



PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
December 10, 2012
Meeting Minutes

December 10, 2012 – 6:30 p.m.

Commissioners present: Belt, Blaser, Britton, Burger, Culver, Hird, Josserand, Lamer, Liese, von Achen

Staff present: McCullough, Stogsdill, Day, Larkin, M. Miller

PC Minutes 12/10/12

ITEM NO. 5A PRELIMINARY PLAT; LANGSTON HEIGHTS ADDITION; E SIDE OF K-10 & S OF W 6TH ST (SLD)

PP-12-00228: Consider a Preliminary Plat for Langston Heights Addition, a 61 lot subdivision that includes detached, duplex and multi-family residential lots. This subdivision includes a variance from Section 20-811 (c) of the Subdivision Regulations that requires sidewalks on both sides of streets. The property is along the east side of K-10 Highway and south of W. 6th Street, north and south of Crystal Lane and Palisades Drive extended to the west. Submitted by Landplan Engineering, for Langston Heights, LC, property owner of record.

ITEM NO. 5B UR TO RM12D; 8.333 ACRES; N & S OF CRYSTAL LN & PALISADES DR (SLD)

Z-12-00229: Consider a request to rezone approximately 8.333 acres from UR (Urban Reserve) to RM12D (Multi-Dwelling Residential), located north and south of Crystal Lane and Palisades Drive extended, as shown in the preliminary plat of Langston Heights Addition. Submitted by Landplan Engineering, for Langston Heights, LC, property owner of record.

ITEM NO. 5C UR TO RS7; 9.206 ACRES; N & S OF CRYSTAL LN & PALISADES DR (SLD)

Z-12-00231: Consider a request to rezone approximately 9.206 acres from UR (Urban Reserve) to RS7 (Single-Dwelling Residential), located north and south of Crystal Lane and Palisades Drive extended, as shown in the preliminary plat of Langston Heights Addition. Submitted by Landplan Engineering, for Langston Heights, LC, property owner of record.

ITEM NO. 5D UR TO RM12; 10.025 ACRES; E SIDE OF K-10 & S OF W 6TH ST (SLD)

Z-12-00232: Consider a request to rezone approximately 10.025 acres from UR (Urban Reserve) to RM12 (Multi-Dwelling Residential), located along the east side of K-10 Highway south of W. 6th Street and along the west side of a proposed street known as Renaissance Drive, as shown in the preliminary plat of Langston Heights Addition. Submitted by Landplan Engineering, for Langston Heights, LC, property owner of record.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Ms. Sandra Day presented the item.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION

Mr. Brian Sturm, Landplan Engineering, reviewed the Langston Heights Addition project. He said there would be a ½ mile extension of the City sanitary sewer system and the majority of the lots would be serviced by a sanitary sewer main that today stops just to the east of where Bob Billings Pkwy ends. He stated the project features a diverse selection of housing types and a selection of rezoning applications for three different districts.

He showed the previous Langston Heights Addition on the overhead and stated it was approved by City Commission in January of 2006. He said the plat was never recorded and ultimately the plat and associated rezoning amendments expired. He said it remained significant because the residents of the existing Diamondhead Subdivision were aware of the plat when they bought their homes over the last 5-7 years and clearly shaped their set of expectation for future development on this ground.

He said the plat became a benchmark for City staff and consultants when evaluating the current development groups proposal. He stated Landplan looked at the plat and sized up the differences to craft something better. He said the first step was looking at Horizon 2020 and the nodal plan that lay out land use recommendations for this part of the city. He said the 6th & K-10 nodal plan provided clear recommendations in graphic and verbal form. He said strategies such as providing a mixture of housing types, styles, and economic levels, providing appropriate transition zones and protecting the character and appearance of existing residential neighborhoods helped form the current proposed plat. He said the South Lawrence Trafficway had an overlay zoning district which provided further guidance on how land adjacent to it must develop. He said the piece of land to the north was platted as part of the Diamondhead subdivision which had not developed yet but had approved zoning of RM24, a high density residential zoning district. He stated it was already adjacent to other parts of the Diamondhead neighborhood. He said on the south side there was other land unplatted and unzoned as urban reserve. He said per the West of K-10 Plan and Horizon 2020 the land was slated for low density residential development. He said the land to the east was platted as part of the Diamondhead subdivision, zoned RS7, and over the last 5-7 years had matured into a vibrant single-family neighborhood. He said any new subdivision platted for this piece of ground would need to respond to all these uses.

