

DRAFT
CITY OF SHORELINE

SHORELINE PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

September 6, 2018
7:00 P.M.

Shoreline City Hall
Council Chamber

Commissioners Present

Chair Montero
Vice Chair Mork
Commissioner Davis
Commissioner Lin
Commissioner Maul
Commissioner Malek

Staff Present

Rachael Markle, Director, Planning and Community Development
Paul Cohen, Planning Manager, Planning and Community Development
Julie Ainsworth-Taylor, Assistant City Attorney
Steve Szafran, Senior Planner, Planning and Community Development
Miranda Redinger, Planner, Planning and Community Development
Carla Hoekzema, Planning Commission Clerk

Commissioners Absent

Commissioner Craft

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Montero called the regular meeting of the Shoreline Planning Commission to order at 7:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Upon roll call by Ms. Hoekzema the following Commissioners were present: Chair Montero, Vice Chair Mork, and Commissioners Davis, Lin, Maul and Malek. Commissioner Craft was absent.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was accepted as presented.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of August 2, 2018 were approved as submitted.

GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no general public comments.

STUDY ITEM: POTENTIAL EXPANSION OF GREEN BUILDING MANDATE TO COMMERCIAL ZONING

Ms. Redinger reviewed that on August 2nd, the Commission discussed whether or not the green building mandate should be expanded to include commercial zones. They also discussed which commercial zoning categories the mandate should apply to, as well as the appropriate certification protocols to fulfill the requirement. At the request of the Commission, staff conferred with the City's Economic Development Manager, several developers, green building certification organizations and King County, and a summary of their comments were provided in the Staff Report. The Economic Development Manager was supportive of the ability to create stringent requirements, even as a mandate, as long as they are predictable. However, a number of developers pointed out that redevelopment of sites, particularly large sites like Shoreline Place, would represent a significant improvement in environmental performance over the existing 1960s development because new development would be required to conform to the 2015 Energy Code, the Department of Ecology's (DOE) low-impact development standards, and the Shoreline Municipal Code frontage improvements and landscape requirements. It was emphasized that new codes and requirements result in building and site design that perform significantly better than when the sites were originally developed. Concern was expressed that if sites become burdened with mandates to the extent that redevelopment is not feasible, the City would not realize the environmental benefits of newer construction and the community would not realize the benefits of an updated commercial center, mixed-use, senior housing, or other uses that have been envisioned for various sites.

Ms. Redinger referred to a letter from Merlone Geier, potential developer of the Community Renewal Area at Shoreline Place, which makes the point that the delta is so great between 1960s development and the 2015 Energy Code that the delta between the 2015 Energy Code and a green building standard has diminishing returns and would not be that significant. She said she spoke with a representative from the City of Seattle, as well as Shoreline's Building Official, who is currently the president of the Washington Association of Building Officials, and learned that many of the early 20th century buildings were quite efficient, but there was a dip midcentury when air conditioning was added to buildings. Starting in the 1980's, energy codes were adopted resulting in significant improvement. In 2006, the State Council set the target of buildings being 70% more efficient by 2030. Compared with properties developed during the lowest ebb of efficiency, there was significant improvement by 2015. She agreed that the City should not discount the importance of redeveloping these sites and should not overburden developers so the existing uses are more profitable than redevelopment.

Ms. Redinger said that in her conversations, it was clear the LEED Gold and Built Green protocols are more holistic and consider a wider range of criteria than Passive House Institute United States (PHIUS). However, PHIUS's focus on energy performance leads to greater conservation than the more holistic protocols. In terms of program equivalency, there is no direct apples-to-apples comparison.

Ms. Redinger said another takeaway from conversations with developers is that because the Evergreen Standard is the green building protocol required for affordable housing and public school projects that utilize state funding, it might create a burden to also require these projects to obtain dual certification in order to fulfill a green building mandate. Doing so could reduce the ability of housing providers who rely on state funding to build projects near the future light rail stations. One option is to add the Evergreen Standard as a requirement that would fulfill the mandate in the station areas.

