property began two years ago when the demolition of the house was requested. He stated that based on his count, this property has been discussed at about six public meetings. He noted that many neighbors have participated in the discussion by speaking at the public hearings and submitting written comments. He stated that it is clear that the property will be developed and it is clear that not everyone will be happy with the development. He reviewed that the property is zoned R-3 and is located in the Historic Residential and Open Space Preservation Overlay District which is intended to support unique and distinctive developments with an emphasis on preserving natural and historic features. He noted that there was much discussion about what should be done with the property, four lots or cluster housing were two ideas discussed at previous meetings. He noted however that most of the discussion has centered around preserving the trees and open space and assuring that public safety is not impacted by curb cuts on to the adjoining streets. He stated that when the streets were originally laid out, it was likely never envisioned that this parcel would someday be subdivided into four lots. He stated for that reason, he thinks the discussion of curb cuts has been appropriate. He stated that he is most concerned about the driveway location for Lot 3 due to the need to balance preserving open space, protecting trees and ensuring public safety. He stated that the driveway should not enter the street near the intersection.

In response to questions from Commissioner Freeman, Ms. Czerniak confirmed that the curb cut for Lot 3 must be located at least 20 feet from the intersection and, based on the staff recommendation, will need to respect tree grouping two. She clarified that the tree preservation areas do not prohibit all removals, but require review and approval by the Historic Preservation Commission and the City's Certified Arborist.

Commissioner Freeman stated that he shares concern about public safety particularly with respect to traffic from Walnut Road on to Washington Road. He stated that the final resolution of the driveway location should be left to the Historic Preservation Commission and City Arborist with direction to assure adequate sightlines at the corner and around each of the curb cuts.

Ms. Czerniak offered that the plat could delineate an area or areas for one or more of the lots, that are acceptable to the City Engineer and City Arborist, within which curb cuts could be located.

Commissioner Freeman suggested that consideration be given to locating the curb cuts on Lots 1 and 4 closer to the west property line but leaving the final decision to

the Historic Preservation Commission, City Engineer, Police Chief and the City's Certified Arborist. He acknowledged that not much traffic is anticipated on each of the driveways. He noted that the conditions require that adequate sightlines be provided.

In response to questions from Commissioner Freeman, Ms. Czerniak stated that the Code permits fences up to four feet in height, of any kind, on the front property lines. She stated that fences taller than four feet must be setback from the front property line at least four feet. She stated that as part of approval of any subdivision, further restrictions can be placed on fences.

Commissioner Freeman stated that a setback of 20 feet from the west property line makes sense. He stated support for editing the condition in the staff report that pertains to fences to prohibit closed, solid or sight obscuring fencing on the front property line but allowing open fences in a manner consistent the Code.

In response to questions from Commissioner Dixon, Ms. Czerniak confirmed that staff is not recommending any protections for the pond located in the southeast corner of the site. She noted that the grouping of trees in that corner is identified for preservation in some form.

Commissioner Dixon stated that it should be clear that the pond in no way should limit the location of a driveway on the western edge of Lot 3.

In response to a question from Commissioner Moorhead, Commissioner Freeman clarified that he is supportive of allowing non-sight obscuring fences at the front property line in conformance with the Code.

Commissioner Moorhead stated support for the tentative plat as presented. He noted that although he was not on the Commission at the time the subdivision was initially discussed, he watched the videos of the meetings and read the minutes. He stated that in his opinion, the project has evolved in a good way from the various concepts that were discussed. He acknowledged that the property is located at a transition between the R-1 and R-3 zoning districts but noted that the property faces east and directly relates to properties to the east that are zoned R-3. He stated that the setbacks as proposed appear to be appropriate noting that the larger front yard setbacks are appropriate for the neighborhood and streetscape. He added that the expanded setback for Lot 4 relates well to Triangle Park. He stated that for various reasons, legal and practical, he does not support shared driveways. He stated that he is reassured to know that the City Engineer will review drainage and grading plans prior to the issuance of any permits for work on the site. He agreed with the concerns raised about the location of the curb cut for Lot 3. He agreed that providing more definition around where a curb cut can or cannot be located will be helpful. He noted that Section 156.004 of the Code appears to state that the location of curbs have to be approved by the City Engineer prior to the recording of the plat. He stated that the recommended tree preservation areas and the

importance of saving significant trees on the site outweigh any burden on the petitioner or future home owners. He stated that he was inclined to support the 30 foot setback from the west property line, but stated that based on the discussion, he can accept a 20 foot setback. He stated support for allowing open fences in the front yards in conformance with the Code.

