

CITY OF BELLEVUE
BELLEVUE PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES

January 25, 2006
7:00 p.m.

Bellevue City Hall
City Council Conference Room

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Chair Bonincontri, Vice-Chair Mathews, Commissioners Bach, Lynde, Orrico, Robertson

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Commissioner Sheffels

STAFF PRESENT: Kathleen Burgess, Matthews Jackson, Steve Cohn,
Department of Planning and Community Development

GUEST SPEAKERS: None

RECORDING SECRETARY: Gerry Lindsay

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 7:07 p.m. by Chair Bonincontri who presided.

2. ROLL CALL

Upon the call of the roll, all Commissioners were present with the exception of Commissioner Robertson, who arrived at 7:10 p.m.; and Commissioner Sheffels, who was excused.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was approved by consensus.

4. STAFF REPORTS

Comprehensive Planning Manager Kathleen Burgess reported that the move to the new City Hall building has been delayed some three weeks.

Ms. Burgess introduced Legal Planner Lesa Hutnak. Ms. Hutnak said she lived in Seattle in the early 1990s before attending law school at Berkeley. She said she only recently moved back to the Puget Sound area.

Ms. Burgess said the Council after much discussion regarding the recommendation of the Commission relative to noticing requirements for land use permits concluded the distance should be expanded to 500 feet, which is greater than what the Commission recommended.

Ms. Burgess said the Council's discussion regarding the Comprehensive Plan Amendment process focused around the criteria of significantly changed circumstances. They wanted it better defined and included at both the threshold review and final review stages. The criteria is now called "significantly changed conditions" and has been given a specific definition.

Ms. Burgess reminded the Commissioners that there were three site-specific Comprehensive Plan Amendments forwarded to the Council. The Lochwood Commons and Tax Lots Triangle amendments were approved by the Council without discussion. There was some discussion

about the amendment relating to Factoria, and the Council elected to add a new policy regarding pedestrian bridges; the language of the new policy mirrors the policy language relating to pedestrian bridges in the Downtown area.

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

Ms. Ellen Kerr, Bridle Trails Community Club Co-President, thanked the Commission for its due diligence in addressing the proposed tree preservation ordinance. She said the Community Club is wholeheartedly supportive of the recommendation of the city and wants to see it moved forward to the City Council. She allowed that it is very difficult to make everyone happy. The Community Club would like to see 20.20.900(E)(1) revised to require a plan to be submitted concurrent with the cutting of the first two trees rather than as outlined. That could be easily accomplished by substituting the word “first” for the word “last.” The proposal has inherent flexibility to accommodate individual homeowners, equestrian and agricultural needs in the community; up to 75 percent of the diameter inches of trees on the interior portions of any lot can be cut, which is considerable. The alternative tree retention option also adds flexibility. The Commission should not be swayed by the few who are saying the proposal is too onerous.

Mr. Warren Halvorson, 13701 NE 32nd Place, said he and his wife are in general supportive of the provisions of the ordinance, though the reasonability provisions offered in writing at the Commission’s November meeting should be taken into account. He said he owns two properties in the Bridle Trails neighborhood, one that has a home on it and one that is undeveloped. The undeveloped property is in Cantor Greens Estates and is covered by covenants that include specified buffer areas, developmental rights, and architectural requirements; the property also has a powerline running along the back part of it. The site is not generally representative of the Bridle Trails area and should not be highlighted as such. The original idea behind the development of the proposed ordinance was to prevent clear cutting actions, but it has moved well beyond that, and much of it is confusing. If a person wants to be able to cut down one or two trees on their property, they should be able to do so without having to jump through too many hoops. A more reasonable approach will save the taxpayers money and will be less costly for the city. The entire structure of a tree, including the trunk, should be within the 20-foot perimeter if it is to be counted. Where the ordinance encumbers the rights of a property owner to develop as they see fit, there should be some allowances offered. All expenses incurred by the ordinance should be picked up by the citizens of the city, not by those having to purchase specific permits. If the Commission adopts an ordinance that will result in restrictions on development rights, all of the citizens of the city should be made aware by calling an open meeting. The ordinance should be tabled to allow for very careful review and community education.