He said Langston Heights was a neighborhood that conformed to the Comprehensive Plan, responded to the existing conditions, and would provide a sustainable and safe addition to West Lawrence. He said speaking to Horizon 2020, Langston Heights represented a low density residential development and would preserve the character of the existing Diamondhead neighborhood to the east by extending that neighborhood to the west while providing similar zoning and size. He stated it provided compatible infill development by extending the pattern of local streets already in place, sidewalks, front yard setbacks, while still providing a variety of housing types for West Lawrence. He said it provided appropriate transitional methods between the different housing types via back-to-back relationships. He said there would be an ample buffer of landscaping prescribed as part of the South Lawrence Trafficway overlay district. He showed a concept plan on the overhead. He said the plan would provide recreational opportunities adjacent to the higher use.

He said regarding transportation concerns, the traffic study indicated that these medium density residential uses would not change the level of service already existing in the surrounding street system. He said the plat provided adequate egress and ingress for vehicles and provided ample pedestrian and bicycle access through sidewalks on both sides of the streets. He said the development would produce more traffic but that the traffic impact study stated the traffic generated would have a nominal impact on the existing street network. He said this would be a safe neighborhood.

Mr. Mehrdad Givechi, Traffic Engineer, discussed the differences between the Langston Heights that was approved in 2006 and the Langston Heights plat that was before them today, in terms of traffic. He said when the traffic study was conducted they looked at traffic from 3pm-6pm to cover the time period when school gets out and 7am-9am to cover the time period when parents drop kids off at school. He stated, in addition, the background traffic usually peaks between 7am-9am and 4pm-6pm so by combining the two together and looking at the generated traffic they came up with the worst case scenario. He said the numbers showed that the worst case scenario would be 134 vehicles generated during one peak hour. He showed a table on the overhead. He said the previously approved plan showed 101 vehicles, which would only add one car every four minutes to each one of the side streets coming out of the proposed development site. He said the traffic study also showed under existing conditions there were no deficiencies with operation and/or safety of the traffic.

Mr. Sturm said the term level of service from the traffic study referred to the delay any motorist would encounter at an intersection. He said the development poses no change to the level of service to those intersections.

PUBLIC HEARING

Mr. Brad Finkeldej, attorney with Stevens & Brand, said he represented some of the neighbors and would be showing about 12 slides on the overhead.

Mr. Andy Pitts said in the original application Horizon 2020 did not specifically designate a land use for the subject project, although it did now. He said they keep skipping over some of the Horizon 2020 language that speaks specifically to a low density single family neighborhood. He said the total density of the proposed plan exceeded what was considered low density by over 7 dwelling units per acre. He said his expectation was that Langston Heights would be part of the low density single family residential zone. He said 42% of the proposed and existing land uses qualified as medium density under the Development Code. He said his concern was the quantity of medium density. He requested deferral of this item to continue dialogue with the developer.

Mr. Mark Crabtree said he had expectations, based on plans and plats, about what would happen to the west when he moved into the area. He said the latitude in RM12 allowed for apartment complexes. He said he did not have enough information to feel comfortable about what would be coming into his neighborhood. He said there was undeveloped and unplanned development to the south. He asked for a deferral to continue discussions so that neighbors could be comfortable about what was going to happen.

Mr. Ryan Fike felt a precedent had already been set by the denial of Greentree Subdivision in 2006 based on the same merits. He said property owners had made important decisions based on previous actions for the area. He requested denial or deferral for further discussions.

Mr. Eric Boedeker said the neighbors met with the developers in December and were told the driving force for the change in zoning was based on economics. He stated Horizon 2020 was a long term vision document and was not subject to economic conditions, market conditions, or the bottom line of developers. He said there was a lot of opportunity in the area for single family home sales.

Mr. Mike Whittlesey said the applicant referred to this as an experiment in design during the December neighborhood meeting. He said multi-family residents would have to travel through single family areas. He said Greentree Subdivision was denied and property owners made decisions based on recent previous actions for the area. He said the proposed request was not in conformance with

Horizon 2020. He stated Alvadora Apartments only had secondary emergency access through the neighborhood. He said the character of the area would change with multi-family residents moving in and out. He also stated the types of people living in multi-family areas were different. He said the neighborhood did not include informed consent.

