

DRAFT



## City of Santa Barbara Planning Division

### PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

April 10, 2014

#### CALL TO ORDER:

Chair Schwartz called the meeting to order at 1:00 P.M.

#### **I. ROLL CALL**

Chair Deborah L. Schwartz, Vice Chair Addison Thompson, Commissioners John P. Campanella, Mike Jordan, and June Pujo.

**Absent: Commissioners Bartlett and Lodge**

#### **STAFF PRESENT:**

John Ledbetter, Principal Planner  
 Renee Brooke, Senior Planner  
 N. Scott Vincent, Assistant City Attorney  
 Barbara Shelton, Project Planner/Environmental Analyst  
 Elizabeth Limon, Project Planner  
 Allison De Busk, Project Planner  
 Julie Rodriguez, Planning Commission Secretary

#### **II. PRELIMINARY MATTERS:**

A. Requests for continuances, withdrawals, postponements, or addition of ex-agenda items.

None.

B. Announcements and appeals.

None.

C. Comments from members of the public pertaining to items not on this agenda.

Chair Schwartz opened the public hearing at 1:01 P.M. and, with no one wishing to speak, closed the hearing.

III. **NEW ITEM:**

**ACTUAL TIME: 1:01 P.M.**

**APPLICATION OF ROBERT PESTER, ARCHITECT FOR STONE 2000 FAMILY TRUST, 296 SCHULTE LANE, APN 055-230-004, A-1 ONE-FAMILY RESIDENCE ZONE, GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL, (MST2013-00406)**

The proposed project involves relocating the previously approved grading envelope on property located at 296 Schulte Lane. The subject property was created as part of the five-lot subdivision of 3688 Foothill Road, which was approved by the Planning Commission on May 7, 1992. The project site is 2.2 acres and is currently vacant. The previously approved grading envelope is proposed to be relocated from the area of the existing orchard (formerly the tennis court and surrounding area) to an area immediately north of the previously approved grading envelope. The intent in relocating the grading envelope is to construct a new single-family residence while maintaining the existing orchard. The proposed grading envelope would have a slope of 29%.

The discretionary action required for this project is an Amendment to the conditions of approval and previously approved grading envelope for Lot 4 (296 Schulte Lane) of the subdivision of 3688 Foothill Road, as approved by Planning Commission Resolution 015-92 and shown on the approved Tentative Subdivision Map.

An Addendum to the Negative Declaration adopted for the original subdivision has been prepared and the Planning Commission considered the Addendum with the Negative Declaration prior to making a decision on the project pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines Section 15164.

Case Planner: Allison De Busk, Project Planner

Email: ADeBusk@SantaBarbaraCA.gov Phone: (805) 564-5470, ext. 4552.

Allison De Busk, Project Planner, gave the Staff presentation.

Clay Aurell, AB Design Studio, Inc., gave the Applicant presentation. Bret Stone, homeowner, and Robert Pester, AB Design Studio, were available to answer any of the Commission's questions. Mr. Aurell submitted three letters of support from neighbors George and Elaine Kitagawa, Don Galloway, and Amy Tracewell.

Chair Schwartz opened the public hearing at 1:11 P.M., and with no one wishing to speak, the public hearing was closed.

**MOTION: Thompson/Jordan**

**Assigned Resolution No. 009-14**

Approved the project, making the findings for the Amendment outlined in the Staff Report, dated April 3, 2014, subject to the Revised Conditions of Approval distributed at the hearing.

Commissioner Pujo asked the motion maker to consider adding the following conditions:

1. Minimize grading such that it is not substantially more than what was approved for the original grading.
2. Retain the orchard to the extent feasible, and include it on the approved Landscape Plan so that any changes require approval by the Single Family Design Board.
3. Lighting shall not be directed toward the creek or riparian area. This is in addition to the standard lighting condition contained within condition II.A.4. of the original PC Resolution No. 015-92.

Chair Schwartz concurred with the request for added conditions. However, the motion makers declined the requested additions.

Commissioners Thompson and Jordan stated that the Single Family Design Board could apply the Single Family Residence Design Guidelines and Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to adequately cover the proposed added conditions.

This motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 4 Noes: 1 (Pujo) Abstain: 0 Absent: 2 (Bartlett, Lodge)

Chair Schwartz announced the ten calendar day appeal period.

Chair Schwartz announced a recess at 2:00P.M. and reconvened the meeting at 2:11 P.M.

#### **IV. DISCUSSION ITEM**

**ACTUAL TIME: 2:11 P.M.**

#### **LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAM (LCP) UPDATE**

Staff will provide an overview of the LCP Update Work Program. This initial presentation will focus on timing and coordination with Coastal Commission staff, and significant work program assumptions regarding the scope of work, including in-progress reviews by the Planning Commission, Harbor Commission and Parks & Recreation Commission.

Case Planners: John Ledbetter, Principal Planner; and Elizabeth Limón, Project Planner  
Email: JLedbetter@SantaBarbaraCA.gov Phone: (805) 897-2569  
ELimon@SantaBarbaraCA.gov Phone: (805) 564-5470, ext. 4569

Elizabeth Limón, Project Planner, gave the Staff presentation joined by John Ledbetter, Principal Planner.

The discussion was interactive between the Commission and Staff over topics that included, but was not limited to the Climate Action Plan, Local Coastal Programs throughout the state, and the potential for suggesting changes to the defined Coastal Zone Boundary.

Commissioner Jordan suggested that the public outreach and education component include some economic descriptors, such as potential impacts of sea level rise to tourism, beach recreation, commercial fishing industry, etc. Staff responded that the current budget does not allow for such an economic analysis, but staff can reference other studies. The Commission acknowledged the budget constraint and encouraged Staff to include reference to any economic studies available.

The Commission was appreciative of Staff's update and looked forward to future reviews as the LCP Update Work Program continues.

**V. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA**

**ACTUAL TIME: 3:24 P.M.**

**A. Committee and Liaison Reports.**

**1. Staff Hearing Officer Liaison Report**

Commissioner Jordan reported on the Staff Hearing Officer meeting held April 2, 2014.

**2. Other Committee and Liaison Reports**

a. Commissioners Pujo and Campanella reported on the Sustainability Committee meeting they attended earlier in the day.

b. Commissioner Thompson reported on the Single Family Design Board meeting of April 7, 2014.

c. Commissioner Thompson reported on the Historic Landmarks Committee meeting of April 9, 2014.

d. Commissioner Campanella reported on the Downtown Parking Committee meeting held earlier in the day.

e. Commissioner Campanella gave insight to next week's Architectural Board of Review meeting. Senior Planner Renee Brooke gave additional comments.

**3. Report from the Chair.**

a. The Natural History Museum will hold a community forum on the Museum Master Plan today from 7:00 P.M. - 8:30 P.M.

b. Chair Schwartz announced the tentative agenda for the next Planning Commission meeting on April 17, 2014.

- c. Commissioners Pujo, Campanella and Schwartz have been working on the Zoning Information Reports subcommittee and provided an update on progress made.

**VI. ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Schwartz adjourned the meeting at 3:38 P.M.

Submitted by,

---

Julie Rodriguez, Planning Commission Secretary

DRAFT





# City of Santa Barbara California

## CITY OF SANTA BARBARA PLANNING COMMISSION

### RESOLUTION NO. 009-14

#### 296 SCHULTE LANE

AMENDMENT TO CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR 3688 FOOTHILL ROAD,  
AS OUTLINED IN PLANNING COMMISSION RESOLUTION NO. 015-92 FOR LOT FOUR OF THE SUBDIVISION  
APRIL 10, 2014

**APPLICATION OF REBERT PESTER, ARCHITECT FOR STONE 2000 FAMILY TRUST, 296 SCHULTE LANE, APN 055-230-004, A-1 ONE-FAMILY RESIDENCE ZONE, GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL, (MST2013-00406)**

The proposed project involves relocating the previously approved grading envelope on property located at 296 Schulte Lane. The subject property was created as part of the five-lot subdivision of 3688 Foothill Road, which was approved by the Planning Commission on May 7, 1992. The project site is 2.2 acres and is currently vacant. The previously approved grading envelope is proposed to be relocated from the area of the existing orchard (formerly the tennis court and surrounding area) to an area immediately north of the previously approved grading envelope. The intent in relocating the grading envelope is to construct a new single-family residence while maintaining the existing orchard. The proposed grading envelope would have a slope of 29%.