Mr. Bill Wilson, a resident on NE 30th Street, said his neighbors are overwhelmingly in support of the proposed ordinance as submitted. He urged the Commission to approve it and pass it on to the Council for adoption.

Ms. Dana Kapela, 5214 134th Place NE, allowed that her property is more representative of a typical Bridle Trails property in that it has both equestrian and residential uses. She said she has at least 30 trees on her pasture, all of which shade the pasture and prevent grass from growing. If required, permits for cutting trees should not be overly costly; they should be offset where a vegetation management plan is agreed to that will include replanting. She thanked the Commission for changing the “whereas” statement to support equestrian and agricultural uses. The ordinance does not spell out just what a vegetation management plan is. It is not clear whether the Director could in fact deny a permit to remove trees from a property.

Mr. Norm Hanson, 3851 136th Avenue NE, said he has actively been working on the tree

ordinance for Bridle Trails for the past five years. He said the support of the planning staff and the Commission has been wonderful. The proposed ordinance includes a great deal of flexibility aimed at allowing homeowners to use their properties. When trees are removed, there should be a requirement for concurrently replanting them. The ordinance should be approved by the Commission and forwarded to the Council for adoption. Clear cutting prevention was not the only reason for developing the ordinance; trees are an identifying characteristic for the Bridle Trails neighborhood, and the ordinance will go a long way toward preserving a reasonable tree canopy.

Mr. Bob Kapela, 5652 132nd Avenue NE, commented that on an operating farm unsafe trees are removed as necessary, and an attempt is made to maintain as much pastureland as possible. If a property owner comes forward with a three-year plan for maintaining the trees on his or her property that includes removing unsafe trees and maintaining the proper ratios, the proposal should be reasonably considered by the city and permitted. Removing trees is expensive, especially where a contractor is hired to do the job; most property owners do not undertake the task without careful consideration.

Ms. Betty Lou Kapela, 5652 132nd Avenue NE, suggested that the first “whereas” statement should be further revised to read “...supports and promotes equestrian and agricultural uses....” In the future the city may have a planning director or staff members who cannot stand horses, and there should be language that strongly support equestrian uses. Whatever the final proposal is, it should be mailed to every person living in Bridle Trails so they can have a chance to respond before it goes to the City Council. The cost of the permits and of replacing trees is not specified. The ordinance calls for replanting with Northwest species, but it should not be that limiting; there are trees from other climates that grow very well in the Northwest.

Ms. Mary Ann Halvorson, 13701 NE 32nd Place, said she and her husband have lived in the Bridle Trails area for 35 years. She said the area around the Bridle Trails State Park has great diversity; there are areas that have nothing but homes, and areas that have open areas where horses graze under significant trees. There is no such thing as the typical Bridle Trails lot. The independence of the Bridle Trails property owners and the respect they show their properties should be taken into account. Too many trails in the area have had their access points blocked, and trees have over time been lost through irresponsible actions, but the vast majority of Bridle Trails residents understand their responsibility to maintain their properties in a way that will preserve the character of the area.

Ms. Eleanor Moon, address not given, thanked the Commission for the effort put into helping the Bridle Trails areas maintain its trees. She agreed that the citizens all need to understand the regulations.

6. COMMUNICATIONS FROM CITY COUNCIL, COMMUNITY COUNCILS, BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS – None

7. STUDY SESSION

A. Land Use Code Amendment
– Bridle Trails Trees

Senior Planner Matthews Jackson informed the Commissioners that the strikeout and highlighted revisions to the ordinance were inadvertently left out of the draft included in the packet. He noted that he had included in the packet a map showing the location of three specific sites that have unique circumstances: one is a large parcel being used for a horse farm and the owner has an obvious need to keep large areas of the site open; one is a smaller undeveloped site that has

some trees and is encumbered by high power transmission lines; and one is a typical developed lot that has only a few significant trees on it that could be impacted by plans to improve and enlarge the house.

Mr. Jackson said the proposed ordinance also includes a provision to allow for the removal of a certain number of trees over time without having to meet the proposed interior or perimeter tree retention requirements.

The ordinance does not prohibit taking action to remove hazard trees at any time. Where there is an imminent hazard posed by a tree, a property owner can remove the tree without a permit. In the context of a vegetation management plan, the removal of trees, including hazard trees, is addressed more specifically. The ordinance does not contain a blanket statement allowing for the removal of hazard trees; with such a clause, trees could be removed without any method for establishing later whether or not such trees did in fact pose a hazard. Vegetation management plans must be designed to meet the interior and perimeter retention requirements over time.

