

DRAFT
CITY OF SHORELINE

SHORELINE PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

February 7, 2019
7:00 P.M.

Shoreline City Hall
Council Chamber

Commissioners Present

Vice Chair Mork
Commissioner Craft
Commissioner Davis
Commissioner Maul
Commissioner Malek

Staff Present

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

Commissioners Absent

Chair Montero
Commissioner Lin

CALL TO ORDER

Vice Chair Mork 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: Vice Chair Mork and Commissioners Craft, Davis, Maul and Malek. Chair Montero and Commissioner Lin were absent.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was accepted as presented.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of January 17, 2019 were approved as amended.

GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

Vice Chair Mork reviewed the rules and procedures for public comment and then invited comments from the audience. No one indicated a desire to participate during this portion of the meeting.

STUDY ITEM: DRAFT 2019 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN DOCKET

Mr. Szafran reviewed that the State Growth Management Act (GMA) limits review of proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendments to no more than once a year. To ensure the public can view the proposals within a Citywide context, the GMA directs cities to create a docket or list of the amendments that may be considered in the “once a year” review process. There are four proposed amendments on the 2019 docket (Attachment A). He explained that anyone can propose an amendment for the docket, which is simply a list of the proposed amendments collected during 2018. Items on the docket have not been analyzed or evaluated. The purpose of the study session is for staff to introduce the proposed amendments and for the Commission to forward a recommendation to the City Council on whether each of the amendments should be included on the docket for consideration in 2019. The City Council will ultimately decide which amendments will be included on the docket. Items on the final docket will be brought back to the Commission later in the year for discussion, a public hearing, and a recommendation to the City Council. The City Council will make the final decision. He reviewed each of the amendments as follows:

- **Proposed Amendment 1.** *Consider amendments to the Comprehensive Plan related to the 145th Street annexation, including amendments for all applicable maps.* This amendment has been carried over on every docket since 2015. The annexation of 145th Street is no longer an active discussion with the City. Since the process of Seattle de-annexing the street and the City of Shoreline annexing the Street could take years, there is no rush or reason to keep this amendment on the docket at this time. Staff recommends it not be placed on the 2019 Docket.
- **Proposed Amendment 2.** *Consider amendments to the Point Wells Subarea Plan and other elements of the Comprehensive Plan that may have applicability to reflect the outcomes of the Richmond Beach Traffic Corridor.* This amendment has to do with the Richmond Beach Transportation Corridor Study as described in Policy PW-9 in the Point Wells Subarea Plan. The amendment was first proposed in 2013 and has been carried over every year since. The City anticipated that the corridor study would be completed before now, but the future of BSRE’s Urban Center Development is in question, as the applications were terminated by the Snohomish County Hearing Examiner and affirmed by the Snohomish County Council without further environmental review. As it currently stands, there are no active development permits under review in Snohomish County, and staff believes it is unnecessary to include the amendment on the 2019 Docket. If any new applications were to come on line, the amendment could easily be added back on the docket. Staff is recommending it not be placed on the 2019 Docket.
- **Proposed Amendment 3.** *Change the land use designation and zoning of two parcels at 1510 and 1517 NE 170th Street.* This is a privately-initiated amendment that seeks to change the land use for the two parcels from Medium-Density Residential (MDR) to Mixed-Use 2 (MU-2) and the zoning from Residential 8 (R-8) to Community Business (CB). The applicant is seeking to align the land use designation and zoning with the existing use of the subject parcels. The current MDR land use designation allows both R-8 or R-12 zoning, but the current use on the subject parcels would not be allowed in either of those zoning types. Properties to the west of the subject parcels are designated as CB, and the properties to the east as MDR. Properties further east beyond the MDR designation, are designated as Low-Density Residential (LDR). The LDR properties are currently zoned R-8 and R-6. He shared photographs to illustrate the existing development on

surrounding properties. Staff recommends that the amendment be added to the 2019 Comprehensive Plan Docket.