Chairman Douglass stated that he is in favor of the plat of subdivision and agrees with much of what has been said. He stated that Lots 1 and 4 are essentially corner lots with a front yard and two side yards noting that he was comfortable with a 15 foot setback along the west side. He said however that a 20 foot setback along the west property line is a good compromise. He stated that in his opinion, the area of the pond on Lot 3 is a natural location for a driveway. He added that to the north end of Lot 3, there is a nice opening along the streetscape that is more than 20 feet from the intersection, that could accommodate a driveway for Lot 3. He suggested that some flexibility should be considered to allow the driveway on Lot 3 to encroach into the required setback along the north property line of Lot 3. He noted that the buildable area on Lot 2 is far enough back that it will not be impacted by shifting the driveway on Lot 3 north. He expressed concern that a fence becomes a natural magnet as a place to plant shrubs which will block views into the properties and interrupt open space. He stated support for a 20 foot setback for fences.

Commissioner Freeman agreed that the idea of not having fences near the front property line is attractive to provide open sight lines. He stated however that the Commission needs to be cautious about placing too many restrictions on the plat.

Commissioner Dixon stated that in his opinion, it is important to allow fences of some type. He agreed that sight obscuring vegetation could be an issue and suggested that be left to the Historic Preservation Commission.

Hearing no further discussion or comments from the Commission, Acting Chairman Douglass invited a motion.

Commissioner Freeman made a motion to approve of the tentative plat for the Margaret M. and Hampden M. Swift Memorial Planned Preservation Subdivision subject to the following conditions:

1. A final plat of subdivision and final engineering plans shall be prepared, submitted to the City and will be subject to review and a determination by the City Engineer and Director of Community Development that they are in conformance with all applicable Code requirements and the conditions of tentative approval. The plat shall reflect the following:
 - a. Tree preservation areas to protect the overall character and integrity of three significant groupings of trees and vegetation 1) along the north portion of the Washington Road street frontage of Lot 2, 2) along the Walnut Road street frontage and at the corner of Lot 3, (3) in the

- southeast corner of Lot 4. (See attached graphic reflecting the general location of the groupings. The boundaries of the areas shall be determined in consultation with the City's Certified Arborist and reflected on the final plat.))
- b. Setbacks of 20 feet along the west property lines of Lots 1 and 4 in recognition of the proximity of the established homes to the west.
 - c. The following notes shall appear on the face of the plan:
 - i. Tree Preservation Areas – No grading, filling or other changes are permitted in these areas if, in the determination of the City's Certified Arborist, said activities will negatively impact trees identified for preservation. Removals of trees or vegetation and replacement plantings are permitted subject to approval and the issuance of a permit by the City.
 - ii. The building setback lines for Lots 2 and 3 as reflected on the plat intentionally supersede the standard setbacks in the R-3 zoning district.
 - iii. Only open, non-sight obscuring fences are permitted near the front property lines and within the front yard setback.
 - iv. The driveway and curb cut for Lot 3 may be located within the required 15 foot setback along the north property line subject to approval by the Historic Preservation Commission, City Engineer and City Arborist.
2. The following condition shall be included in the final approval document:
- a. The Historic Preservation Commission is directed to consider the following factors when reviewing proposed driveway locations: preservation of parkway trees, protection of healthy trees within the Tree Preservation Areas, limiting impervious surface to the extent possible, considering curved driveways to minimize direct views into the property and assuring appropriate sightlines for safety purposes.
3. All fees due to date must be paid.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Dixon and approved by a vote of 4 to 0.

Acting Chairman Douglass complimented the petitioner on the responsiveness and willingness to respond to comments heard in the public hearings and look for compromise.

Commissioner Freeman commented that the Commission is obligated to think beyond what is presented and consider longer term opportunities. In the case of this petition, it was appropriate for the Commission to consider density, zoning, driveway and housing type options. He noted however that he is pleased with where the project is at this point.

3. Additional public comment on non-agenda items

There was no testimony presented on non-agenda items.

4. Additional information from staff.

No additional information was presented by staff.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:02 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Catherine Czerniak
Director of Community Development