Answering a question asked by Commissioner Orrico, Mr. Jackson said where hazard trees are involved the typical story is that someone will call the city to report it, usually after a storm event. Often a clearing and grading inspector is sent out to provide verification; just looking at the tree is often enough to verify the hazard. Trees called out in a vegetation management plan as hazard trees should be checked by a professional. Where there is an imminent hazard involving a tree, removal is allowed without a permit, though technically the city should be notified, especially if the tree is in a critical area; no permit is required to remove a hazard tree on a single family lot if it is not in a critical area, and thus there is no obligation to notify the city. Commissioner Orrico observed that none of that is covered by the language of the provision, and Mr. Jackson responded that the practice is applicable across the city and not just in Bridle Trails.

With regard to 20.20.900.E.1, Mr. Jackson reviewed with the Commissioners the changes made to the proposed ordinance, beginning with the first “whereas” statement. He noted that equestrian and agricultural uses are unique to Bridle Trails, which is located within an urban environment. He commented, however, that the emphasis of the ordinance is trees, not specific uses.

With regard to 20.20.900.E.1, Mr. Jackson said the original proposal was to let vegetation management plans cover a span of ten years. It was concluded, however, that three years would be a more reasonable time span. The activities specified in a vegetation management plan could be implemented over three years under the single permit; any additional work beyond the scope of the original plan would require an amendment of the plan, though it would not require an additional permit.

Also in 20.20.900.E.1, Mr. Jackson pointed out that the proposed ordinance language had been revised to permit the removal of up to two trees in a three-year period without having to meet the tree retention requirements applicable to the interior and perimeter areas. The change was made in part based on comments made by the Commission, and to create a tie to the duration of the vegetation management plans. Some expressed concern over the fact that on small lots having only six to eight significant trees, the provision would allow for the removal of all of those trees within a short period of time without having to meet the other provisions of the ordinance. A provision was added to require replanting where the last one or two significant trees on a lot are removed. Some in the community support the notion of requiring the replacement of any significant trees removed.

Mr. Jackson noted that paragraphs (a) through (c) of 20.20.900.E.2 outline the criteria for when

the Director may administratively approve a modification to the provisions of the ordinance through the alternative tree retention option. Language was added to allow for specific uses such as pasture land and agriculture uses as additional criteria.

The Commissioners were reminded that the perimeter area is defined as the 20-foot area adjacent to all property lines. Within the perimeter area, the cumulative diameter inches of all significant trees must be retained, provided there is no conflict with access, utilities and the like. Within the interior area, 25 percent of the cumulative diameter inches of significant trees must be preserved.

The alternative tree retention option allows for site-specific approaches. The ordinance does not spell out in detail what actions can be allowed under the option in order to allow for flexibility. The option must meet the spirit and intent of the ordinance. Not all replanting must be with native Northwest trees, but the trees planted must complement the Northwest environment.

Mr. Jackson said the cost of the permit has not been determined yet. The clearing and grading permits are in the range of \$100, but the permits are likely to be reviewed by the land use department. The intent is to make the permits simple to get.

Once the Commission makes a recommendation and the Council takes action, one of the first things the city will do is go out with public information to let people know how the ordinance will impact properties. A full public notice was mailed to all property owners within the R-1 district and within 200 feet of the district.

Commissioner Lynde asked if “compliment the natural character of the Pacific Northwest” is defined as a term anywhere. Mr. Jackson allowed that it is not. The city does maintain a list of trees that grow well in the environment of the Northwest, as well as a list of native species. He said the term is used in 20.20.900.E.3.b.3 to mirror the intent of the ordinance, which is spelled out in 20.20.900.A.

Answering a question asked by Commissioner Orrico about someone wanting to develop a fairly small but densely wooded lot, pushing the lot coverage limits to their max, Mr. Jackson said, the tree retention permit would be reviewed along with the building permit. An inventory of all existing significant trees would have to be submitted, and the development and perimeter area setback areas would be drawn in. The significant trees within the 20-foot perimeter area required to be saved would be noted. If a significant tree within the perimeter area that would otherwise be retained must be removed in order to facilitate development of the site, the alternative tree retention option can be triggered. If a site configuration cannot accommodate the full replanting of trees, a lower replacement value could be permitted.

