



**Board of Zoning Appeals & City Planning Commission Minutes
Tuesday, May 7, 2019
7 P.M.
Council Chambers**

Members Present: David Weiss, Mayor
Rob Zimmerman, Council Member
John J. Boyle III, Member
Kevin Dreyfuss-Wells, Member
Joanna Ganning, Member

Others Present: Joyce Braverman, Director of Planning
William M. Ondrey Gruber, Director of Law
Daniel Feinstein, Senior Planner

The meeting was called to order by Mayor Weiss at 7 P.M.

* * * *

Approval of the April 2, 2019 Meeting Minutes

It was moved by Mr. Boyle and seconded by Dr. Ganning to approve the minutes as submitted.

Roll Call: Ayes: Weiss, Boyle, Dreyfuss-Wells, Ganning
Nays: None
Abstain: Zimmerman

Motion Carried

* * * *

BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS

2016. MENDELL RESIDENCE – 2676 CRANLYN ROAD:

A Public Hearing was held on the request of Stuart Mendel, 2676 Cranlyn Road, to the Board of Zoning Appeals for a variance to the fence location and height regulations on a corner lot. The applicant proposes to install a 4 foot tall black aluminum ornamental fence on this corner lot at Cranlyn and Calverton Roads. The fence is proposed to be located 36 feet off the Calverton Road sidewalk. Code requires that fences located in corner side yards not extend in front of the setback line of the principle building on the adjacent lot. The adjacent house on Calverton Road is set back

CITY OF SHAKER HEIGHTS

3400 Lee Road Shaker Heights, Ohio 44120 P 216.491.1400 F 216.491.1465 Ohio Relay Service 711
shakeronline.com www.shaker.life

48 feet. Code allows a fence height of 3 feet tall on a corner side yard. The area around the fence is a mature garden planted with a variety of existing shrubs and trees, which will remain to screen the fence from street view. Additional evergreen bushes are proposed to further screen the fence and rear yard. The fence is proposed to contain dogs in the yard.

Mr. Feinstein showed slides of the site. He stated this is a request for a variance to the corner lot fence regulations. The applicant proposes a fence on the Calverton side yard of this house at the corner of Calverton and Cranlyn Roads. The 4 foot tall ornamental aluminum fence is proposed to extend from the house to the side property line and be 26 feet off of Calverton Road. Code requires a 48 foot setback and only a 3 foot tall fence. An existing mature garden and additional bushes will screen the fence from street view. Staff supports this request.

Stuart Mendell, owner, said he has owned this home since 2016. One of the things they have come to realize is that there are many dogs in their neighborhood. Their own dogs are hard to keep in the yard when there are dogs walking by all the time. They currently have a makeshift wire fence in the yard to keep their dogs in the yard. They are now proposing a real fence for the yard, integrated with their existing landscaping. They also propose additional evergreen landscaping that will completely screen the area.

Mr. Dreyfuss-Wells asked for an explanation of exactly where the fence would be located. The site plan and the overhead picture of the house do not exactly match.

Mr. Mendell explained and described where the fence would extend from, the corner of his home, through the side yard, through the middle of the landscaped area and connect to the existing fence on the property line.

Mr. Feinstein explained that the existing fence on the property line was approved at a past variance hearing. The proposed fence would go from the corner of the home to that fence.

Mr. Zimmerman said he does not live very far from this home. He agrees that there are many dogs being walked in the neighborhood. He understands the need for a barrier for their dogs to not get out of the yard. There are other corner lot fences that are similar to this one which provide precedent in the neighborhood.

Ms. Braverman asked about the final landscape plan and bushes proposed for this fence.

Mr. Mendell said they have now purchased 6 bushes that are to be planted 2 to 2.5 feet apart. Each of those bushes are 4 feet tall. These evergreens will screen the new fence even in the winter.

Mr. Dreyfuss-Wells asked if landscaping for an aluminum ornamental fence is required to be evergreen.

Mr. Feinstein said no. An aluminum ornamental fence, in a typical situation with a street view, is only required to have deciduous landscaping of approximately one (1) foot tall.

Mayor Weiss opened the Public Hearing. No one was present to speak in regard to this application.

Ms. Braverman suggested that any approval be subject to a final landscape plan reviewed by staff.

Staff supports the request with conditions, including review of the structure by the Architectural Board of Review, and parking lot lighting being turned off after school events.