- **Proposed Amendment 4. Amend Natural Environment Goal NE-V.** This privately-initiated amendment is in response to recent reports showing the consequences of allowing global warming to increase higher than 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels. The City signed a joint letter in 2014 committing to greenhouse gas reduction goals contained in the King County Cities Climate Collaboration Document. In addition, the City's Climate Action Plan has a goal of limiting greenhouse gas emissions to 2°C of global warming above pre-industrial levels. The proposed amendment seeks to update and make consistent the City's emission goals with those adopted through the Paris Agreement. Staff recommends that this amendment be added to the 2019 Docket.

Mr. Szafran summarized that staff does not recommend including Amendments 1 and 2 and recommends including Amendments 3 and 4 on the draft docket. Amendments 1 and 2 are no longer necessary as described in the Staff Report. Staff does recommend including Amendment 3. However, as a privately-initiated amendment, the applicant will be responsible for the cost of staff time, and the resolution of this code enforcement issue has already been identified as part of the staff's work load. Although staff hasn't completed analysis for Amendment 4, it does appear to align with the City's Climate Action Plan and Sustainability Goals. Staff does not anticipate the amendment will consume additional staff resources to process.

Mr. Szafran invited the Commission to make a recommendation to the City Council on which proposed amendments should be included on the 2019 Final Comprehensive Plan Amendment Docket. The City Council will discuss the Commission's recommendation on March 18th and establish the final docket on April 1st. He emphasized that the docketing process should not be construed as approval or denial of any of the amendments. The Commission is simply being asked to make a recommendation on which amendments should be studied in 2019. It is only after the final docket has been established that the amendments will be studied, analyzed and considered for potential adoption by the end of 2019.

Commissioner Craft asked staff to clarify the code enforcement component of Amendment 3. Mr. Cohen explained that the City issued a code enforcement violation to the property owners regarding the current use of the property, giving them three options for resolution. One option was to apply for a Comprehensive Plan amendment and rezone. The other options included removing the use from the property or reducing the use of the space to comply with the home occupancy standards.

Lee Keim, Shoreline, said she has lived in the Briercrest Neighborhood for 30 years and was present to comment on Proposed Amendment 4. As a college freshman in 1970 (the year of the very first Earth Day), she learned about ecosystems and the importance of protecting the environment. The things she learned have informed her activities since that time. There has been tremendous progress in environmental safeguards since 1970, but we have not prepared ourselves for the greatest threat our world faces today, which is global warming and climate change.

Ms. Keim pointed out that the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change Report to the United Nations, as required in the Paris Agreement, highlights the consequences of allowing global warming annual average temperatures to increase higher than 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels. The report warns that, at

the current rate of global warming, the earth is likely to reach this level in the next 12 to 30 years. The report also indicates that allowing global warming to rise 2°C will risk the health, livelihood, food security, water supply, and personal and economic security of generations to come. This possible scenario is so alarming to her that she feels compelled to speak out. It is unimaginable that leaders would not do everything they could to prevent these catastrophes.

Ms. Keim advised that the Natural Environment Element of the City's Comprehensive Plan contains "*goals and policies necessary to support the City's responsibility for protection of the natural environment.*" Her proposal adds a specific and quantifiable limit to the greenhouse gas emissions in the City. She expressed her belief that this commitment will resonate with the residents of the City, and the City will be acknowledging the most current scientific facts and stating clearly that it will act to avoid the most devastating impacts of climate change for future generations. She asked that the Commission recommend Amendment 4 for the 2019 Comprehensive Plan Amendment Docket.

Justin Sakounthong, Shoreline, said he and his wife moved to their home on 15th Avenue NE in 2015 with the hopes of starting their family. They chose the neighborhood because of the convenient retail opportunities to the north. While he enjoys watching people walk to the businesses, he is concerned that the street is not designed to accommodate the higher level of traffic associated with the MU-2 land use designation and CB zoning. Currently, 15th Avenue NE feels like a neighborhood street, and rezoning the property would change that forever. If the current business on the subject parcels moves away, the proposed CB zoning would allow a variety of uses. He does not want to jeopardize the neighborhood's character and safety.

Mark Rettmann, Shoreline, said he was present to speak on behalf of the Save Shoreline Neighborhoods Group. He said he currently lives directly adjacent to the parcels that are the subject of Amendment 3. He asked the Commissioners how they would like to have residential properties next to their homes and for their neighborhoods to be permanently rezoned to allow any type of business. He asked how they would like all of the associated traffic, noise, odor, air quality, light, glare, toxic and hazardous chemical exposures, visual and other environmental impacts, increased risk of fire and explosion, social justice impacts, and many more dropped on their doorstep. He said that is what the residents on or near NE 170th Street face if Amendment 3 is approved.