Commissioner Orrico observed that the language of the ordinance allowing the Director discretion calls for an equal or better result. Mr. Jackson said such decisions must be made on a site-by-site basis given the specific opportunities. Similar rules are already in place for both commercial and multifamily developments. There will always be exceptions, and that is why the ordinance has been crafted with language allowing for flexibility. Commissioner Orrico held that the phrase “equal or better result” in fact limits the flexibility allowed the Director. Mr. Jackson said the phrase as used could refer to allowing for the reasonable development of the lot. He pointed out that the proposed ordinance applies only in the R-1 zoning district in which the minimum lot size is 35,000 square feet.

Commissioner Orrico commented that a percentage figure is used in 20.20.900.E.3 rather than an actual number of trees. She proposed using a percentage in 20.20.900.E.1 as well. Some lots have only a few trees, and other lots have a large number of trees. Using a percentage would be a more fair method to use. Mr. Jackson said if a percentage figure is used, properties with a

large number of trees on them could see many of them removed without having to meet the requirements of the code.

Commissioner Bach said he is opposed to clear cutting properties but is reluctant to tell property owners they cannot remove trees as they need to. A limit of only two significant trees over a three-year period is overly restrictive. For most properties that have been developed for a long time, the bulk of the trees will be significant. On some lots, the removal of two trees would not even be noticed. Mr. Jackson pointed out that 20.20.900.E.1 does not prohibit the removal of trees from a property, rather it allows for the removal of up to two trees over a three-year period without having to meet the requirements for the perimeter and interior areas. Any number of trees can be removed from those areas provided the retention requirements are met.

Mr. Jackson agreed the percentage approach could be perceived as being more equitable. Larger properties should be able to remove more trees because they have more trees to manage. However, in the context of what the proposed ordinance is attempting to address, the percentage approach could have more of an impact depending on the circumstances of a particular site. Commissioner Orrico commented that the “last tree” requirement would not have to be included in the ordinance language if the percentage approach were used because there never would be a last tree removed. Mr. Jackson agreed but observed that under the percentage approach the owner of a large property could remove a large number of trees within the perimeter area and thus remove what otherwise would serve as a visual buffer.

Commissioner Lynde commented that the percentage approach would not work well on properties that only have a few significant trees because one cannot remove only a portion of a tree.

Commissioner Robertson suggested the language of the third paragraph of 20.20.900.E.1 could be worded to read “...the removal of more than ten percent of the significant trees on the lot, or two significant trees, whichever is greater...” With regard to the second paragraph of the section, she suggested that if the intent is truly to save significant trees the language should read “...one or more of the last six significant trees...”

Mr. Jackson allowed that the percentage approach could work if it were tied to the cumulative diameter inches of the significant trees on a site. Even that, however, could result in significant impacts.

Commissioner Matthews noted that if the section were to allow for the removal of ten percent of the significant trees, the net result could look like a clear cut if all the trees removed were taken from a single area.

There was agreement not to utilize the percentage approach.

From the audience, Mr. Hanson said the Bridle Trails Community Club is concerned that the language of the proposed ordinance could be interpreted to mean that a property owner could cut two trees every three years without being required to replant. The language of the second paragraph of 20.20.900.E.1 should be revised from “..is for one or both of the last two significant trees... to “...is for one or both of the first two significant trees...”

Commissioner Robertson held the view that the number used in the paragraph should be higher than two. She suggested the language “In any lot that has less than eight significant trees, any removal request, regardless of whether it constitutes a safety hazard, shall require a planting plan showing a one-to-one ratio of replacement.”

Chair Bonincontri proposed including a blanket statement requiring a one-to-one replacement ratio for every tree cut from lots that have ten or fewer trees. Mr. Jackson said that could be done by adding a new section. Chair Bonincontri said under that approach the paragraph focused on the last two significant trees could be removed.

Commissioner Orrico said she would not advocate moving in a more restrictive direction.

Commissioner Lynde said she could support Chair Bonincontri's proposal but suggested the threshold number should be eight trees instead of ten.