Dr. Fran Bisselle, Hathaway Brown Head of School, indicated the school had been on this site since 1927. They have a faculty and staff of 200 with 830 students. The school is not growing, and will probably shrink over the next year or two. They have tried to propose a comprehensive Master Plan for the campus. The first part of that plan is to make a safe school. They are working on parking and athletic fields first. They only have a certain amount of acreage which is completely bordered by streets. They held an open house with their neighbors last weekend. Good points were made and they heard their neighbors and have made adjustments to the plans. The Board of Trustees has reviewed and approved these plans. The Board of Trustees includes five Shaker Heights residents. She read into the record a letter from the Board of Trustees that approves of the Master Plan and the proposal submitted to the Board of Zoning Appeals.

Craig Cawrse, landscape architect with CT Consultants, showed the plans. He described where the parking lots are proposed. They will try to raise some of the mounding from 3 feet to 5 feet in some areas so that the landscaping will immediately block more of the parking lot. When they know all of the tree locations, they will be better able to locate exactly where the mounding can be increased. On the Courtland Boulevard side of the property they will re-establish the taxus hedge which currently screens the parking lot. It will be 14 feet from the sidewalk. They propose to move their storage facility from the current pony barn on the south side of the site around to Courtland Boulevard. The storage facility will be adjacent to the loading dock and maintenance area on the Courtland side of the property. It will be completely screened with new evergreen trees and shrubs. There were also good ideas and suggestions from the neighbors. They have gotten rid of the idea of a circular driveway into the pool area, due to traffic issues on Sherbrooke Road. They will maintain the existing driveway as two way access. They will propose to the Police Department to expand the no parking area around that entry for better visibility, and also to allow for buses to load students. They will change the location of the construction driveway so that it is off of South Park Boulevard, not off of Sherbrooke Road. He showed some 3-D views of potential parking, landscaping and fields.

Tammy Jo Hughes, traffic engineer with CT Consultants, said they used the required measurement standards for traffic analysis to take the traffic for one day between 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. Although the traffic counts were taken on a Tuesday, she visited the site on multiple days to get a better idea of the variation of traffic from day to day. The proposed parking should reduce the number of vehicles that are parking on-street, which should help with visibility and parking for students. There have only been two accidents recorded by the Police Department in the last several years. This makes for a low traffic, low accident area.

Richard Washington, CT Consultants, explained the landscape plan in more detail. He spoke about the types of trees and the taxus that will be replaced along the Courtland Boulevard side of the school. There will be 10 to 12 foot trees that will be placed around the new storage structure to completely hide it as well.

Mr. Cawrse explained the construction schedule. He explained there will be two years of staging of construction in order for the landscaping, fields and parking lots to be completed in an orderly fashion and to not disrupt the school's function.

Mr. Boyle asked about the use of the central field and the need for additional fields. Will the parking lot on South Park Boulevard be used to help with events on those fields? He agrees that moving the tennis courts is appropriate. He supports that the South Park Boulevard parking lot is being placed as far away from neighbors as possible.

Dr. Bisselle said the central field is used for field hockey and lacrosse. The soccer field would be an added use so they can have many more practice sessions on site instead of busing children to Ursuline College where they currently practice daily. This helps maximize the time the students have after school for these activities, as well as the effort and safety to move the children off campus. There will be 93 parking spaces added on the campus, around the facility. This will help absorb as much of the on-street parking as possible. She understands there will still be on-street parking, but it should make it less of a burden on the surrounding neighborhood streets. Currently, there is an officer that assists with dismissal on the street. She described the process for dismissal through the North Park Boulevard entrance and out of the Sherbrooke Road exit.

Mr. Dreyfuss-Wells asked how the additional parking, both on-street and on the property, will help to reduce the amount of parking that occurs on the street. How will this help the situation in the neighborhood?

Ms. Hughes explained that there will be better sight lines and distances that can be accomplished both with no parking zones near driveways and with fewer cars on the street. Limiting the areas where vehicles can park might be more palatable if there are more parking spaces overall throughout the site. It will also be a better situation for emergency vehicles to enter and exit the property.

Mr. Zimmerman said it seems that these are all area variances. The Board should be using a practical difficulty standard as they use in all zoning cases. This Board will be considering those area variances on the school site but not the on-street parking.

Mr. Gruber agreed. These are all area variances that consider the on-site facilities only and not the proposed on-street parking at the Sherbrooke/North Park triangle.