Mr. Rettmann suggested that the Commission consider the proposed amendment from both a short and long-term perspective. According to the City's Comprehensive Plan, over 19% of the City's land area is available for commercial business. He said the Save Shoreline Neighborhoods Group is comprised of more than 60 neighbors, citizens and voters, as well as the North City Neighborhood Association. The group was able to identify many opposing residents by one morning's walk of a small area of the neighborhood. They will continue public outreach and anticipate many more opponents if the amendment goes forward to the City Council. Not everyone was able to attend the meeting for a variety of reasons, and he and his wife had to miss their son's music concert in order to attend the meeting and defend and save their neighborhood. He asked those in the audience who oppose the rezone to stand up or raise their hand. He summarized that he submitted written comments on behalf of the group, and the City received a number of additional comments that were not associated with the group. All of the comments demonstrate why Proposed Amendment 3 must be rejected. They need to keep the residential neighborhoods residential.

Mr. Rettmann summarized that there is absolutely no merit to the proposal, as it would only benefit one company that was caught violating laws continuously, as they have been illegally operating a business on one residential parcel for at least 11 years and recently started a commercial business on a second residential parcel. The neighbors did not know that the property was not zoned to allow commercial business uses. However, the applicant cannot claim ignorance or that they didn't know, as they should be well versed in codes and laws if they follow them for their construction projects. Furthermore, the applicant has the audacity to protest the rezone fee and ask that the City process the amendment application for free, at the taxpayer's expense. The amendment has been proposed to fix the position the applicants (Irons Brothers Construction) put themselves in by the illegal activities on residential properties.

Mr. Rettmann asked that the City enforce the existing zoning laws and hold violators accountable. He cautioned against setting a precedent of changing the rules for all future violators. All of the proposal materials thus far demonstrate misrepresentations and inaccuracies of what the applicant has done and is doing, what the community likes, and what they think will benefit the community. He questioned why the neighborhood should be impacted by the applicant's ongoing, willful, illegal actions. He urged the Commission to keep the neighborhood residential. Based on his information, there are only two options for code enforcement on the subject parcels, the proposed amendment and rezone or compliance with current zoning. The amendment would be a permanent change that adversely affects the neighborhood forever. It would allow any business, including marijuana shops, gas stations, utility yards, night clubs, motels, car rentals, repair shops and mega condominiums. All of these uses would have significant adverse impacts and residents do not want them. Don't hurt the good of the many law-abiding neighbors for the benefit of one business that seeks to continue their illegal operations. He asked that they reject the proposal.

Kristy Rettman, Shoreline, said she has lived on NE 170th Street since 2008 and is opposed to Amendment 3. The City recognizes that the applicants have been operating a business (Irons Brothers Construction) out of an office that was converted from two apartments since 2004, yet they have been allowed to continue to do so for 15 years. Regardless of what the applicants say, if Amendment 3 is approved, nothing would stop them from applying for a permit to develop the property for any use allowed in the CB zone. If the property is sold, a developer could aggregate lots and construct a large commercial building or large apartment building. She urged the Commission to think about all future development possibilities when making a decision on a permanent rezone of residential lots. She said she likes small community businesses, but they should not be allowed to encroach into peaceful residential neighborhoods simply because they have overgrown their current location and it is easier to ask for a rezone than to relocate. She believes, as do most of the residents she has recently talked to, that community businesses that grow as large as Irons Brothers Construction should move to an appropriate commercial zone and not take away residential lots. She concluded that the noise, congestion and environmental impacts of the growing business are incompatible with a peaceful street. She asked that the Commission reject the rezone application and propose another appropriate solution other than a permanent loss of residential property.

Kimberly Steele, Shoreline, said she has been a resident of Shoreline for over 20 years and currently operates an in-home childcare business. She has been involved in the community as she raised her own children and as she serves the children in her care. She voiced concern that if Amendment 3 is approved,

4a. Draft Minutes from Thursday, February 7, 2019

future use of the property could greatly affect the neighborhood families and children in various ways. She voiced opposition to Amendment 3.