The discretionary action required for this project is an Amendment to the conditions of approval and previously approved grading envelope for Lot 4 (296 Schulte Lane) of the subdivision of 3688 Foothill Road, as approved by Planning Commission Resolution 015-92 and shown on the approved Tentative Subdivision Map.

An Addendum to the Negative Declaration adopted for the original subdivision has been prepared and the Planning Commission considered the Addendum with the Negative Declaration prior to making a decision on the project pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines Section 15164.

**WHEREAS**, the Planning Commission has held the required public hearing on the above application, and the Applicant was present.

**WHEREAS**, no one appeared to speak in favor of the application, and no one appeared to speak in opposition thereto, and the following exhibits were presented for the record:

1. Staff Report with Attachments, April 3 2014.
2. Revised Conditions of Approval (Exhibit A), dated April 10, 2014
3. Site Plans
4. Correspondence received in support of the project:
  - a. George and Elaine Kitagawa, Santa Barbara, hand-delivered
  - b. Don Galloway, Santa Barbara, hand-delivered
  - c. Amy Tracewell, Santa Barbara, hand-delivered

**NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** that the City Planning Commission:

I. Approved the subject application making the following findings and determinations:

**A. ENVIRONMENTAL FINDINGS**

The Planning Commission has considered the Addendum dated March 18, 2014 with the Negative Declaration approved by the Planning Commission on May 7, 1992 (SB-150-91) prior to making a decision on the project. Together they are determined to be adequate to serve as the environmental documentation for this project and satisfy all the requirements of CEQA. The Planning Commission has determined that no subsequent ND is required pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162 and 15614 because:

1. Project changes do not require major revisions of the previous ND because there are no new significant environmental effects and there is no increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects, as identified in the Addendum.
2. There have been no substantial changes with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken; therefore, no major revisions of the ND are required to address new significant environmental effects or an increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects, as identified above.
3. There is no new information of substantial importance that shows that the project will have any significant effects not discussed in the ND or that significant effects previously examined will be more severe than shown in the ND. The project proponent has not declined to adopt any identified mitigation measures or alternatives.

**B. GENERAL FINDINGS**

The findings to support approval of the Tentative Map for the subdivision of 3688 Foothill Road, which were made by the Planning Commission on May 7, 1992 in Resolution No. 015-92, can still be made recognizing the relocation of the Lot 4 grading envelope. The grading envelope relocation is consistent with the findings for approval of the original Tentative Map. The project is consistent with the City's Zoning Ordinance and General Plan, as outlined in Section VI of the staff report. The site is physically suitable for the proposed development and the design of the project is consistent with the surrounding neighborhood, will not cause substantial environmental damage and will not cause serious health problems, as discussed in Sections VII and VII of the staff report. The associated conditions of approval, as outlined in Resolution No. 015-92, are hereby amended to reflect relocation of said grading envelope.

II. Said approval is subject to the following conditions:

**A. Order of Development.** In order to accomplish the proposed development, the following steps shall occur in the order identified:

1. Pay Land Development Team Recovery Fee (30% of all planning fees, as calculated by staff) at time of building permit application.
2. Record any required documents (see Recorded Conditions Agreement section below) prior to issuance of a building permit.