Ms. Redinger summarized that the City has sufficient evidence from the green building providers and from the City's recent Rushing Study to conclude that a green building mandate will result in greater efficiency. While developing to the 2015 Energy Code standard will be a great improvement, the City should still strive to do better. She referred to a letter from Zack Semke, NK Architects, which points out that simply relying on the usual approach of incremental code improvement would mean that annual emissions from Seattle's buildings would drop by just 12% between 2008 and 2050. This falls far short of the 82% reduction in building emissions that Seattle has targeted as necessary in order to reach its 2050 emissions goals. His letter also talks about how PHIUS reduces energy by about 50% compared to the 2015 Washington State Energy Code. Ms. Redinger summarized that there is still considerable savings beyond the Energy Code, but the City should not discount the importance of redeveloping old sites.

Ms. Redinger also referred to a Built Green infographic showing some of the results of a study they recently did. The graph illustrates the electricity savings of a Built Green home versus non-certified homes. The study found that Built Green 4-Star projects were coming in at 33% more efficient than code-compliant homes and Built Green 5-Star at 40%. The study demonstrates there is substantial savings, which is why the City is moving forward with the creation of a 4th Tier to encourage commercial development to become part of the Deep Green Program, which has been on the books for more than a year but has not been utilized. The intent is that the 4th Tier would be more attainable and attractive to developers. She described the potential Deep Green Incentive Program as follows:

- Tier 1 – Living Building or Community Challenge
- Tier 2 – Emerald Star or Petal Certification
- Tier 3 – LEED Platinum, 5-Star Built Green, or Zero Energy plus Salmon Safe.
- Tier 4 – PHIUS or 4-Star Built Green.

Ms. Redinger advised that code amendments will be required to implement the proposed program. As the Commission reviewed the proposed changes, she invited them to provide feedback on the following:

- Should the green building mandate be extended to commercial zoning? Staff is recommending no.
- Should the Deep Green Incentive Program be expanded to include a 4th Tier? Staff is recommending yes.
- If it is appropriate to expand the Deep Green Incentive Program to include a 4th Tier, which certification protocols are appropriate to fulfill the requirement? Staff is recommending Built Green 4-Star and PHIUS. Staff is also recommending that the Evergreen Standard could fulfill the green building mandate for projects in the MUR zones that utilize state funding.
- Should parking reductions be cumulative? Staff is recommending yes. For example, for a full Living Building Challenge Project in a light rail station subarea, a developer could capture both the 50% Tier 1 reduction with the 25% high-capacity transit reduction to get to a total parking

4a. Draft Minutes from Thursday, September 6, 2018

reduction of 75%. Tier 4 could offer a 5% reduction for the Deep Green Program combined with the 25% high-capacity transit reduction for a total parking reduction of 30%. Staff believes the parking reduction will be meaningful for mixed-use projects that have a residential component.

- Should Tier 4 be granted expedited review? Staff is recommending yes. If there are so many applications for expedited permitting that it becomes meaningless, they could revisit the incentive and perhaps place conditions on Tier 4 projects.
- Should public storage facilities require more than LEED Certification? Staff is recommending yes. If the mandate is extended to commercial zoning and public storage facilities were simply a use in that zone, the provision would be unnecessary. However, as it now stands, there would still be an outlying certification requirement for the use. Potentially, they could make it more specific, potentially LEED Core and Shell or PHIUS.
- Is it appropriate to mandate a program in one area and incentivize it in others? Staff is recommending yes, based on the fact that there are different market forces operating along the major retail and commercial corridors and light rail station areas. The commercial zones are more subject to market forces, including the declining success of retail brick and mortar stores. The market forces in the MUR zones are based more on transit opportunities.

Ms. Redinger advised that if the Commission reaches relative agreement to move forward with the draft language, Ordinance No. 839 will be finalized and a public hearing will be scheduled for October 18th. Following the public hearing, the Commission will forward its recommendation to the City Council, who could hold a study session on November 26th and potentially adopt Ordinance No. 839 on December 10th.

Vice Chair Mork clarified that, as proposed, PHIUS would also be added to the MUR zones. Ms. Redinger answered affirmatively and clarified that the proposal would create a 4th tier to the incentive program that applies citywide. It also gives greater options in the MUR zones such as allowing the Evergreen Standard to apply to housing and school projects that utilize State funding.