Mr. Dreyfuss-Wells asked if there was a specific number of parking spaces that the school is trying to create.

Dr. Bisselle said there is nothing magic about 93 parking spaces. They are trying to maximize the number of parking spaces. They will encourage staff and enforce where students park. She described the current parking situation where students and staff park their cars. They can and will enforce where their staff park and where their students park in the future with these new parking spaces.

Mr. Dreyfuss-Wells suggested that the South Park parking lot could be set back further so that it is no closer to the sidewalk than the Courtland Boulevard lot.

Mr. Cawrse explained where they might be able to accomplish that suggestion. They may lose several spaces from the South Park Boulevard lot if it was pulled back to 14 feet off the sidewalk.

Dr. Ganning asked if they had looked at other solutions to parking on the site, besides those proposed to this Board. She appreciates the effort of the school to find additional parking on the site. Have they looked anywhere else besides the front yard of the school?

Mr. Cawrse explained that they have looked at other sites. They looked at adjacent park land. They looked at other places on the school site. Every part of the site faces onto a public street. There really is no other area where parking would not be in the front yard. He explained that much of the existing parking, particularly on the Courtland Boulevard side, is already in the front yard.

Mr. Zimmerman said it is good that the school had an open house with residents to get their input. He asked if the school had reached out to any other neighbors besides that meeting.

Dr. Bisselle said they had reached out to and met with parents of the students that live in the area, first. Those neighbors suggested they meet with the other neighbors on the street. They met with those neighbors as well. They held their open house on Saturday, where they presented the plans, and listened to the concerns of the neighbors. They have responded to the best of their ability and revised the plans to take those suggestions into account. She is concerned with safety for the girls. The parking that is proposed on-street is within sight of the front entry where the girls enter the building. That is important as it increases safety for the students. She is concerned about a longer journey after hours to a car parked far away on the street.

Mr. Boyle asked if the Planning Commission was considering the on-street parking lot that is at the corner of Sherbrooke and North Park. Will there be action from this body on that parking area?

Ms. Braverman said no. That parking is proposed to be completely within the right-of-way, so it is not in the purview of the Board of Zoning Appeals as it is not on private property.

Mayor Weiss opened the Public Hearing.

Kathy Lincoln, 19715 North Park Boulevard, said she does not want the parking lot at Sherbrooke and North Park to be on public property, right out on in front of her house. Her property will be the most impacted by this parking lot. The students already park on North Park Boulevard and Sherbrooke Road. It should stay that way.

Christine Janicki, 2781 Sherbrooke Road, said she met with Dr. Bisselle. She is concerned with the parking spaces being proposed so near to Doan Brook. She asked why couldn't the on-street parking proposed at the corner of South Park and Sherbrooke be somewhere else on the property. She showed a picture of her view out her front door. She is concerned with sustainability of the pavement instead of green space. She purposely avoids the intersection of Sherbrooke and North Park during the hours when children are being dropped off. How will the property values in their neighborhood be affected by these proposals?

Chris DuPaul, 2721 Sherbrooke Road, said he is not happy with the loss of green space at South Park Boulevard. He is concerned with the parking within the right-of-way. He would like to make sure there is room for emergency vehicles and good line of sight on all of the streets. The exit is already a concentrated traffic area. They should clear some of that area with some additional no parking areas on the street, so it is safer when school is being let out.

Courtney DuPaul, 2721 Sherbrooke Road, said the traffic study was only one day. It did not see the entire process throughout a timeframe she thinks is appropriate. There are already spaces on Sherbrooke Road that are being parked in illegally. She thinks that needs to be remedied. Buses add

to this issue. They should add a traffic person to the exit only area and reduce the amount of on-street parking to allow for greater visibility to maximize the safety of both pedestrians and motorists going anywhere near the corner of Sherbrooke and North Park.

Diane Benfer, 2761 Sherbrooke Road, said she supports the proposal for the on-site parking. She is concerned with some of the issues regarding the on-street parking. She thinks there needs to be better enforcement of some of the no parking areas, which was mentioned by some of the neighbors, that could improve safety in the area.

Mayor Weiss asked if Hathaway Brown could explain to the Board and the public their on-site parking plan and who is allowed to park in which lot.

Dr. Bisselle explained where students park, and where staff now parks. They certainly could enforce those rules in a more strict sense, but students and faculty really do not park in the same places. It depends which part of the facility you are going to as to where you park, so that partially governs who parks where.