Ms. Debbie Pitts expressed concern about traffic. She said the West of K-10 Nodal Plan discussed the required need for neighborhood connectivity. She said it stated streets within the various neighborhoods of the area shall be connected to each other and that connected streets provide multiple route options, which helps eliminate choke points. She said without the complete development of the north/south road all of the development traffic would be forced on to the two local streets. She stated Mr. Sturm said the width of Diamondhead was 60' but it was actually 23' in width. She said they weren't arguing that the traffic was okay as far as the City statutes provided, however the traffic did not take into account the dramatic impact of the neighborhood elementary school on traffic patterns. She said the applicant stated at the neighborhood meeting that this was a minor blip in the traffic study. She said this had been a primary focus of the Langston Hughes site council for years. She requested the item be deferred for to allow for continued dialogue.

Mr. Erica Gudenkauf said when she moved in to the neighborhood they were told it was single family. She said it was a close neighborhood that planned activities together. She discussed the goals in Horizon 2020 of neighborhood conservation/identity. She requested deferral of the item to further discuss concerns with the developer.

Mr. Rustin Schemm agreed with everything that had been said. He was skeptical of the pitch from the applicant about keeping the integrity of the neighborhood intact. He said the applicant was proposing the maximum number of dwelling units. He said he would like to see a cost benefit analysis on multiple courses of action besides just one preplanned optimization program. He expressed concern about the safety of children walking in the area.

Mr. Alan Cowles, President of West Lawrence Neighborhood Association, said there were too many other areas on the west side of Lawrence for high density development. He said the connector streets would not connect for years to come and it did not make sense to put this development here. He said the neighbors had staked their homes and the futures of their children on this area. He said the West Lawrence Neighborhood Association opposed the rezoning and urged Planning Commission to oppose it also.

Ms. Melinda Henderson, President of the League of Women Voters, expressed concern about predictability and being able to rely on codes and documents. She said documents like Horizon 2020 were in place to protect the citizens so that they could see what was expected and feel comfortable building their dream home. She said the developer indicated that they were working on acquiring the property to the south, which should send up red flags, because if this property was developed in a higher density than single family then the area to the south would most likely develop that way too. She felt this was a great opportunity to plan the remainder of the area. She was encouraged that the neighbors wanted to meet with the developer for further discussions.

Mr. Rod Laing said he was a homebuilder in the area and currently had three spec houses going up in Diamondhead. He felt there needed to be access for the multi-family portion. He expressed concern about increased traffic and being able to purchase more lots in Diamondhead. He said the Longleaf area had major arteries for the townhome ground. He recommended going back to the original zoning requested, single family and duplexes or creating a separate access road.

Mr. Finkeldei said the neighbors would like more time to work with the developer on this project. He said the neighbors met with the developer on December 3rd for an informational session. He said no changes had been made since that meeting and that the plan was the same. He requested a deferral to allow time for the developer to consider neighborhood concerns. He discussed changes that could be made. He said the 6th & Wakarusa Nodal Plan does not define low density residential but does say low density, single family detached. He stated staff and the applicant fit RM12 in the low density category. He said if the proposal was just for row housing it would not comply with Horizon 2020 but when put in combination it was seen as being compliant.

He asked Planning Commission to request the applicant look at that and come back with a plan that really meets the heart and spirit of Horizon 2020 and the 6th & Wakarusa Plan, as well as being low density and single family detached. He said the area to the south was in the West of K-10 Plan, which defines low density slightly differently as single family duplex and attached dwellings, with an emphasis placed on residential type uses. He said the West of K-10 Plan also includes zoning districts RS10, RS7, RM12D & PD. He said RM12 was not possible in the definition of low density in the West of K-10 Plan. He said placement of the access road made all the difference and that the original plan put the road as a buffer along K-10. He said the West of K-10 Plan included an outer rim road. He requested Planning Commission direct the applicant to use Renaissance Drive at the edge to be a buffer between the highway and neighborhood. He felt this would influence land uses to the south. He also requested a road be constructed to serve the multi-family.

