

**VILLAGE OF LAKE BLUFF  
JOINT PLAN COMMISSION & ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS  
MEETING**

**JUNE 20, 2018**

**APPROVED MINUTES**

**1. Call to Order & Roll Call**

Chair Peters called to order the regular meeting of the Joint Plan Commission and Zoning Board of Appeals (PCZBA) of the Village of Lake Bluff on Wednesday, June 20, 2018, at 7:00 p.m. in the Village Hall Board Room (40 E. Center Avenue).

The following members were present:

Members:     Sam Badger  
                  David Burns  
                  Jill Danly  
                  Elliot Miller  
                  George Russell  
                  Gary Peters, Chair

Absent:        James Murray

Also Present:  Glen Cole, Assistant to the Village Administrator (AVA)  
                  Drew Irvin, Village Administrator  
                  Steve Kraus (former chairman of the PCZBA)

**2. Non-Agenda Items and Visitors (Public Comment Time)**

Chair Peters stated the PCZBA allocates 15 minutes during this item for those individuals who would like the opportunity to address the PCZBA on any matter not listed on the agenda. Each person addressing the PCZBA is asked to limit their comments to a maximum of three minutes.

There were no requests to address the PCZBA.

Chair Peters recognized two representatives of Boy Scout Troop #42 observing the meeting.

**3. Comprehensive Plan Workshop**

AVA Cole described the separation of meetings in June due to a public notice issue and stated that this regular meeting will focus on the Comprehensive Plan, while the next meeting will focus on ordinary business and petitions. He apologized for the error. He also distributed copies of a book, *The Job of the Planning Commissioner*, stating that he wanted to provide a resource now that there are new members on the PCZBA.

Chair Peters introduced the Comprehensive Plan Workshop and asked AVA Cole to provide a presentation. AVA Cole provided an overview of the Comprehensive Plan process to date; the effect that the transition of new Plan Commissioners will have on the process; the role of the Comprehensive Plan in the work of the PCZBA and the efforts of the Village; and the various sections of the Comprehensive Plan draft and their importance.

Chair Peters noted for the record the letter recently received from Mark Stolzenberg concerning the draft Comprehensive Plan. Member Badger stated that he had not had a chance to review it and asked AVA Cole for a summary. AVA Cole stated that the letter shares similar themes to Mr. Stolzenberg's testimony given to the PCZBA at its April 2018 meeting principally concerning the Village's residential environment. He stated that the letter discusses and advances arguments concerning issues specific R-5 zoning; the disposition of public land for development as alternative housing products; the tension between new housing development and historic preservation; the likelihood that the Village could realize development not dependent on automobiles; and that efforts to increase density may harm property values and Lake Bluff's single family character. Member Miller noted that Mr. Stolzenberg's letter was critical of the use of the word "enable" in one of the draft policies, and that he may be inclined to revisit these word choices.

### **Comprehensive Plan Workshop - Economic Development**

Chair Peters asked that the PCZBA's discussion begin with the Economic Development draft section. AVA Cole began to explain the individual goals, objectives, and policies in the Economic Development draft section. Member Badger stated that the PCZBA had gone through these sections in previous meetings, and that he was unsure of the best way to proceed through the review this evening. He stated that he had notes regarding the policies and began to review them.

Referring to a subpoint of Policy 2.2, Member Badger asked if the term Planned Commercial Development should be defined for the benefit of the reader. AVA Cole, attempting to summarize, stated that the PCD tool gives the Village flexibility in regulations. He stated that it may not be efficient or effective to write regulations specific to such a small parcel of land, but that the PCD tool gives the PCZBA additional control over development that may lead to better outcomes. Member Badger added that it may be overly restrictive for projects to proceed under current zoning.