Mayor Weiss asked about the possibility of the on-street parking being a one-way parking area with angled parking spaces.

Mr. Cawrse said that he thinks the head-in parking is safer with the ability to look both ways as you pull out. They would lose 20% of the spaces if they are angled, with the street being one-way.

Dr. Bisselle said she is open to considering one-way parking on the on-street parking and some of the other suggestions by the neighbors concerning enforcement of no parking areas on the street. There are currently 251 parking spaces. There are 200 faculty members as well as 100 students who drive. They are overparked. They stagger dismissal times to attempt to minimize congestion. There is only so much they can do.

Mr. Boyle asked about the setbacks required for the soccer field, parking lot, and tennis courts from Sherbrooke Road.

Mr. Feinstein said they meet the 75 foot setback from Sherbrooke Road, so there are no variances in this instance.

Mr. Boyle indicated that this Board is not considering or acting on the on-street parking. He thinks this is an extension of some of the on-site parking.

Dr. Ganning said she is sensitive to the concerns of the neighbors. She thinks that they should consider angled parking for the on-street parking if that turns out to be safer. Have they considered structured parking on site?

Dr. Bisselle said they did consider underground parking. The price is prohibitive. Investing in underground parking is not necessarily the safest since the lot will not be visible and students would be in an area that could not be monitored.

Mayor Weiss said the action for this Board is only for on-site parking. The on-street parking that is proposed at the corner of Sherbrooke and North Park will be an on-going discussion between the

City and the school on how to take that process forward. He used to live across from the Shaker Heights High School, so knows well what it is like to live across from a very busy school setting. He supports the neighbor's desire for as much safety as is possible, knowing there are teenage drivers. Personally, he sees the benefit to getting some of those drivers off of on-street parking and into on-site parking. Certainly there could be ongoing discussions about the operational issues on site. There seem to be very good ideas that are worthy of consideration coming from the neighbors regarding much of the on-street parking and movement of traffic.

Mr. Zimmerman indicated this is a land-locked city and land-locked institutions are abundant. Laurel School has had their issues over the years. Lyman Circle makes their situation more difficult than the other schools. It is good to hear that there has been discussion between the school and the neighbors. There are no perfect solutions. Whether to do the parking at North Park and Sherbrooke will be a City issue, and work between the City and school will be required.

Mayor Weiss indicated that property values are always a concern to the City. Private schools typically help maintain the property values within the City, especially in the neighborhoods directly surrounding them.

Mr. Dreyfuss-Wells said the accessory storage structure needs a variance because it is in the front yard of Courtland Boulevard. That will require Architectural Board of Review design review as well. The parking lot expansion on Courtland Boulevard seems reasonable, being screened in a way similar to the way it is screened now. He said the landscaping on the South Park Boulevard lot looks good. He wondered if the same setback of 14 feet for the Courtland Boulevard lot could be held on the South Park Boulevard lot. As proposed, that parking lot gets very close to the street at one point.

Dr. Bisselle said they could move the South Park lot, so that it is further from South Park Boulevard, but will lose some parking spaces.

Mr. Boyle said he is in favor of having both parking lots on Courtland and South Park being no closer than 14 feet from the property line.

Ms. Braverman said the driveway could be in the same location, but they would lose several spaces on the west side of that South Park parking lot in order to stay 14 feet from the property line.

Dr. Ganning said she is concerned with the loss of green space. There are no homes across the street from the South Park Boulevard parking lot. There is currently green space on both sides of the road. She wants to be assured there is still sufficient landscape screening so that is the view, not a parking lot.

Mayor Weiss said the Staff Report suggests some conditions and there are some changes to be added. One is the loss of the loop road by the natatorium and that there needs to be a final landscape plan to be approved by staff, with a tree survey.

Mr. Boyle added that the parking lot on South Park should be redesigned to be held 14 feet from the road.

Mr. Dreyfuss-Wells said the parking lot lights should have a lower glare so they do not cause glare toward the neighbors.