APPLICANT CLOSING COMMENTS

Mr. Sturm said during the neighborhood meeting the developer recognized there was at least one thing they could do in that amount of time to make an improvement in the proposed plan, which was included in the letter of intent. He said it was uncertain if the development group would have a chance to work on the property to the south in the near future or at all. He said they were able to put into writing an agreement to establish a temporary construction access regulated by easement. He said if and when Langston Heights Addition would move forward construction traffic for the development could travel directly from Bob Billings Parkway through Alvamar property to the subject site. He felt the development conformed to Horizon 2020 and said staff agreed with that.

Mr. Tim Herndon said the street width right-of-way was 60'. He said the street was 27' from back of curb to back of curb. He stated the plan was not snuck through a loophole, as was insinuated by some comments. He said the previous plan that had been referred to multiple times tonight was a moot point because it was never recorded and the plan expired. He said the previous plan did not conform with contemporary subdivision regulations, did not provide any traffic calming devices, and did not provide sidewalks on both sides of the street. He said all of the professionals involved in the project were in unison with a valid approvable project.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Commissioner Burger asked who owned the property to the north and if it was financially connected to the applicant.

Mr. McCullough said it was his understanding they were separate entities.

Mr. Sturm confirmed they were separate entities, owned by Kenny Liu, and not connected in any way to the project.

Commissioner von Achen asked if averaging the different densities in a development to come up with an average unit per acre was common, as opposed to taking each zoning district separate.

Mr. McCullough said it had the W 6th St & K-10 Nodal Plan associated with it. He said staff had the opportunity with this project to look at the total parcel size and spread the density across 27 acres. He said they typically do that by project. He stated the plan talks about low density single family neighborhoods with a small portion considered appropriate for medium density residential development. He said the medium density served as primary buffer between single family neighborhoods and commercial activities and staff extended that concept of buffering to K-10 Highway which was articulated in the packet. He said they looked at the density spread out over 27 acres and then looked at transitioning. He said it was typical to look at density spread over the entire area of the project and similar to what would be seen with a Planned Development overlay if this was a different zoning process.

Commissioner von Achen asked if that approach was common.

Mr. McCullough said it was common in recent history with the City.

Commissioner Lamer asked why the Planned Development approach wasn't used instead of three different zoning applications.

Mr. McCullough said typically when staff meets with an applicant they lay out some options to get to the goal. He said one approach was the combination of platting and base district zoning. Another approach was the Planned Development overlay.

Commissioner Lamer asked if there would only be one category for dwelling units per acre if there was a Planned Development.

Mr. McCullough said there would likely be one base district and a clustering of different types of housing types and different densities in a specific area. He said the density would be spread out over the entire area.

Commissioner Lamer asked if the Planned Development would be tied to a certain number of dwelling units per acre.

Mr. McCullough said it could be but would have a cap/limit associated with it.

Commissioner Lamer asked if the proposed RS7 rezoning would be 4 dwelling units per acre.

Ms. Day said yes.

Commissioner Lamer asked if the proposed RM12D rezoning would be 7 units per acre.

Mr. McCullough said it would be about 7.5 net after right-of-way was taken out.

Commissioner Lamer asked if the proposed RM12 rezoning would be 11 units per acre.

Mr. McCullough said that was correct.

Mr. Sturm said zoning district boundaries were shifted for lots to meet the Code in all manners. He said with the latest zoning applications put forward the RM12 district had 10.8 dwelling units per acre, the RM12D district had 7.5 units per acre, and the RS7 district had 4.2 dwelling units per acre.

Commissioner Lamer said RM12D zoning and RM12 zoning was higher than what they would consider single family residential dwelling units per acre.

Mr. Sturm said 6 dwelling units per acre was what Horizon 2020 spelled out as low density residential development.

Commissioner Liese inquired about considering each item separately or as a package.

Mr. McCullough said it was essentially a package with how the plat was designed. He said they could legally separate out three separate zoning requests. He urged them to look at it as a package because the plat was designed to accommodate the different zoning districts.

Commissioner Hird asked the applicant to respond to the comments about the nodal plan describing this as low density single family neighborhood.

Mr. Herndon stated the nodal plan did not say that the property within the subject boundary was to be all single family. He said the plan said the subject property was to be comprised of low density residential. He said it described a variety of residential types that could occur there. He said the report given to them by the neighbors counsel referred to the West of SLT plan, which described the type of houses at certain locations. He said it did not apply to the 6th Street Nodal Plan or to the Comprehensive Plan. He said those plans specifically cite a mixture of housing types and emphasis on transition and buffering.