Commissioner Lin commented that 4-Star Built Green is more comparable to LEED Platinum, but the proposal would place them in two different tiers. Ms. Redinger recalled that during their last discussion, the Commission discussed that including LEED Gold as an option for Tier 4 would likely result in most developers choosing that option, which is the least expensive and least beneficial of the programs. This issue was a topic of discussion amongst the green building certifiers in King County, and there was no consensus. Staff concluded that it is okay to have two different types of programs because the City values holistic programs and has carbon reduction targets. LEED Gold was dropped as an option because it was lower performing and the long-term statistics do not show the benefit the City wants to see. The Commission could certainly add LEED Gold as a Tier 4 option.

Ms. Redinger briefly reviewed the code changes necessary to implement the proposed changes as follows:

- **SMC 20.20.016 – D Definitions.** The Definition for “Deep Green” would be expanded to include a Tier 4 (Built Green’s 4-Star or PHIUS).

4a. Draft Minutes from Thursday, September 6, 2018

- **SMC 20.30.080 – Preapplication Meetings.** This provision would be amended to add PHIUS as a potential protocol. It also adds a third sentence stating that the preapplication meeting fee would be waived if the project would not otherwise require a preapplication meeting. Preapplication meetings require a lot of staff from a variety of departments. If a project is already going to require a preapplication meeting and multi-departmental review, staff believes the applicant should be charged for that time. But if the only reason the project requires a preapplication meeting is because it is a deep green project, the fee could be waived.
- **SMC 20.30.297 – Administrative Design Review.** This amendment would add the Deep Green 4-Star and PHIUS as part of the Deep Green Incentive Program. It would also add a provision specific to the MUR zones. As proposed, it would require construction in the MUR zones to achieve green building certification through Built Green 4-Star or PSIUS. However, the Evergreen Standard would fulfill the requirement for affordable housing projects.
- **SMC 20.50.400 – Reductions to Minimum Parking Requirements.** This amendment would add a parking reduction of up to 5% for Tier 4 projects. It also makes it clear that the parking reductions for affordable housing could not be combined with the parking reduction allowed by the Deep Green Incentive Program. However, the parking reduction could be cumulative to other parking reductions allowed in the light rail station areas.

Vice Chair Mork suggested it would be appropriate to allow the parking reduction for affordable housing to be combined with other parking reductions allowed by the Deep Green Incentive Program. Ms. Redinger reviewed SMC 20.50.400.E, which allows a parking reduction of up to 50% for the portion of a project that provides low-income units.

Commissioner Maul commented that PHIUS and Built Green 4-Star are pretty significant energy packages. He questioned if they are that much less than LEED Platinum. Ms. Redinger reviewed her discussions with the green building certification organizations that LEED Platinum is more similar to PHIUS and Built Green 4-Star. If LEED Platinum and PHIUS are not much different, Commissioner Maul questioned why PHIUS should not simply be added to Tier 3. Ms. Redinger commented that this change would make PHIUS equal to Zero Energy, and solar panels are all that would be required to make a PHIUS project qualify for Zero Energy certification.

Vice Chair Mork said she likes the direction of Commissioner Maul's recommendation. Another option would be to move LEED Platinum to Tier 4 or move Zero Energy with Salmon Safe to Tier 2. Ms. Redinger questioned whether Zero Energy plus Salmon Safe would really be equal to Emerald Star or Petal Certification. She reminded them that the Rushing Study showed very similar results in cost and performance for PHIUS and Built Green 4-Star. However, other organizations have grouped PHIUS with Built Green 5-Star. Any way that the tiers are arranged would be justifiable, but also not a perfect fit.

Vice Chair Mork pointed out that Built Green 4-Star is for residential development only. Ms. Redinger added that Built Green will certify retail components of a mixed-use building, but will not certify a full commercial building. She reminded them that the Deep Green Incentive Program would not be limited to certain building types.

Commissioner Lin voiced concern that Tiers 3 and 4 are quite a range apart in their incentives, but they are comparable in their requirements and efficiency. She suggested that perhaps the Tier 4 incentives should be increased to be closer to Tier 3.