Member Danly, referring to the next subpoint regarding transitions, stated that this point strikes her as a grey area among the other, more specific policies. Member Badger responded and discussed the PCZBA's consideration of Block 3 and how it framed this discussion. Chair Peters concurred, saying that it is too difficult to be explicit about that transition but that being more specific would be helpful. Member Burns, speaking as to the Comprehensive Plan, said that it is beneficial to have high level verbiage and not to get into the specifics of setbacks, frontage, and so forth in this document, as that was the role of the Zoning Ordinance. Concerning the PCD tool, he stated that this tool was not one-size-fits-all and that it would be restrictive to put more guidelines about it. Member Russell stated that he believes it is unlikely to assemble the parcels necessary for a PUD on Block 2 due to the diversity of ownership in this area. He asked if there was any discussion regarding this likelihood in the PCZBA's prior meetings. He stated that he believes that new construction pursuant to the Zoning Regulations would be appropriate and effective in this area, and so is unsure why there is a specific recommendation contrary to that path. Member Badger, responding to Member Russell, stated that assembly is difficult but possible yet that it may be more appropriate to soften that recommendation so as to say that PCD is merely appropriate if possible. Member Burns, speaking as to the approach of the plan, stated that he was originally uncomfortable with some of the plan's more aspirational statements. He became more comfortable with the idea that, if the possibility presents itself, the PCZBA has laid out the most ideal course of action even if private property owners may ultimately choose different plans of

actions. The consensus of the group was to add "preferred" or "if appropriate" to conclude the sentence.

Member Russell asked if AVA Cole had already summarized the next Policy, and if not, asked him to explain the statement that Lake Bluff should "support transportation of skilled labor from northeastern Lake County." AVA Cole stated that, statistically, Lake Bluff residents tend to work to the west and south along the North Shore towards the Chicago Loop, but that Lake Bluff employees tend to come from north and northwest of the Village.

Member Russell stated he was confused by a comment concerning the greenbelt and parking lower on the page. AVA Cole stated that the language here is somewhat of a drafting error, but it also reflects the tension in the PCZBA's earlier plans regarding preserving this greenbelt (100' deep) and the recommendations of the Waukegan Road Corridor Study that the regulatory greenbelt should be shallower (50') as it hinders redevelopment. He provided alternate language should the group choose this option. Member Badger stated that he sees both sides of the argument, as the greenbelt is a unique aesthetic feature in this section of Waukegan Road, but that redeveloping creating retail-level parking demand would be a challenge with this greenbelt requirement. Member Burns, speaking more generally, said that the reality is that the Village will not generate large revenue streams from economic activity in the Central Business District. Therefore, one of the compromises to be evaluated may need to be to leverage the development possibilities in the Business Park more fully. He stated part of the feedback from residents is that taxes are too high, and that this can be part of the strategy to address these concerns. Member Russell concurred and stated that he supports allowing parking in the rear 50' of the 100' Waukegan Road setback, discussing the history of variations allowing development into the setback. AVA Cole noted that there are development inquiries on this subject, which implies that the interest is there. Member Miller asked if the phrase "if appropriate" would be an appropriate signal in this section. AVA Cole noted that some developers will see an entitlement process for a discretionary setback reduction as overly risky.

Returning to the skilled labor conversation, Member Miller asked that the phrase "Northeast Lake County" be struck from the policy. AVA Cole presented Census OnTheMove data showing commuting patterns concerning Lake Bluff and restated his prior comments. He noted that some of the conversation in northeastern Lake County, with Lake Forest playing an active role, is if adequate transit and transportation connections exist for these laborers and if realignments are necessary.

Chair Peters asked if there was consensus regarding the inclusion of "northeastern Lake County." The consensus was to strike the term. Member Miller asked the same regarding the greenbelt language. Member Russell stated he supports the language that would allow parking closer to Waukegan Road. The group discussed the specific language to use and the effectiveness of the use of various phrases in the Plan. Chair Peters recognized Village Administrator Irvin to respond to a comment from Member Burns. He stated that the use of "study" or "encourage" language is not uncommon in these plans and should not be frowned upon. The consensus of the group was to "encourage" these parking uses.

Member Russell stated his last note was regarding studying "hotels or residential uses" in the vicinity of Waukegan Road. He stated that he was completely opposed to residential uses in these areas and requested the phrase be struck. Member Badger stated that he concurred strongly, and

that - while other uses may be appropriate - the Village should not encourage residential uses that would be completely incompatible with the Business Park's light industrial businesses. He noted that past members of the Board felt strongly that this language should be included. Member Danly concurred with striking the phrase, as she believes it is a conflict with the other subpoints of this policy. Chair Peters said that the consensus of the group was to delete this phrase. AVA Cole stated that, as a compromise, the group may seek to incorporate this language into Policy 4.4 concerning the Route 41 / 176 interchange as residential and hotel uses are already present in this area. Member Badger stated that the interchange is more of a transitional area and may be more appropriate. Chair Peters recognized Steve Kraus from the audience. Mr. Kraus came forward and stated that Policy 4.2 is intended to encompass many types of different redevelopment in the context of the interchange reconstruction. The consensus of the group was not to amend any components of Objective 4.