Brian Ellsworth, Shoreline, said he has lived in the neighborhood near NE 170th Street since 1997 and owns the first R-6 zoned lot east of the buffer zone (R-8). He commented that regardless of the intentions of the current landowners, he is concerned about the finality of rezoning the properties to CB. Given what is already taking place in the area, the proposed rezone would open the potential to create a huge parcel (57,000 square feet) for sale and redevelopment. He pointed out that a 240-unit apartment complex is currently being developed across from Safeway, and the neighborhood is already nervous about impacts associated with parking, speeding, and traffic in general. If approved, the rezone would allow the current owners to sell the properties so they can be aggregated with others and redeveloped.

Synth Hoffman, Shoreline, said he is a resident of Seattle and operated a small business on NE 170th Street until 2012 when he was told he would no longer be able to operate a commercial use on the site. At the time, he was given numerous reasons why, including environmental impacts and traffic congestion. Allowing Irons Brothers Construction to change the zoning brings up the question of what will become of 15th Avenue NE and how commercial it will become. The residential property owners want to keep their small community intact. If the current wastewater site changes, there will be a variety of new possibilities. If the rezone proposed in Amendment 3 is approved it will take away from what Shoreline has been able to hold onto for so long.

Allison Sakounthong, Shoreline, said she and her husband previously lived in Seattle, but decided to move to Shoreline because it was more affordable and they liked the small community feel and less traffic. She is worried that Amendment 3 would end up creating the same craziness they moved away from in Seattle. She suggested that rather than rezoning the subject parcels to allow Irons Brothers Construction to expand, a better option would be for them to relocate to somewhere more appropriate. She said she is opposed to proposed Amendment 3.

Kelly Martinez, Shoreline, read a letter into the record on behalf of her neighbor, Ramona Curtis, who has lived on NE 170th Street for 30 years. Ms. Curtis' letter voiced opposition to the proposed rezone on NE 170th Street (Amendment 3). She has good neighbors who talk, share, work and play together. She would like the neighborhood to stay as it is. She understands that growth is necessary, but not in the residential neighborhoods. In some of the applicants' information, they talk about what good neighbors are. However, it is important to understand that they are not neighbors and do not live in the neighborhood. They run a business from a lot that is zoned R-8. When the applicants purchased the property in 2005, it was not zoned for business. However, the City issued a variance that allowed the business to continue. This was the first step in changing the neighborhood. Now the applicants have purchased property across the street, also zoned R-8 and started to expand their business. They are out of compliance and behaving like they can break the rules and then have the City change the zoning so their use is in compliance. If the applicants' business is so successful, perhaps they need to find another location that is currently zoned for the purposes of their business. The zoning should not be changed to correct the City's map to be consistent with a use that was illegal to begin with.

Julia Boyd, Shoreline, said Iron Brothers Construction did the remodel of her home in the Briercrest Neighborhood before she moved in six years ago. Since that time, they have done a number of smaller

DRAFT

projects for her, as well, and she has found their workmanship, integrity and communication skills to be outstanding. They do a lot of volunteer work in the community, too. She wishes other businesses would follow their model. She is in favor of Amendment 3 so the applicant's business can remain on the site and continue to be an asset to the community.

Cody Ross, Lake Forest Park, said he is an employee of Irons Brothers Construction and grew up in Shoreline before serving 10 years in the Marine Corps. One of the main reasons he works for Irons Brothers Construction is because of their continued community service (Rampathon, Painting a Better Tomorrow, Shoreline Earth Day, etc.). He would like the business to continue to operate in its current location. While he understands the neighbors' concerns, the impacts will not be as grave as they make it sound.

Matt Behring, Shoreline, said he lives in Shoreline and has worked at Irons Brothers Construction for three years. He has not worked for anyone more principled or honest than the Irons Brothers Family. They frequently give back to the community, and one example is the bird houses they help kids build at the arts festival. Their service enriches the community in wonderful ways. A decision to not even study Amendment 3 would be a disservice to a company that is trying to do all the right things.