Commissioner Davis explained that the incentives are intended to reduce developer costs so that the savings can be put towards green design features. She asked if staff has any information to indicate whether or not the savings are equivalent to the costs associated with implementing the various green programs. Will the incentives result in a meaningful cost savings that a developer could use to make a project greener? She voiced concern about deterring good development that results in meaningful improvements in the City. She is also concerned about missing the opportunity for the City to be a leader in green development because the incentives are not meaningful enough. Ms. Redinger commented that removing the mandate eliminates the possibility of precluding development, and the intent is to offer enough incentives to enable developers to take advantage of the programs. She reminded them that the additional costs of implementing the programs were identified in the Rushing Study. Staff can also reach some level of projection for fee reduction incentives, with the exception of transportation impact fees, which are project and location specific. She acknowledged that the fee reduction incentives do not equal the certification costs associated with green building. However, the benefits increase when you factor in height and density bonuses, expedited permitting, etc. Rather than the City telling developers how much they can save by participating in the Deep Green Incentive Program, she would like developers to start doing the math themselves.

Commissioner Davis asked if the developers provided any indication of the incentives that would be meaningful and spur interest. Ms. Redinger answered that their first concern was that the City not subject developers to a mandate. If the proposal is no longer mandated, she could invite developers to share ideas about the types of incentives that would be enticing. She expressed her belief that expedited review will be a significant incentive and cost savings. The Commissioners voiced general support for increasing the incentives for Tier 4, particularly the parking reduction.

- **SMC 20.50.630 – Deep Green Incentive Program.** The amendments in this section would change “Net Zero Energy Building” to “Zero Energy” to be consistent with the program’s new name. The amendments would also add Built Green 4-Star and PHIUS to the list of potential programs. It also adds Tier 4 to Section B.4 and identifies a 25% waiver of application fees for Tier 4 in Section D.1, a 25% density bonus under Section E.3.a, and a 5% reduction in parking in Section E.3.b. She summarized that the Commission has suggested that the parking reduction for Tier 4 should be increased to 15%. The amendments also make note that additional thought is needed about whether or not expedited permit review should be offered for Tier 4 and if specific conditions should apply. Section F would be amended to update the minimum compliance standards to include the standards for Built Green 4-Star and PHIUS.

Commissioner Maul asked how expedited permitting is accomplished. Ms. Redinger said projects are moved to the front of the queue. If there is not enough capacity to do the review in house, the City contracts with an outside consultant to do the review.

Commissioner Maul asked what happens if a developer fails to meet the requirements of a certification program yet the incentives have already been implemented. Ms. Redinger recalled this was a huge point of debate when the original Deep Green Incentive Program was created. There is an entire section that deals with the issue, and no changes are proposed at this time. Developers who fail to turn in the required reports in a timely manner will be fined. If a developer fails to meet the requirements of the certification sought, all of the waived fees would have to be paid back and there would be a 5% building valuation fine.

Commissioner Davis pointed out that the commissioning requirements for Built Green and LEED were not built into the timeline. Ms. Redinger said the City would rely on 3rd-party review to ensure that projects are meeting the commissioning requirements. Commissioner Davis suggested there should be some leeway built into the six-month provision to account for the different commissioning requirements associated with Built Green and LEED. Ms. Redinger pointed out that the Director can grant extensions. The point is to set some benchmarks for expectations. If there is a legitimate reason why a developer cannot meet the six-month requirement, they simply need to let the City know why.

The Commission indicated general support for the proposed amendments as recommended by staff and agreed to move them forward to a public hearing on October 18th. However, they requested that the parking reduction for Tier 4 be increased from 5% to 15%. They agreed that the parking reductions should be cumulative, including parking reductions for affordable housing. They also agreed with the protocols proposed by staff for each of the 4 tiers.

STUDY ITEM: 2018 DEVELOPMENT CODE AMENDMENTS

Mr. Szafran advised that there are 38 proposed Development Code Amendments; three are citizen-initiated and the remainder were initiated by the Director. He explained that staff's intent is to present the administrative and clarifying amendments now, and present the policy amendments on September 20th. He reviewed each of the amendments as follows:

Administrative Development Code Amendments

- **Amendment 4 (SMC 20.20.044) – Refuse Definition.** The Development Code neglected to update the citation for the definition of “garbage” when the new definitions were added to Title 13. In addition to updating the citation, the amendment would renumber the definitions.
- **Amendment 7 (SMC 20.30.040) – Noise Variance.** Newly adopted Ordinance No. 818 (Noise Code) resulted in the creation of a new variance process. Staff has determined that a Type A Action is the appropriate method of processing a noise variance so it can be managed administratively by the permitting authority or department.
- **Amendment 8 (SMC 20.40.405) – Homeless Shelter.** “Homeless Shelters,” in general, is a policy question that will be addressed later. If the amendments were to go through, Amendment 8 would add “Homeless Shelter” as a use on the title page.