AVA Cole summarized Staff comments that they would recommend for inclusion, such as:

- A statement encouraging the Village's recent practice of landbanking in the Central Business District, which may be necessary for use of planned commercial development tools. This may be appropriate for the Central Business District or at a Village-wide level.
- A statement encouraging the continued use of shared or landbanked parking in the Central Business District or more broadly Village-wide.
- Include Block 1 in the Planned Commercial Approach list of possibilities.
- Including language regarding aesthetics and high-quality design in Policy 4.
- Other minor tweaks.

Responding to a comment from Member Burns, AVA Cole stated that there was no specific design guidance or standards in the draft Plan. He noted that the current plan includes the Central Business District planning principles, which are design oriented. Member Burns stated that the importance of design is an example of a theme incorporated throughout the Plan, and that he would like to see a more explicit way of calling out some of these themes building up throughout the Plan.

The consensus of the group was to support these changes. AVA Cole stated that Staff would work on specific language to implement these recommendations and bring draft language to the PCZBA alongside their revisions at a future date.

### **Comprehensive Plan Workshop - Connectivity and Transportation**

The PCZBA concluded their review of the Economic Development section and proceeded to discuss their comments on the Connectivity and Transportation section.

Member Russell noted that Policy 1.3 was redundant with the results of the interchange Phase I design study that considered this issue specifically. He asked that "Study" be struck from this phrase.

Member Russell expressed his concern with the inclusion of "Thorn Valley Lane" under Policy 1.4. He stated that he believes it is inappropriate for the Village to assume financial responsibility for improving this road and that improvements should only occur if the homeowners elect to fund it via a Special Service Area pursuant to statute. Member Burns concurred, noting that the same approach is taken often in the Annexation chapter of the Plan. Member Badger stated that he recalls wanting to encourage these residents to pursue upgrades via a Special Service Area.

Member Russell stated that many Departments of the Village would like to see this area paved. Member Miller stated that the same principle applies to water and sewer extensions, and this principle should be stated in the Plan explicitly and independently.

Chair Peters asked that "unsafe traffic patterns or substandard design" phrasing be rewritten to avoid the implication that these areas are unsafe.

Member Russell asked for the history of the Sylvan Road section of Policy 1.9. Member Badger stated that he believed there was support for it among the residents of that street, and that a poll may reveal broader support. Member Russell said that he knew residents on that street opposed to such a change, and discussed the history of changes to the street. The consensus of the group was to strike the Sylvan Road section of the Policy.

Member Russell expressed similar concerns with the second section of Policy 1.9, stating that a two-way conversion of Oak Street would encourage commercial traffic circulating on North Avenue and that the street is very narrow. The group briefly discussed the history of this topic, and its consensus was to retain this policy as "Consider conversion."

Member Russell noted, variously, that:

- Under Policy 2.1, the Knollwood shared use path was intended to parallel the right-of-way of Northern Avenue, one block away from the listed Birch Avenue.
- He did not understand why the subsequent bullet point lists the Skokie River Preserve when it is off the axis of Sunset Terrace. Following an explanation by AVA Cole, Member Russell noted that the subsequent bullet point regarding Witchwood Lane is the same path as contemplated in the Sunset Terrace subsection.
- Where previously discussed by the Village - the second to last subpoint would describe a path connecting Campbell Court to West Scranton Avenue, rather than Blodgett Avenue. Member Badger asked, and Member Russell provided, further explanation.
- For the final subpoint, the crossing should read "west of" Green Bay Road and not "to" Green Bay Road.
- Member Russell, moving to Policy 2.2, stated that he did not understand why dead-end streets are not excluded as large lot subdivisions were excluded. Member Badger reviewed the discussion of this item and said the PCZBA had not discussed dead end streets.
- Under Policy 2.4, it should reflect that the Village should cooperate with neighboring communities such as Knollwood rather than only Lake Forest.
- Under Policy 4.4, "public parking areas" is clearer than "public areas."
- Member Russell discussed the exhibit included with this draft policy section. AVA Cole stated that Staff was working on new replacement exhibits and provided examples.