Commissioner Hird said it appeared to be a unique project with multi-family housing and the only access being through the single family residential areas. He asked if there was another example in Lawrence where the traffic patterns were similar.

Mr. Sturm referred to a multi-family development of townhomes that were addressed on Jana Drive or Jana Road, north of Harvard, west of Lawrence Avenue, and east of Kasold Drive. He said it was a townhome development that was smack dab in the middle of mixed residential development.

Mr. Herndon said in Old West Lawrence and older parts of the city multi-family development coexists with single family and permeates the eastern portion of Lawrence. He said another thing that was important to contemplate was that Horizon 2020 prescribed a maximum of 6 units per acre coming from the approximately 30 acre site. He said whether it was 6 units per acre of single family homes or 6 units per acre of a mixture of row homes, brownstone villas, duplexes, or single-family homes the traffic generated would be the same.

Commissioner Hird stated the townhomes on Jana Drive were built by his uncle. He asked if there were any examples of this type of traffic pattern since the 2006 Development Code was adopted.

Mr. Herndon said the traffic generated was 6 units per acre, so yes, it was typical throughout the city.

Commissioner Liese inquired about the word 'experiment' that speakers mentioned the applicant using during a neighborhood meeting.

Mr. Sturm said he probably did use the word 'experiment' and believed this was a relatively unique project since the passage of the 2006 Development Codes and 2008 Subdivision Regulations. He said he was referring to the project being something new and different by using creativity.

Commissioner Liese asked staff to respond to Mr. Boedeker's earlier comment about the inventory of multi-family in the area.

Mr. McCullough said staff does not track market conditions of multi-dwelling structures to know whether there was a healthy or unhealthy apartment or rental market. He felt the comment was referring to opportunities along 6th Street and other areas on the west side of Lawrence.

Commissioner Liese asked if they should be concerned about whether the units would be inhabited.

Mr. McCullough said they could be owner occupied structures. He said in terms of multi-dwelling structure type it was not tracked the way retail inventory was.

Commissioner Liese inquired about the access to multi-dwelling structures.

Mr. McCullough said traffic studies are reviewed by several people within the City for acceptance. He said the traffic was an interesting component of this because at some point when you look at just the 27 acres developing at 6 units per acre, unit type actually matters. He said the unit type of multi-dwelling would actually create a little lower traffic volume than single family units would generate. He said from a traffic volume basis single family type housing typically generates more traffic. He said the traffic study was accepted. He also said they do anticipate the north south roads to go in.

Commissioner Liese said a number of people suggested that Planning Commission should consider deferral.

Mr. McCullough said that was within their purview. He said typically Planning Commission has only deferred items when they seek additional information or provide specific instruction to staff or applicant.

Commissioner Josserand asked if the trip generation traffic data was based on national data or data from a college town.

Mr. Givechi said the data used was national data and could not really be distinguished between locality due to the data being collected throughout the nation and submitted to the institute of transportation over the last 20 years. He stated it was a compilation of the data put together as a summary.

Commissioner Josserand said the data could in fact be wrong if Lawrence was substantially different than what a national average would be.

Mr. Givechi said that was always a possibility.

Commissioner Josserand felt that Planning Commission had a role in the timing of development and that excess inventory of any type could and does have a deleterious effect on the community. He asked Mr. Herndon about his conclusory remarks about not considering the earlier plat.

Mr. Herndon said the previous plat was never reality.

Commissioner Josserand said it was appropriate to know it existed.

Mr. Herndon said it never existed beyond being reviewed and approved. He said it was never recorded and never became an item of record.

Commissioner Josserand said it was something the neighbors relied upon.

Mr. Herndon said he would not say it shouldn't be discussed or not a topical matter. He said the point he was making was that if it was ever represented to a prospective home buyer that the ground was zoned in a certain way or that the ground had been subdivided it was not true.

Mr. Herndon said there were other factors that affect comparisons of housing. He said the row houses would not compete for the same market as Hunters Ridge.

Commissioner von Achen asked if there was ever any consideration about changing the route of Renaissance Drive.

Mr. Herndon asked which streetscape would be a better buffer for residents and pedestrians; a row of apartments with landscaping separated by a 50' South Lawrence Trafficway prescribed greenspace buffer, or a street with two curbs, two sidewalks, and two rows of trees. He said that was what drove the changing of the street from the original plan. He said the previous plat was not as well thought through, as creative, or as environmentally designed as the current plan.