4a. Draft Minutes from Thursday, September 6, 2018

- **Amendment 9 (SMC 20.40.020).** This amendment would add the Town Center (TC-4) zone to the residential zoning category on the table. TC-4 is primarily a residential zone that acts as a transition between the more intense TC zoning designations and the lower-density residential zones.
- **Amendment 10 (SMC 20.40.030).** This amendment would add the TC-4 zone and delete the R-36 zoning category, which the City has never had.
- **Amendment 11 (SMC 20.40.046(D)).** This amendment would add the missing word, “in.”
- **Amendment 13 (SMC 20.40.160) – Unlisted Uses.** The amendment would remove “Unlisted Uses” and rely on SMC 20.40.110, which allows the Director to determine those “Unlisted Uses.”
- **Amendment 14 (SMC 20.40.235) – Add Exemption.** Currently, the section uses the term “Waiver,” but it is also referred to as an exemption under both the Development Code and the Revised Code of Washington, authorizing a low-income impact fee exemption. To be consistent, staff recommends to remove the term “transportation impact fee waivers” because the exemption applies to all of the City’s impact fees.
- **Amendment 20 (SMC 20.50.120).** This section of the code is unclear and confusing when applying single-family attached and multi-family design standards to town home projects in certain mixed-use residential zones. Adding a semicolon instead of a comma will make the provision easier to understand.
- **Amendment 23 (SMC 20.50.240) – Lighting.** Pedestrian right-of-way standards are typically determined by Public Works through the Engineering Development Manual and should not be addressed or duplicated in the Development Code. To clarify for Commissioner Malek, Mr. Szafran advised that the requirement that light be shielded from spilling over onto adjacent residential properties would remain unchanged.
- **Amendment 25 (SMC 20.50.340).** This amendment would simply capitalize the word “preparation” since it is a title.
- **Amendment 32 (SMC 20.50.410) – Disabled.** The term “handicap” is no longer appropriate and needs to be replaced with “disabled.”
- **Amendment 38 (SMC 20.230.200) – SMP Shoreline Policies and Regulations.** This amendment would update the title of the section to be regulations and not policies.

Clarifying Development Code Amendments

- **Amendment 1 (SMC 20.20.012) – Building Coverage Definition.** The current definition for “Building Coverage,” is unclear whether it includes covered but unenclosed structures or portions

4a. Draft Minutes from Thursday, September 6, 2018

of structures such as carports, covered decks, and porches. The amendment would make the definition cover all of the roof area of all buildings on a lot.

Vice Chair Mork asked if the definition would include solar panels, and Mr. Cohen answered that flat, stand-alone panels would be considered a structure. However, panels on an existing roof would not be double counted. Overhanging panels would also count as part of the building coverage. Vice Chair Mork questioned if it would be appropriate to make an exception for solar panels, and Mr. Cohen agreed to research the option further and report back. He noted that, currently, solar panels are given a height exception as a rooftop appurtenance. However, there is no exception for lot coverage. The Commission also requested more information about how solar shading fixtures would be counted.

Commissioner Maul observed that the proposed amendment would essentially reduce lot coverage because instead of the building envelope being the walls of a structure, an overhang would count as part of the lot coverage, too. Mr. Cohen said lot coverage already includes the entire roof area. Commissioner Maul pointed out that large overhangs on a roof protect buildings and reduce solar heat gain. He agreed that covered decks should be counted, but he is not convinced that roof overhangs should be counted, too. Other Commissioners agreed and asked staff to research the issue further for a continued discussion at their next meeting. Mr. Szafran pointed out that building coverage has to do with the amount of pervious surface available to absorb rainwater and also massing and aesthetic value.