- B. **Recorded Conditions Agreement.** Prior to issuance of a building permit on the Real Property, the Owner shall execute a *written instrument*, which shall be prepared by Planning staff, reviewed as to form and content by the City Attorney, Community Development Director and Public Works Director, recorded in the Office of the County Recorder, and shall include the following:
1. **Approved Development.** The development of the Real Property approved by the Planning Commission on April 10, 2014 is limited to a revision to the previously approved grading envelope on Lot 4 of the 5-lot subdivision of 3688 Foothill Road, which was approved by the Planning Commission on May 7, 1992 (Resolution No. 015-92). The previously approved grading envelope shall be relocated from the area of the existing orchard (formerly the tennis court and surrounding area) to an area immediately north of the previously approved grading envelope. The intent in relocating the grading envelope is to construct a new single-family residence while maintaining the existing orchard, as shown on the plans signed by the chairperson of the Planning Commission on said date and on file at the City of Santa Barbara.
  2. **Development Rights Restrictions.** The owner shall limit the location of buildings, structures and habitable space to within the identified grading envelope, as shown on the approved plans. The Owner shall continue to be responsible for (i) maintenance of the entire parcel, and (ii) compliance with orders of the Fire Department. The approved grading envelope shall be shown on the construction plans for the residence on the Real Property.
  3. **Recreational Vehicle Storage Limitation.** No recreational vehicles, boats, or trailers shall be stored on the Real Property unless enclosed or concealed from view as approved by the Single Family Design Board (SFDB).
  4. **Storm Water Pollution Control and Drainage Systems Maintenance.** Owner shall maintain the drainage system and storm water pollution control devices in a functioning state. Should any of the project's surface or subsurface drainage structures or storm water pollution control methods fail to capture, infiltrate, and/or treat water, or result in increased erosion, the Owner shall be responsible for any necessary repairs to the system and restoration of the eroded area. Should repairs or restoration become necessary, prior to the commencement of such repair or restoration work, the Owner shall submit a repair and restoration plan to the Community Development Director to determine if an amendment or a new Building Permit is required to authorize such work. The Owner is responsible for the adequacy of any project-related drainage facilities and for the continued maintenance thereof in a manner that will preclude any hazard to life, health, or damage to the Real Property or any adjoining property.
  5. **Pesticide or Fertilizer Usage Near Creeks.** The use of pesticides or synthetic fertilizer shall be prohibited outside the grading envelope, as it drains into Creek 139, which is a tributary to Barger Creek.
  6. **Geotechnical Liability Limitation.** The Owner understands and is advised that the site may be subject to extraordinary hazards from landslides, erosion, retreat, settlement, or subsidence and assumes liability for such hazards. The Owner unconditionally waives any present, future, and unforeseen claims of liability on the part of the City arising from

the aforementioned or other natural hazards and relating to this permit approval, as a condition of this approval.

**C. General Condition.**

1. **Prior Conditions.** These conditions are in addition to the conditions identified in Planning Commission Resolution 015-92.

**D. Litigation Indemnification Agreement.** In the event the Planning Commission approval of the Project is appealed to the City Council, Applicant/Owner hereby agrees to defend the City, its officers, employees, agents, consultants and independent contractors ("City's Agents") from any third party legal challenge to the City Council's denial of the appeal and approval of the Project, including, but not limited to, challenges filed pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (collectively "Claims"). Applicant/Owner further agrees to indemnify and hold harmless the City and the City's Agents from any award of attorney fees or court costs made in connection with any Claim.

Applicant/Owner shall execute a written agreement, in a form approved by the City Attorney, evidencing the foregoing commitments of defense and indemnification within thirty (30) days of being notified of a lawsuit regarding the Project. These commitments of defense and indemnification are material conditions of the approval of the Project. If Applicant/Owner fails to execute the required defense and indemnification agreement within the time allotted, the Project approval shall become null and void absent subsequent acceptance of the agreement by the City, which acceptance shall be within the City's sole and absolute discretion. Nothing contained in this condition shall prevent the City or the City's Agents from independently defending any Claim. If the City or the City's Agents decide to independently defend a Claim, the City and the City's Agents shall bear their own attorney fees, expenses, and costs of that independent defense.

This motion was passed and adopted on the 10th day of April, 2014 by the Planning Commission of the City of Santa Barbara, by the following vote:

AYES: 4 NOES: 1 (Pujo) ABSTAIN: 0 ABSENT: 2 (Bartlett, Lodge)

I hereby certify that this Resolution correctly reflects the action taken by the city of Santa Barbara Planning Commission at its meeting of the above date.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Julie Rodriguez, Planning Commission Secretary

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

**PLEASE BE ADVISED:**

**THIS ACTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION CAN BE APPEALED TO THE CITY COUNCIL WITHIN TEN (10) CALENDAR DAYS AFTER THE DATE THE ACTION WAS TAKEN BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION.**

DRAFT



## City of Santa Barbara Planning Division

### PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

April 17, 2014

#### CALL TO ORDER:

Chair Schwartz called the meeting to order at 1:09 P.M.