Returning to policy 2.2, Member Danly asked if sidewalks were necessary in these areas, as constructing sidewalks adds impervious surface and may take away from the charm and character of Lake Bluff. Member Russell concurred, saying the current draft sounds as though the Village intends to construct many sidewalks that seem of limited value in these areas. Member Burns stated that their discussion had not gone into a deep level of detail, but noted personally that the prevalence of sidewalks was one of the reasons he moved here from an area with an absence of sidewalks in Lake Forest. From the audience, Mr. Kraus came forward and stated that this point was driven by public safety and a desire to get users, especially children, out of the streets. Chair Peters contrasted these public safety needs to streetscape disruptions for adjacent residents.

Member Russell stated that he supports the policy as-is if it is edited to exclude dead-end streets. He discussed the controversy associated with previous sidewalk installations. After further discussion, the consensus of the group was to support this change.

Member Danly noted that many of the policies in this section relate to the work of the Sustainability and Community Enhancement Ad Hoc Committee. She asked how the committees and the Village's various plans interact with one another in view of the Plan. AVA Cole stated that the Comprehensive Plan was the plan for the Village, not just for the PCZBA, and that it would be appropriate to incorporate material from and action steps for the Village's other groups.

### **Comprehensive Plan Workshop - Residential Environment**

The PCZBA concluded their review of the Connectivity and Transportation section and proceeded to discuss their comments on the Residential Environment section. Chair Peters asked Member Danly to open the discussions.

Member Danly discussed the opportunities for sustainability and sustainable technologies in the future, as well as the importance of preservation. She said she had no other major comments.

Chair Peters asked Member Russell for his remarks. Member Russell expressed his concern with the inclusion of Policy 1.4, subsection 2, concerning the "buildability" of ravine lots. He described the Village's bluff and ravine protections and stated that, as written, this policy implies removing the ability of some lots to be built upon at all. Member Miller responded that some houses on ravines seem too large for the size of the lot, and that is the subject that his remarks in the minutes were directed towards. Member Russell suggested alternative language about restrictions on the size of homes these lots. Responding to a comment from Member Badger, Member Russell stated that he and his wife first became aware of these discussions when they saw a specific recommendation in the minutes about not counting ravine land in any way towards the permissible bulk on these lots. He stated that such a policy would have extreme effects on these lots and would practically make them unbuildable. He said that he had no problem with exploring further restrictions on the size of home on ravines, but that a specific recommendation should not come without more study. The consensus of the group was to concur. AVA Cole stated that the word choice of "buildability" was his error.

Shifting to Policy 3.1, Member Russell said that he would suggest striking "enable" from the policy. Member Burns stated his sense is that, unless the Village does something differently, appropriately scaled multi-family will not happen in the Village. He stated that policies today are overly prohibitive and that regulations must be adjusted to realize the Village's goals. AVA Cole noted that 15 E. Washington, whether a good or a bad proposal, illustrates the amount of relief necessary to merely build a duplex in the R-5 district. Member Burns concurred, saying that the request was excessive from a process perspective and that regulations will need to change. Responding to these comments, Member Russell stated that Policy 3.3 appears to provide a high level of protection to single-family homeowners, and he may retain the word "enable" in this light. Member Badger asked if the word "enable" is necessary in view of the following sentence / subsection. Steve Kraus came forward and stated that, for context, the prior PCZBA had a discussion with two components: that multifamily development needs to be encouraged, and that current zoning does not facilitate that type of development. He said, therefore, that the PCZBA attempted to develop two policies: one is that appropriately scaled multi-family housing development should be encouraged, and the second is to recognize that the existing zoning are not

effective in encouraging that development and should be changed. Over time, the PCZBA softened that language from "change" to "evaluate." AVA Cole stated that, to better reflect the PCZBA's intent, Staff could attempt to rework policies 3.1, 3.3, and 3.4 into a new policy and split out the language concerning R-5 zoning. Noting Mark Stolzenberg's written testimony, Chair Peters asked if it was too dilute of a recommendation if the word "enable" is deleted. Member Miller stated that the word "enable" may seem to some to imply underhanded actions, and so he has no problem removing it and reducing ambiguity. Member Badger stated that the PCZBA may review this policy after it is reworked. Chair Peters summarized the consensus of the PCZBA as desiring to strike "enable" and to rework this group of policies.

Member Russell, speaking to Policy 3.5, asked why the policy was specific as to "west" of Route 41 rather than the entire vicinity. He was unsure if that was an intentional decision. Member Badger, responding, stated that this policy was intended to refer to the Business Park. Member Russell stated that this policy would already need to be adjusted based on the PCZBA's prior conversations.