- **Amendment 5 (SMC 20.20.046) – Sign Definition.** This amendment would add a definition for “Sign” to the Development Code.
- **Amendment 6 (SMC 20.20.0480) – Trellis.** This amendment is based on Amendment 3, which is a unified definition for “Landscape Structure” that includes arbors, pergolas and trellises. Trellises would be absorbed into the definition of “Landscape Structures.”
- **Amendment 16 (SMC 20.40.504) – Self Storage.** This amendment would add the word “gross” before “square feet.” The word was inadvertently left out of Ordinance No. 789 that adopted self-storage requirements.
- **Amendment 17 (SMC 20.50.020) – Height.** The current code sets the base height for high schools at 50 feet, and the base height may be exceeded to a maximum of 55 feet for gymnasiums and 72 feet for theater fly spaces. Because middle and elementary schools may also want to add these types of uses, the word “high” would be deleted. The amendment would also allow an additional height for elevator shafts and other rooftop structures that provide open amenities and their access. Staff is finding that more and more developers use rooftops to meet some of the open space requirement and the Building Code requires Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) access to the rooftop open spaces. All of the applications that provide elevators to the roof exceed the building height by about 15 feet.
- **Amendment 19 (SMC 20.50.040) – Landscape Structure in Setback.** This amendment would provide clarification on the applicability of maximum height and sight distance requirements to

vegetation supported by landscape structures. It allows them to grow over the maximum height subject to sight clearance provisions and the Engineering Development Manual. Commissioner Lin asked if the height exception would have a maximum allowance. Mr. Szafran answered not for vegetation.

- **Amendment 22 (SMC 20.50.150) – Storage Space for Garbage.** The current standards for garbage container storage are too specific and inflexible regarding sizes, numbers and distances when their location and visibility are more important. The amended language would require that the containers be stored inside or screened and covered.
- **Amendment 30 (SMC 20.50.390) – Office Parking.** The City has “Professional Office” as a use, but there is no applicable parking standard. The proposed amendment would require 1 parking space for 400 square feet of office space. Also, because “Government/Business Services” is not listed as a use in the Development Code, the use would be deleted from this section as it can more easily be administered under “Professional Office.” To clarify for Vice Chair Mork, Mr. Szafran advised that the proposed parking ratio is based on staff’s research with other jurisdictions.

Commissioner Maul questioned if it is necessary to use the word “Professional.” Mr. Szafran pointed out that “Professional Office” is a use in the use table. The intent is to use consistent terms throughout the Development Code. Mr. Cohen added that the term is generic enough to include a number of different types of office uses.

- **Amendment 35 (SMC 20.70.450) – Access Widths.** Consistent with the Engineering Development Manual, this amendment would make the driveway widths and access types match up with the types of development. “Circular” drives would also be removed because they are not a type of development.

Mr. Cohen summarized that the Commission would like staff to provide more information about how roof top cell towers are regulated. They also want staff to research the option of allowing solar panels, eaves and sun shades on windows to be exceptions to the building coverage limitation. Commissioner Mork said she is interested in more information about potential exceptions for anything that either produces or saves energy.

DIRECTOR’S REPORT

Mr. Cohen announced that the City issued a building permit for the Alexan Project, which was originally submitted at the end of 2014 but then went dormant for a few years. The building permit was needed in order for the new developer to assume ownership of the project. The developer has submitted a street vacation application, as well as a design for the Westminster/155th intersection.

Mr. Cohen reported that staff has been negotiating with developers at Shoreline Place for development of the Sears site. A preapplication meeting was held about a month ago, as the proposal is large and complex. The intent is to construct about 1,300 residential units and about 84,000 square feet of retail commercial space. The design is very conceptual at this point, and the intent is to do the project in phases based on the market demand. One option is for the developer to vest the project long term via a development

4a. Draft Minutes from Thursday, September 6, 2018

agreement, which would come before the Commission and City Council. However, no development agreement has been proposed at this time.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

There was no unfinished business.

NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONERS/ANNOUNCEMENTS

There were no reports or announcements.

AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING

Mr. Szafran advised that the remaining 2018 Development Code amendments would be presented to the Commission in a study session on September 20th. The September 20th agenda would also include a discussion about the sidewalk ballot measure.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:28 p.m.

William Montero
Chair, Planning Commission

Carla Hoekzema
Clerk, Planning Commission

DRAFT