#### I. ROLL CALL

Chair Deborah L. Schwartz, Vice Chair Addison Thompson, Commissioners Bruce Bartlett, John P. Campanella, Mike Jordan, and June Pujo.

**Absent: Commissioner Lodge**

#### STAFF PRESENT:

Bettie Weiss, City Planner  
 Danny Kato, Senior Planner  
 Rob Dayton, Principal Transportation Planner  
 Bea Gularte, Project Planner  
 N. Scott Vincent, Assistant City Attorney  
 Julie Rodriguez, Planning Commission Secretary

#### II. PRELIMINARY MATTERS:

A. Action on the review of the following Draft Minutes and Resolutions:

1. Draft Minutes of April 3, 2014
2. Resolution 008-14  
3714 – 3744 State Street

#### MOTION: Thompson/Pujo

Approve the minutes and resolutions as corrected.

This motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 6 Noes: 0 Abstain: As noted. Absent: 1 (Lodge)

B. Requests for continuances, withdrawals, postponements, or addition of ex-agenda items.

None.

C. Announcements and appeals.

Mr. Kato made the following announcements:

1. No appeal was filed for 3714 State Street
2. No appeal was filed for 3744 State Street

D. Comments from members of the public pertaining to items not on this agenda.

Chair Schwartz opened the public hearing at 1:15 P.M.

Ethan Shenkman provided public comments and considerations regarding the Transit Occupancy Tax initiative.

With no one else wishing to speak, the hearing was closed at 1:18 P.M.

**III. DISCUSSION ITEM**

**ACTUAL TIME: 1:18 P.M.**

**NEW ZONING ORDINANCE (NZO)**

Staff will give an overview of the draft Scope of Work for the Request for Proposal (RFP) that will be used to hire a consultant to assist with the development of the New Zoning Ordinance (NZO) effort. Staff requests that the Planning Commission provide input as to the adequacy of the draft Scope of Work and whether any other zoning standards or processes should be included.

The New Zoning Ordinance project will update the Zoning Ordinance, which is contained in Title 28 of the City's Municipal Code. The Zoning Ordinance establishes the zone classifications, permitted uses in the various zones, development standards and regulations, and the development review process for individual lots throughout the City. The zoning regulations affect land use, design, lot size, building heights, density, setbacks, yards, parking, landscaping, fencing and other aspects of property use.

The specific details and recommended direction of zoning standards will be vetted through a public process over the next two years, and additional amendments could be identified through the public process.

Case Planner: Beatriz Gularte, Project Planner  
Email: [Bgularte@SantaBarbaraCA.gov](mailto:Bgularte@SantaBarbaraCA.gov)

Phone: (805) 564-5470, ext. 4556

Beatriz Gularte, Project Planner, gave the Staff presentation.

Chair Schwartz opened the public hearing at 1:39 P.M., and with no one wishing to speak, the public hearing was closed.

Commissioner's Comments:

All Commissioners were supportive of the list included in the Staff Report (Exhibit A) outlining the types of standards and processes to include in the scope of work and that could be amended as part of the NZO effort.

Commissioner Campanella:

- Suggested highlighting more about the General Plan and the basis of sustainability, such as environmental, our resources, social, as well as economic. It would be good to have available throughout the process so that everyone understands the goal we want to have implemented.
- Encouraged adaptive reuse in place. Sustainable neighborhood planning.
- Agreed with scope of work that is included and what is excluded.
- Would like incentive programs that are not being reviewed at this time to be kept in place and utilized as intended with the zoning changes made.
- Appreciated that the policies and implementation actions contained in the General Plan are delineated for the public to see and serve as a reminder of where we want to be.