Yoshiko Saheki, Shoreline, expressed very strong opposition to Amendment 3. She recalled that the City recently upzoned her Parkwood Neighborhood saying that it would benefit the future of Shoreline. The Planning Commission and City Council paid little or no attention to the compromises she proposed to the MUR-45' zone so that she could keep her forever home. In the end, in order to live in a more traditional neighborhood, she was forced to relocate to another home. She studied the zoning map prior to purchasing her current home in North City, which is about two blocks away from the subject parcel of Amendment 3. She voiced concern that the proposed amendment could be the start of "upzoning creep," and owners of adjacent parcels will ask for the same.

Ms. Saheki explained that the current R-8 zoning serves as a transition between the businesses along 15th Avenue NE and the R-6 homes to the east, and that is how zoning should work. She vehemently disagrees with the Staff Report that states that the proposed rezone would not be materially detrimental. To the contrary, reducing the transition would be most detrimental and the rezone has absolutely no merit or value to the surrounding R-6 neighborhood. If the applicants are such good neighbors, they would not ignore City code and run a business in a residential neighborhood. In fact, if they can ignore City code, she is wondering if she should have just ignored the MUR-45' rezone and done as she pleased to her home in Parkwood. If the amendment goes through, the best she can hope for is that she can sell what was to be her new forever home for what it cost her to move and remodel. In that case, she will never buy another home in Shoreline because the zoning maps cannot be trusted.

Michelle Chiu, Shoreline, said she was present to discuss Amendment 3 from both a legal and urban planning perspective. According to a Washington State case in 1983, the proposed amendment can potentially be considered "spot zoning," which refers to singling out a larger area or district surrounded by zoning of other kinds of land uses that are inconsistent with the classification of the area. In addition, the proposed amendment is the antithesis of urban planning because it is not consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. According to the Comprehensive Plan that was adopted in 2001, all the commercial activities were planned to the north of NE 172nd Street. The subject parcels are located south on NE 170th

4a. Draft Minutes from Thursday, February 7, 2019

Street. She expressed opposition to proposed Amendment 3 and encouraged the Planning Commission to consider the legality of the amendment, together with its potential impacts to long-term urban planning.

Joseph Irons, Shoreline, said he lives in the Parkwood Neighborhood and also considers himself a resident of North City. He commented that not all of the information provided by previous speakers is true. He said Irons Brothers Construction is a proud member of the community and works hard to do philanthropy to benefit the local citizens. For example, they provide the materials and labor to bring birdhouses to kids at the arts festival and build ramps for Shoreline families at no cost. They have worked hard to give back to the community. A lot of people have voiced concern about what could potentially happen if the property is rezoned, but that is not his intent. They never operated with the intention of not following the rules, and when they learned they were not allowed to operate the business in its current location, they requested a waiver because the \$26,000 application fee is a huge hardship for his business and family. Consulting fees would result in additional costs. Regarding the comment that, as a construction company, he should have known the rules, he noted that Irons Brothers Construction does remodeling, which doesn't involve zoning issues.

Mr. Irons pointed out that a dance studio was operating on the subject parcel until the night before he closed on the purchase. The property has been operating as a business as long as he has owned it, and he thought they were getting all of the necessary permits and operating according to code. The only complaint he knew about was related to parking, and it was resolved quickly. He said he doesn't want to change anything with his business. He applied for Amendment 3 after learning from the City that his business simply outgrew what is allowed in the current zone. They were advised that the next step would be to either relocate the business or request an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan and zoning. They don't want to move the business out of Shoreline. They want to be good neighbors and community members.

Venetia Irons, Shoreline, said her parents do not want to move their business because they love Shoreline. They are very happy with the business and it is part of their family and life. They also contribute to the Shoreline Arts Festival, Painting a Better Tomorrow, Rampathon, Earth Day and more. They are very nice to their customers and they love the neighbors.