Lee Weingart, president of the Shaker Heights Country Club, said he is also a resident of Shaker Heights. He said there is a triple benefit to having the Country Club propose this rezoning. The schools will gain property tax from the property value increase. The organic fill on the site will be removed and replaced. That organic fill area has been an eyesore for the neighbors and a breeding ground for coyotes in the area. Thirdly, the storage tanks for the gas well will be removed. They would like to replace that area with two home sites for future home buyers and residents in the city. Those home sites and future residents will be of means, which will provide income tax for the city and property tax for the school and library. The school district has calculated that it could raise as much as \$100,000 per year for the school district. The Country Club has been in existence for 120 years. There really is no additional land for the Country Club to develop. This is the only land outside of the flood plain that could be developed. It is only two lots. They will sell to a builder, who will follow all the city rules, and build quality homes on these lots that are consistent with other large single family residences nearby. These lots will be proposed as SF-1 single family zoning district. He showed a preliminary plan of two possible home sites. He outlined where the trees would be maintained around the perimeter. He read a letter submitted by Brian Christman, treasurer for the school district that is supportive of the development. The schools need every opportunity to make additional tax income, as they are limited by state law and the fact that the school district are landlocked and without new, developable land.

Mr. Dreyfuss-Wells asked about the quality of the development for the site. What type of further review will this development be held to?

Mr. Feinstein said this development will be held to the design review of the Architectural Board of Review and site plan review and any variances by the Board of Zoning Appeals and City Planning Commission like any other infill home proposed within the city.

Mr. Dreyfuss-Wells asked the applicant if they propose to hold any additional quality control over the potential home buyers as the sellers of the property. Will there be anything in the sale agreement to require a high level of design.

Mr. Weingart said they would be relying on the city's review process for that quality of development.

Mr. Gruber said there will be a conservation easement on the property that will preclude development anywhere close to the stream or in the flood plain. This will control the location of development.

Mayor Weiss indicated there is a green line on the map provided that indicates where the trees will be maintained. Does the Country Club propose to expand the conservation easement to include that entire area banded by the green line?

Rob Meyers, Meyers Homes, said the green line is where trees will not be disturbed on the site. The riparian setback and flood plain are where the conservation easement will be, by law. They will not include the entire green area within a conservation easement.

Mr. Gruber clarified that the conservation easement is required by code within the 75 foot riparian setback, and anywhere in the 100 year flood plain where it exceeds the 75 foot setback.

Dr. Ganning asked about the process for removing the contaminated soil on the site. Will this removal occur before or after sale to a home builder? Will the Country Club remove the contaminated soil or will the home builder?

Mr. Weingart said it could happen either way. The home builder could do it, or the Country Club may do it all at one time before the property is sold.

Mr. Boyle asked about any environmental compliance required during removal of the contaminated soil. What would the Country Club need to do in that respect?

Mr. Gruber said they would need to acquire all environmental approvals and disposal permits that are required by state and federal law.

Mr. Meyers indicated they hope to be approved for the lot split and the rezoning by the city. This would allow them to coordinate removal of the soil and prepare the site for building all at one time.

Mr. Gruber said the city will work with the Country Club, but there are codified ordinances that require review of any such removal and/or land disturbance on this site before any work commences.

Mr. Dreyfuss-Wells asked if there are any other developable lots along the exterior of the Country Club on public streets.

Mr. Feinstein said there are no other lots that have not yet been developed which front a public street and are outside of the flood plain around the Country Club. There are a few lots that could be developed, but only if the golf course was not in use.

Mayor Weiss opened the Public Hearing.

Mikkael Sekeres, 17100 Parkland Drive, said he is a cancer epidemiologist by training. The benzo(a)pyrene that is in the contaminated soil is six times what is allowed in a residential development. That is not normal soil levels all over town. Benzo(a)pyrene certainly causes cancer. The organic material includes asphalt and concrete as well as soil. He is convinced that it all needs to be removed. He is concerned about that removal, and how that will affect the residences nearby and the public at large. It is not a uniform area of removal. He asked if there is any conflict of interest, with any of the Board members being members of the Country Club. He indicated that recently the gates to the driveway have been left open to emphasize what an eyesore the current organic fill area has become. He thinks this is a deliberate attempt to make it look like the Country Club is doing something good by getting rid of the dump site.

Doug Johnson, 17120 Parkland Drive, said cleaning up a dump and this development are unrelated issues. This is a dump, but it is really a public green space given to the club by the city long ago. He thinks it is an artificial distinction to say that they will be cleaning up the area when the Country Club is the one that created the dump in the first place. It is better to preserve open space in a city that is land locked, for the very small amount of money that will be gained. The club should clean up their dumping area no matter what.