Commissioner Jordan:

- Include development groups and property managers in the process. They would have economic development input.
- Include prior and current Planning Commissioners and Board Members in the process.
- When reaching out to public groups, set up an outreach environment where people can be candid in expressing their comments.
- Encourages making the administrative process more casual and less onerous, with the appeal process more casual as well.
- Increase technology tools to include something like hyperlinks within the document that links to explanations, examples and graphics when looking at the zoning ordinance online.
- Referenced multigenerational facilities and services as related to secondary dwelling units. Suggested looking at more than one food prep area for separate dwellings to address multigenerational families.
- When looking at encroachments and building setbacks, encourages looking for ways to better handle residential water storage for reuse and home agriculture.

Commissioner Pujo:

- Suggested screening for sustainability practices. Look where there might be opportunities to make small changes such as in energy conservation, water conservation, on site food production, etc.
- Include a definition of 'habitable space'. Many ideas are out there, but no consistency.
- When definitions are reviewed, suggest looking at other ordinance or documents that have similar definition to ensure that they are compatible and consistent.
- Look at how we handle basements, entrances/exits, ventilation, and underground parking.
- This is a perfect opportunity to go 'virtual' with the information produced. Would like the consultant to have strong capabilities and knowledge on compatible programs and web capabilities. Presently the website has too much information to download. Make it easier for the public to search and find.
- Agrees with Commissioner Jordan on streamlining the ordinance and not bulking it up too much. The more you put in the ordinance, the more outdated it becomes.
- Does not believe that graphics have a place in the ordinance, more suited for user manual or hand-out.
- Suggested setting aside some of the budget to look at the ordinance annually in the future instead of having to wait another generation to comprehensively amend it.

Commissioner Bartlett:

- The main priority is to eliminate and reduce the majority of the non-conforming situations that have been created by the evolution of zoning and density. The properties have not changed, only the rules around them.
- Eliminate redundancies, or where things are not in alignment.
- Eliminate carry over ordinances from the 1920's and 30's, such as the street-widening ordinance at State Street and De la Vina.
- Make the ordinance concise and cohesive. This could even help simplify the ZIR issues.

Commissioner Schwartz:

- Set strict timeline with sequencing issues so that as the committee moves forward, you can whittle down the issues and set aside. Recalled that with the General Plan, as Boards and Commissions changed, many issues kept being revisited. The issues should not continue to be brought back for more discussion.

- If there is a nexus with the 22 excluded items from the scope then consider tackling a subset within the next 2-3 years.
- Connect the General Plan principles, goals and policies with the kinds of findings that the Commission has to make in approving projects. For example modern day land use decisions that support sustainability may mean in certain circumstances that the character in a neighborhood may be different. We may need to look differently at character and compatibility as our society and city evolves.
- Strongly urged looking into civic engagement platforms to improve public involvement.

Danny Kato, Senior Planner, thanked the Commission for its encouragement and comments and stated that secondary dwelling units will not be a part of the NZO scoping process because during the General Plan Process, City Council made it clear that secondary dwelling units needed to be done on a neighborhood by neighborhood basis. That is too large a project for what is being undertaken or budgeted.

Mr. Kato also clarified that the NZO budget does not include civic engagement software. In July, Staff will be working on the process of replacing the permit tracking software, and most new software have more robust civic engagement functionality.

The street widening setback lines ordinance is a larger issue and will also not be a part of the NZO process. Also, project findings will be reviewed, but the definition of compatibility might not be included.

The Commission was appreciative of Staff's work. Staff agreed to Commissioner Campanella's request for a copy of all questions asked and comments made to be given to the NZO subcommittee. Commissioner Jordan added a request for the Commission to be informed of upcoming NZO subcommittee and focus group outreach meetings.

#### IV. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

##### ACTUAL TIME: 2:34 P.M.

- A. Committee and Liaison Reports.
1. Staff Hearing Officer Liaison Report

Commissioner Jordan reported on the Staff Hearing Officer meeting held on April 16, 2014.

2. Other Committee and Liaison Reports
  - a. Commissioners Bartlett and Campanella reported on the Architectural Board of Review meeting of April 14, 2014.
  - b. Commissioner Schwartz reported on the Water Commission meeting of April 14, 2014.
3. Report from the Chair

None given.

**V. ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Schwartz adjourned the meeting at 2:43 P.M.

Submitted by,

---

Julie Rodriguez, Planning Commission Secretary

**DRAFT**