Mark Rettmann, Shoreline, noted that according to the Comprehensive Plan, over 19% of Shoreline is already available for commercial business uses, and a good community member would move into appropriate zoning to run their business. A lot of community events are good tax write-offs. He said he purchased his home next to the subject parcels to raise his family, and he has been working hard with his neighbors to protect and save their neighborhood. They want to live in a neighborhood and not in a commercial business zone. His family and neighborhood should not be impacted to fix the applicants' legality problems and violations that they created themselves. Other businesses have to follow the rules, and the applicant should not get special treatment for not following the rules. He emphasized that the change proposed in Amendment 3 would be permanent and allow many different business uses that are incompatible with residential neighborhoods. All these businesses bring impacts to neighborhoods, including traffic, noise, odor, air quality, light glare, invasion of privacy by existing security cameras filming his back yard and children without consent, increased risk of fire explosion, social justice issues, decreased property values and demand, etc.

4a. Draft Minutes from Thursday, February 7, 2019

Ramona Curtis, Shoreline, said she has lived on NE 170th Street for 30 years. She suggested the issue is not whether or not Irons Brothers Construction is a good company. They do wonderful work. But the Commission must consider that the properties are part of a neighborhood that is zoned R-8. They want to keep it that way.

Vice Chair Mork explained that, at this time, the Commission is not being asked to make a recommendation to either approve or deny the amendments. The Commission's recommendation should be whether or not to include the amendments on the 2019 Docket for further study.

Commissioner Davis thanked those who attended the meeting and provided testimony. It shows the Commission that the residents of Shoreline are active, good citizens who care about where they live. Vice Chair Mork concurred.

COMMISSIONER MAUL MOVED THAT COMMISSION FORWARD A RECOMMENDATION TO THE CITY COUNCIL THAT AMENDMENTS 3 AND 4 BE INCLUDED ON THE 2019 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT DOCKET FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION. COMMISSIONER MALEK SECONDED THE MOTION.

Commissioner Maul pointed out that the City Council will make the final decision about which amendments are included on the final docket. He said he has some reservations about Amendment 3, but it is worth a greater discussion. Commissioner Malek agreed. He believes the testimony that Irons Brothers Construction is a great company, but if the zoning is changed, the company could move and another business could locate there. He is concerned about how a future business could impact the neighborhood. He is also concerned about "spot zoning." He thanked all those who provided heartfelt and well-thought-out comments both in favor and in opposition to Amendment 3. He agreed that Amendment 3 should be included on the docket for further discussion.

Commissioner Davis said she is unsure whether Amendment 3 should be included on the 2019 Docket. The main convincing arguments favor the opposing side, and she is not sure it is worth including the amendment on the docket. Zoning is usually addressed on a much bigger scale, and it doesn't seem right to consider such a small-scale rezone.

Vice Chair Mork also thanked Ms. Keim for proposing and speaking in favor of Amendment 4, which would amend Natural Environment Goal NE-V.

Commissioner Malek asked what would happen to Amendment 3 if the Commission votes to not include it on the 2019 Docket. Assistant City Attorney Ainsworth-Taylor clarified that the Commission is simply making a recommendation to the City Council. The City Council will consider their recommendation when making the final decision about which items to include on the 2019 Docket.

THE MOTION CARRIED 3-1, WITH COMMISSIONERS MALEK, MAUL AND MORK VOTING IN FAVOR AND COMMISSIONER DAVIS VOTING IN OPPOSITION. (COMMISSIONER CRAFT WAS NOT PRESENT FOR THE VOTE.)

DRAFT

Assistant City Attorney Ainsworth-Taylor advised that the Commission's recommendation regarding the 2019 Comprehensive Plan Amendment Docket will go before the City Council for discussion on March 18th. At that time, the Council will set the final docket. Each of the amendments on the docket will come back to the Planning Commission for review and study, a public hearing and a recommendation to the City Council by about September. The Commission's recommendation will be presented to the City Council, who will also study the issue and conduct a public hearing prior to making a final decision in December. Mr. Szafran reminded the public that they could sign up on the City's website to receive notification of future meetings.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

There was no Director's Report.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

There was no unfinished business.

NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONERS/ANNOUNCEMENTS

Vice Chair Mork reported that the subcommittee met to review the Commission's By-Laws, and they are working to draft some minor changes.

AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING

Mr. Cohen advised that staff will present the proposed Shoreline Master Program (SMP) amendments on February 21st. Mr. Szafran said the agenda will also include a public hearing on a proposed code amendment related to plat alterations.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:02 p.m.

Laura Mork
Vice Chair, Planning Commission

Carla Hoekzema
Clerk, Planning Commission