Christina Bordonaro, 3140 Attleboro Road, said she is concerned with health and safety issues with the remediation of the soil. The residents should be protected during that process. She does not think they should be willing to give up open space in the city. This is her view from her house. She knows other residents of Shaker Heights also enjoy that view as they travel along the streets. She understands infill development, and thinks this property needs to be abated no matter what. She does not favor additional loss of open space.

Leann Morrison, 18209 Fernway Road, said she agrees with the last two speakers. The loss of green space for two additional homes is not worth it.

Carl Morrison, 18209 Fernway Road, said it is a green space that is habitat for wildlife. It is worth protecting and should be held for the future. He does not think it should be developed.

Mayor Weiss said the City does have conflict of interest policies. No members of this committee are a member of the Country Club, nor do they have conflicts of interest. It would be up to the city and the individual members to identify any conflicts.

Ms. Braverman said the city's contracting engineer is a member of the Country Club. In order to evaluate the environmental reports within this request, the city hired another engineer that does not have any conflict with the Country Club.

Mayor Weiss said the obligation of any environmental or health study and removal analysis is clearly the responsibility of the owner of the property. The owner did conduct a Phase 1 and Phase 2 environmental study as was requested by the City Planning Commission, in order to establish the contaminated area and requirements. The real estate owners are responsible for any of that environmental clean-up. Permits, either state or federal, would be required for any remediation on the site. The applicant is required to remediate any contaminated soil, and the applicant proposes to remediate this soil.

Mr. Gruber said the city can request, as part of this review, additional documentation and information.

Mr. Weingart noted there is no other level land that is not in the flood plain on the Country Club property that could be developed. There is already a pattern of development around the Country Club for almost all developable land. The Country Club is 120 acres. This is 2.3 acres. This is a very small portion of that land. It is privately held land that is available to be used. The Country Club provides a public service. They do not invite, but they do not run off any public visitors. There are runners, walkers, dog walkers, skiers on the golf course year-round. Other golf courses in the area do not and would not allow this in their communities. The Shaker Heights Country Club is a community asset and also a friend and partner of the community. 118 acres of Country Club green space will remain after this development.

Mayor Weiss said that per the development plan and the riparian setback and conservation easement area, only about 50 percent of these lots will be developed. The rest will be left in their natural state.

Mr. Boyle asked about any deed restrictions on the property. Do those deed restrictions restrict development?

Mr. Gruber said he would like to clarify that the Van Sweringen brothers, developers of Shaker Heights, gave the land to the Country Club. The city never owned, nor gave the land to the Country Club. Any deed restrictions on that property have expired and are no longer enforceable.

Mr. Boyle said the city has formal site plan review of any proposed lots. During that process, the City Planning Commission could require proof of any environmental remediation that has occurred, or any continuous issues?

Mr. Gruber said yes, the city would certainly not allow any residential development without being completely sure that environmental issues are cleaned up on the site first.

Dr. Ganning said she is concerned that there is a carcinogen on the site in the soil. She is worried that it is not only in the soil as indicated in the packet, but seeped into the soil underneath. It has been there for a long time and may have spread. She is concerned that this will be an ongoing issue on the site.

Mr. Weingart said Partner's Environmental completed Phase 1 and Phase 2 environmental studies. A document has been submitted which shows the extent of any environmental issues on the site.

Mr. Meyers said there are different levels of contamination, some that need to be removed and taken to hazardous waste areas and others that do not. The type of contamination on this site is not considered to be a hazardous controlled substance, so it will be removed, but it is not the worst contamination levels in any way.

Mr. Zimmerman asked who will be removing the soil. How will that be regulated?

Mr. Meyers said they have contacted several excavation companies that are familiar with how to remove this type of contaminant. They will be following all environmental regulations with the removal and disposal of the contaminated material.

Mayor Weiss said there are clear environmental laws at the state and federal levels with which the Country Club will need to comply.

Mr. Boyle said the city still has regulatory control over the site plan review, which can include follow-up to make sure the land is safe for residential development.

Dr. Ganning said she would insist on additional testing after any remediation and removal of soil to make sure nothing dangerous has seeped into the soil or gone farther than what is indicated in these studies.

Mr. Dreyfuss-Wells said he does not think that the development is worth the loss of the green space.

Dr. Ganning said she is concerned and does not know enough about the remediation that has to take place, including the process and the aftermath.

It was moved by Mr. Boyle and seconded by Mr. Zimmerman to recommend approval to Council,