### **Comprehensive Plan Workshop - Annexation and Development**

The PCZBA concluded their review of the Residential Environment section and proceeded to discuss their comments on the Annexation and Development section. Chair Peters asked Member Russell to open the discussions.

Under Policy 2.1, Member Russell requested that the policy be revised to include language supporting connections to Lake County Forest Preserve's Oriole Grove, as well as the Village's Skokie Preserve, as part of the Stonebridge development. He described the development of Oriole Grove. Village Administrator Irvin came forward to address the PCZBA. He stated that the Forest Preserve has not had the resources to develop a specific plan for this area yet, but that it would be useful for the plan to propose connections for when the Oriole Grove is developed. AVA Cole described the chain of parks and floodplains extending north and south along the Skokie drainage area parallel to the North Shore.

Member Russell stated that he is completely opposed to Policy 2.2. He stated that the west side of Sheridan Road has only 75 feet between the train station parking lot and the edge of pavement, and that the parking lot is already constrained in width. He contrasted the development possible here to strip mall development elsewhere along Sheridan Road. He stated that many developers would love to propose something there, but he does not believe the Village wants that type of development. He stated that development there would disrupt the bicycle path, the parking and its growth potential, and the green belt. He restated his opposition. Member Miller concurred. He stated that this property is fine the way it is. Member Badger stated that, while it may not make sense today, it may be an option in the future for development that does not negatively impact North Avenue and the surrounding neighborhood. Member Burns concurred with Member Badger's perspective, noting that ideas such as zero minimum parking for housing there may make a product feasible. Member Russell said he recognizes the interest, but he remains opposed and reiterated that the green belt cannot be restored once surrendered. AVA Cole, speaking generally, said that change as well as realization of the Village's multifamily goals will only come in one of three ways: infill development in already developed areas; teardowns and reconstructions (which competes against historic preservation); or new development in undeveloped areas (which competes against open space). He stated that he understood the group's direction to date as trying to balance these competing principles, and that Policy 2.2 is part of that balancing effort. He stated

that, in this area, the greenbelt is already punctuated and that more development may be highly feasible. At Chair Peters request, Member Russell read aloud the 1997 Comprehensive Plan's greenbelt policy for Sheridan Road.

The discussion continued. Chair Peters said that he perceives that there is not true consensus on this issue; he asked Member Danly for her opinion. Member Danly stated that she disagrees with the policy, as it harms the green belt and creates more impervious surface. She did state that parking needs may reduce over time. Member Badger again stated that he is not married to this policy, but said he believes it is a reasonable position to take in regards to a centrally located piece of land that does not have a high use today. Member Burns concurred with Member Badger; he asked where this development would occur if not here. Member Miller asked if redevelopment of the Montessori school site near the electric railroad right-of-way as multi-family housing should be an option. The consensus of the group was that it may be. Member Miller stated that, in that case, the policy should be expanded to include areas west of the railroad tracks. Member Russell noted that the green box in the exhibit for study area 2.2 extended into existing single family lots to the east. He asked if that was his intention. A discussion ensued with no resolution to this question; Member Badger suggested that perhaps a box should not be shown and just a general statement should be developed regarding opportunities for development in this area. Chair Peters expressed his preference to re-incorporate the greenbelt preservation language from the 1997 Comprehensive Plan. AVA Cole, referring to a previous comment by Member Burns, presented information from the Village's recent survey wherein many residents identified development issues as the most important problem facing the Village. Discussion of the previous points continued. Chair Peters stated that a compromise position may be to study these opportunities generally in the vicinity of the Metra station west of Route 176 Union Pacific Line, and that both Member Murray and the public will both comment on this policy in the future. He stated that there was a 4-2 consensus to preserve the area on the east side. The group discussed reincorporating the greenbelt language from 1997. AVA Cole stated that, were that language to be followed strictly, development such as Village Commons on Block 1 would not occur as it would be too close to Sheridan Road. He asked if this was consistent with the PCZBA's intent. Chair Peters asked AVA Cole to rework the language of Section 2.2 based on the discussion of the group so that the PCZBA can revisit this issue at the next opportunity.

AVA Cole stated that, during Staff's review, a new item would be to add language regarding placemaking and extending some of the principles used in the Central Business District to encompass and integrate the Metra station.