Mr. Jackson clarified that 20.20.900.E.1 as it is written applies in situations where the interior and perimeter requirements do not have to be met. The proposal of Chair Bonincontri would require replanting on a one-to-one ratio in all circumstances where the number of significant trees on a lot is a set number or less.

Commissioner Bach reiterated his desire to see as many trees as possible retained in the Bridle Trails area, but noted his reluctance to legislate too narrowly, an approach that will only lead to more problems. He added that enforcement will be very difficult. If the ordinance overly restricts the rights of property owners to use their properties as they see fit, there could be some repercussions.

Commissioner Lynde commented that the Commission is charged with taking into account what is best for the city as a whole and to do things that will preserve neighborhood character. Bellevue has a number of diverse neighborhoods, some of which would prefer to have no trees and others that take the opposite view. The ordinance language as proposed incorporates a significant amount of flexibility that allows for the reasonable use of properties.

Commissioner Robertson concurred. She said the character of the Bridle Trails neighborhood is clearly associated with trees; people who do not want to live in the woods move to Somerset. The proposed ordinance respects the unique characteristic the community wants to maintain. The proposal of Chair Bonincontri to have a one-to-one replanting ratio where the removal of trees is contemplated on properties having only a few significant trees should be incorporated. She suggested the threshold should be eight trees.

Commissioner Mathews concurred and agreed that the threshold should be eight trees.

There was consensus to strike the second paragraph of 20.20.900.E.1 and to add a new paragraph with the language proposed by Chair Bonincontri, using eight trees as the threshold.

There was also consensus not to add "and promote" to the first "whereas" statement.

Commissioner Robertson drew attention to 20.20.900.F.2.b and held that "an equal or better result" is vague and could be interpreted to mean the same number of cumulative diameter inches. If the primary use of a particular property is pasture land for equestrian uses, the "equal or better result" could be interpreted to mean more open space with fewer trees. Depending on how (b) is interpreted, it could in fact defeat the intent to allow equestrian and agricultural uses. Mr. Jackson said the language of (b) is existing code language. It is intentionally vague to allow for many different interpretations for many different uses.

Commissioner Orrico suggested that rather than being too vague, "equal or better" is too specific. Mr. Jackson said the phrase has traditionally been interpreted to mean any equal or better result, including better placement of structures and modified landscaping.

Commissioner Robertson proposed deleting paragraph (b). Mr. Jackson allowed that paragraph (a) is focused broadly enough on meeting the purpose of the ordinance, and paragraph (c) is sufficient to prevent unintended impacts.

There was consensus to eliminate 20.20.900.F.2.b from the proposed ordinance.

Motion to transmit the ordinance as revised to the City Council was made by Commissioner Lynde. Second was by Commissioner Mathews and the motion carried unanimously.

B. Comprehensive Plan Amendment
– Wilburton/NE 8th Corridor Study

Associate Planner Steve Cohn said he has been working on the study with Economic Development Manager Ellen Miller-Wolfe and Kris Liljeblad, Assistant Director of Transportation. Ms. Miller-Wolfe recently announced, however, that she will be leaving the city; Senior Planner Emil King will be taking on her role in the study.

Mr. Cohn used a map to outline for the Commission the study area boundaries. He noted that the area between I-405 and 116th Avenue is zoned Office/Limited Business (OLB), a classification that allows office uses, hotels, restaurants if attached to a hotel, and car dealerships with a special overlay. The area between 116th Avenue and the Burlington Northern/Sante Fe railroad is zoned General Commercial (GC), a zone that allows all kinds of retail and commercial uses, including office; residential uses are not permitted in the GC zone. The OLB district has a height limit of 75 feet, whereas the GC zone has a 30-foot height limit. The third focus of the study is the area between the railroad track and 120th Avenue.

In the OLB portion of the study area, the current City Hall use will soon be replaced with an auto dealership with mostly at-grade parking and nice landscaping. To the north there is an empty lot with a wetland on which nothing can be built. There is no anticipation that the properties on which the extended stay hotel, post office and Puget Sound Energy substation uses are currently located will redevelop. Behind the substation there is a tack store; while the use on that property could change, the site is very small. The property on which the Ford dealership is located is not owned by the person who owns the dealership; conceivably, that property could see redevelopment at some time in the future. The empty lot to the north of the Ford dealership is ripe for development. The lot is adjacent to an office building, but because of the FAR requirements the site is probably not going to redevelop, unless there is an effort to consolidate a number of properties. The hotel on the next property to the north recently changed ownership and likely will not seek to redevelop. The Denny's just south of NE 8th Street is a grandfathered use, and unless combined with the property on which the car rental is located, those properties are not likely to redevelop.