Commissioner von Achen asked if any thought had been given to how the road would go through the south parcel.

Mr. Herndon said Horizon 2020 prescribes a certain set of parameters for land use to the property to the south, as it does on the subject property. He said the Comprehensive Plan suggested a range of uses, a general density, so that is what is used to move forward with specifics of zoning. He said the interchange at Bob Billings Parkway and the South Lawrence Trafficway was set to be fully constructed by 2015. He said KDOT already established a north entrance point that would serve the school districts ground, serve the ground south of the subject property, and eventually connect further north. He said KDOT had already established that intersection point which dictated the "s" shape.

Commissioner Culver asked if there had been any open discussions prior to the December 3rd neighborhood meeting.

Mr. Sturm said the December 3rd meeting was the first interaction between planners for the developer and neighbors.

Commissioner Culver asked if the applicant would be open to having further discussions about this concept plan and possibly alternative plans prior to moving forward on it.

Mr. Sturm said the developer was not opposed to continuing dialogue with neighbors but based on the findings of fact he felt the Planning Commission had a decision that they could make tonight.

Commissioner Liese asked staff if the project was denied would the applicant have to wait one year.

Mr. McCullough said Planning Commissions action was a recommendation on the zoning items and the final decision making body for the preliminary plat. He said the zoning items would move to the City Commission for final decision. He said if the rezoning requests were denied the Development Code had a requirement that the same application could not be resubmitted for 12 months. He said a substantially different application could be submitted but the same application could not be.

Commissioner Blaser felt the area to the south was more important than what they were giving it credit for and that consideration should be given to how the area to the south would develop. He felt both sides, the neighbors and the applicant, needed to get together and come up with a plan they could both accept. He did not think they should have a higher density area driving through a single family home area.

ACTION TAKEN on Item 5A-5D

Motioned by Commissioner Blaser, seconded by Commissioner Belt, to defer items 5A-5D to January Planning Commission.

Commissioner Hird asked the applicant if there would be benefit in deferral.

Mr. Herndon said he was willing to accept a 30 day deferral. He said they would gladly and promptly reschedule a neighborhood meeting to work through concerns as best they could.

Commissioner Hird said he would support the motion. He said there was a certain cost to an applicant for deferral but if there was a chance for some compromises it was worth having the applicant meet again with the neighbors.

Commissioner Liese said he supported the deferral.

Commissioner Britton supported the deferral. He stated the neighbors made some compelling points. He felt it would be difficult to resolve traffic thru single family without building new roads. He said he had a problem with the fact that the nodal plan said low density, single family detached and that was not what they were talking about. He said there was some reliance put on the previously approved plat, even if it wasn't recorded. He said he would have difficulty voting to recommend a plat or rezoning that included those provisions.

Mr. Herndon asked for clarification and guidance on moving forward so they could have a productive 30 days of deferral. He said if the plan had, for example, 80 single family homes that generated x amount of traffic through an existing neighborhood, versus a combination of multi-family/single family homes that generated the same amount or less traffic. He said he was at a loss at how to appease the Commission.

Commissioner Britton said he was not sure. He said there was something to be said for the type of community that a certain type of housing builds and grows. He felt there was a difference between the hard numbers of traffic that go into an apartment complex as opposed to a single family subdivision.

Mr. Herndon asked if phasing or a timing element that changed the timing of traffic going in certain places would be compelling to him.

Mr. Britton said that might be able to alleviate some concerns.

Commissioner Liese said staff could assist in the process of design.

Commissioner Josserand agreed with Commissioners Blaser and Britton. He expressed concern about the location of the eventual road. He thought there was benefit to having the street along the edge. He was concerned about the implications of the location of the road to the property south. He was concerned about the amount of multi-family going in. He also felt they should handle traffic and parking better within the community.

Commissioner Burger agreed with Commissioners Blaser, Britton, and Josserand. She said at this point with the planning documents they had without additional area planning to give more clarity on the issue of the area to the south. She said she would vote for deferment because both sides of the table were willing to talk more and she hoped they could work something out.

Commissioner von Achen said she supported the deferral. She said her main concern was traffic going from an area of somewhat higher density to lower density.

Commissioner Hird said he respectfully disagreed with Commissioner Josserand's comment about too much multi-family because there was no data/evidence to make that determination.

Motion carried 10-0.