Member Russell asked for an explanation of the competing options for Policy 2.3 concerning the Village-owned ten acres east of the CLCJAWA water plant. AVA Cole stated that one line of thought is to develop this as residential land to advance the Village's diverse housing goals; one line of thought is to develop them as parkland for the West Terrace; one line of thought is to do nothing; and one line of thought is that CLCJAWA should take control of this land and close it to public access. Member Russell stated that CLCJAWA was previously not interested in taking title to the land, and that he would prefer it be developed as a blended open space and multifamily development as the land is of sufficient size to provide a buffer. Members Burns, Badger, and Miller concurred. Chair Peters expressed that he had a minority position and supported only parkland in this area, but that he could be persuaded to support a 50/50 division of land use as he does not desire to disrupt the West Terrace with new development. Member Burns discussed the competing interests involved in this policy and stated that he would not specifically call out a

specific number of acres. Member Russell concurred. Chair Peters asked that Staff develop compromise language that strongly conveys the need to balance open space preservation and enhancement, as he is concerned for the development that would be proposed there otherwise especially as this site is part of the Village's gateway along Route 176. AVA Cole stated that Staff would work to develop new language. He also described some of the design challenges involved in any development of this site, such as vehicular access and topography.

Speaking to Policy 2.4, Member Russell asked that the exhibits accompanying this section be corrected to reduce overlap of the illustrated area into other parcels that would not be involved in redevelopment. Speaking to Policy 2.5, Member Russell asked that the parcel west of Stonebridge be reclassified from 2.1 into 2.5 and that the Zenni property north of Blodgett also be included as subject to Policy 2.5 in the exhibit. The group discussed the development potential of this property.

### **Comprehensive Plan Workshop - Open Space (Parks, Recreation, and Natural Areas)**

The PCZBA concluded their review of the Annexation and Development section and proceeded to discuss their comments on the Open Space section. Chair Peters asked Member Danly to open the discussions.

Member Danly referenced the prior conversation about the greenbelt and preserving green space, and said that was her principal concern. She asked that Policy 3.2 be revised to say that the Village should enhance, and not merely maintain, these scenic green spaces and entryways. Member Badger asked if this policy was in conflict with the parking changes previously discussed for Waukegan Road. The consensus of the group was that it was not. Member Russell noted that some features, such as an abandoned path near Carriage Way, would benefit from enhancement. Member Danly stated she would emphasize Policy 3.4. AVA Cole noted that the Sustainability and Community Enhancement Committee would host its first workshop on the subject of Policy 3.2 the following Wednesday evening.

Member Russell stated that Policy 3.2, subsection 1 should be revised to make clear that the barbed wire fencing should be replaced with a different type of fencing. He stated he would provide alternative language for the other subsection concerning the Sheridan Road drainage ditch. Member Russell asked for an additional policy statement that, if the golf course is closed, these 160 acres should be maintained as open natural areas not to be developed in any fashion. He believes that it is so large that the PCZBA should make a statement to this effect in the Plan. Member Badger concurred. The group discussed this policy. Steve Kraus came forward and stated that policy 4.2 is directed to this end, noting that "where changes" is the operative phrase.

Member Russell asked if there should be a statement included encouraging further development of Oriole Grove in cooperation with the Forest Preserve. The consensus was to do so.

AVA Cole began to summarize the results of Staff's review. He asked the PCZBA to confirm the existing statement regarding Lillian Dells remaining a disconnected pathway. Member Russell noted that private property separates the path from Sunrise Beach and that the topography is a challenge. Member Burns discussed parking concerns in this area. AVA Cole stated that this is the only true recreational asset controlled by the Village. The group continued to discuss Lillian Dells path.

AVA Cole stated that Policy 4.3 previously read that households should have a ten minute walk to a "park." At a previous meeting, the policy was amended to read "to open space." AVA Cole stated that Staff's analysis shows that, as defined, virtually no property does not meet this standard. He stated that this doesn't reflect the PCZBA's discussion and recommended that this change be reverted. He also described the areas that would not meet the previous standard. The consensus of the group was to proceed.

**4. Staff Report**

AVA Cole reported on the next steps the PCZBA may take in regards to the Comprehensive Plan, as well as the RIO (Institutional) zoning draft. He also reported that the PCZBA had recently received letters from Julie Capps (concerning short term rentals) as well as from Mark Stolzenberg.

**5. Commissioner's Report**

There was no commissioner's report.

**6. Adjournment**

As there was no further business to come before the PCZBA, Member Burns moved to adjourn the meeting. Member Miller seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at 10:02 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Glen Cole  
Assistant to the Village Administrator