In the GC zone, the area shown as the KG Interest, is home to the Chrysler, Dodge and Jeep auto dealership. KG Interest has an option to buy the property, and chances are pretty good the site will redevelop more intensively. The Toyota dealership has announced plans to move to Eastgate, leaving that property ripe for redevelopment. The owner of the Mercury dealership owns the land it is on; the same is true for Lithia. Ownership of the property on which the General Motors dealership sits is separate from the dealership. There are a number of small properties fronting NE 8th Street in the GC zone which could redevelop over time.

The area to the east of the railroad tracks is home to an office building and several big box uses, all of which are built to the maximum allowed. The property on which the Bellevue School District parks school buses is prime for redevelopment. Behind it is where Mutual Materials is located; that site is used to store granite and is also a property ripe for redevelopment. However,

in order for the Mutual Materials site to redevelop, the school district site will need to redevelop, and the school district would have to identify a suitable location to park its buses elsewhere. Chances are slim that the properties along NE 8th Street will redevelop.

Mr. Cohn said the study will consider various land use scenarios and will run traffic models based on the scenarios. The scenarios will range from hardly any redevelopment in the middle section, which would require a change in the code to not allowing any office or big box retail uses, to massive redevelopment of the area to the limits of what is currently allowed. Scenarios will be developed showing redevelopment of the bus barn and Mutual Materials sites, both with and without extending NE 4th Street under the railroad tracks to 120th Avenue.

Answering a question asked by Commissioner Orrico, Mr. Cohn said the entity that has picked up the option, KG Investment, has indicated that all things being equal they would prefer to see a big box constructed on the site. They have offered the traditional one-story big box, and a scenario with a four-story building form similar to one in Northgate. The Northgate structure houses Best Buy on the first floor, GI Joe on the second floor, and Target on the top two floors along with six or eight stories of structured parking.

Mr. Cohn said the preliminary study results will be before the Commission in March or April. The Commission will then make a recommendation to the Council with regard to the preferred option, and once the Council selects the preferred option the summer will be spent working on design guidelines.

Chair Bonincontri asked if the KG Investment is holding off a decision about purchase and redevelopment of the site given that the study is under way. Mr. Cohn said they are following closely the process but have not indicated whether or not they will hold off on seeking a permit to redevelop. If they come in for a permit now, they will develop with the current zoning.

8. NEW BUSINESS

Ms. Burgess reported that a joint meeting with the Transportation Commission has been scheduled for April 19.

9. OLD BUSINESS

Ms. Burgess said the Lake Hills Shopping Center architects are close to being ready to come in for design review. She said the new owner of the Factoria Mall has not made application for any changes there as yet.

Ms. Burgess noted that because of the delay in moving into the new City Hall it cannot be said for sure when the next Planning Commission meeting will be held.

10. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. October 12, 2005

Motion to approve the minutes as submitted was made by Commissioner Lynde. Second was by Commissioner Bach and the motion carried without dissent. Commissioner Orrico abstained from voting.

B. October 26, 2005

Motion to approve the minutes as submitted was made by Commissioner Mathews. Second was

by Commissioner Bach and the motion carried unanimously.

C. November 9, 2005

Motion to approve the minutes as submitted was made by Commissioner Lynde. Second was by Commissioner Bach and the motion carried without dissent. Commissioner Robertson abstained from voting.

D. November 16, 2005

Motion to approve the minutes as submitted was made by Commissioner Bach. Second was by Commissioner Orrico and the motion carried without dissent. Commissioner Lynde abstained from voting.

E. November 30, 2005

Motion to approve the minutes as submitted was made by Commissioner Bach. Second was by Commissioner Orrico and the motion carried unanimously.

11. PUBLIC COMMENT – None

12. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Bonincontri adjourned the meeting at 9:17 p.m.

Staff to the Planning Commission

Date

Chair of the Planning Commission

Date