



**TALENT PLANNING COMMISSION  
MEETING MINUTES  
TALENT TOWN HALL  
FEBRUARY 9, 2017**

***Study Session and Regular Commission meetings are digitally recorded and will be available online at:  
[www.cityoftalent.org](http://www.cityoftalent.org)***

The Planning Commission of the City of Talent will meet on Thursday, February 9, 2017 in a special session at 6:30 P.M. at Talent Town Hall, 206 E. Main Street. The meeting location is accessible to persons with disabilities. A request for an interpreter for the hearing impaired, or for other accommodations for persons with disabilities, should be made at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting to the City Recorder at 541-535-1566, ext. 1012. The Planning Commission reserves the right to add or delete items as needed, change the order of the agenda, and discuss any other business deemed necessary at the time of the study session and/or meeting.

**REGULAR COMMISSION MEETING- 6:30 PM**

*Anyone wishing to speak on an agenda item should complete a Public Comment Form and give it to the Minute Taker. Public Comment Forms are located at the entrance to the meeting place. Anyone commenting on a subject not on the agenda will be called upon during the "Citizens Heard on Non-agenda Items" section of the agenda. Comments pertaining to specific agenda items will be taken at the time the matter is discussed by the Planning Commission.*

**I. Call to Order/Roll Call 6:32 P.M.**

**Members Present:**

Commissioner Dolan  
Commissioner French  
Commissioner Hazel  
Commissioner Milan  
Commissioner Pastizzo  
Commissioner Riley  
Commissioner Schweitzer

**Members Absent**

None

**Also Present:**

Darby Stricker, Mayor  
Daniel Wise, City Councilor  
Zac Moody, Community Development Director  
Jeff Wilcox, Minute-Taker

**II. Brief Announcements**

***Request to modify Agenda***

Moody requested to move Agenda Item 5 (Action Items; 2017 Planning Commission Goals) to the end of the list since the Public Hearings are high priority items.

Hazel asked for objections.

The Commissioners unanimously and informally agreed to modify the agenda per Moody's request.

**III. Consideration of minutes for January 12, 2017**

**Motion:** *Commissioner French moved to approve the Minutes for January 12, 2017 as presented. Commissioner Pastizzo seconded and the motion carried.*

**Consideration of minutes for January 26, 2017**

**Motion:** *Commissioner Milan moved to approve the Minutes for January 26, 2017 as presented. Commissioner Pastizzo seconded and the motion carried.*

**IV. Public Comments on Non-Agenda Items**

None

**V. Public Hearings**

**Continued Public Hearing (Legislative/Quasi-Judicial) Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Map Amendment, 35 Lot Subdivision with Variance – Consideration of a Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment from Light Industrial (LI) to Residential High Density (RH) and a Zoning Map Amendment from Light Industrial (IL) to Multiple-Family High Density (RM-22) for property described as Township 38 South, Range 1 West, Section 26AD, Tax Lot 500. The application also requests the consideration of a 35 Lot Subdivision and associated Variance to property setbacks. Decisions are based on the approval criteria found in Zoning Ordinance 8-3M.160 and 8-3L.4 and Subdivision Ordinance 8-2.320 and are also based on compliance with the Talent Comprehensive Plan and Oregon Statewide Planning Goals. File: REZ 2016-001/CPA 2016-003 and SUB 2016-001/VAR 2016-001. Applicant: Bradley Properties, LLC.**

The opening statement was read into the record. Moody explained that he would provide the approval criteria in the following staff report.

**Staff Report:**

Moody acknowledged the lengthy set of Final Orders, explaining there were many items to be addressed in the Comprehensive Plan/Zoning map and variance criteria. All requirements are detailed in the Findings in the Final Order. The Final Order starts with the upper level Oregon Administrative Rules, then addresses Comp Plan policies, and finally, zoning and variance requirements.

Moody explained that a properly noticed meeting was held on January 26, 2017 and was continued to this specified date/time, state law does not require re-noticing for the continuance of a Public Hearing. At that meeting, the Planning Commission asked Moody to provide a Staff Report and Final Order at this meeting.

More Public Comment has been received since the past meeting, as recently as February 9, 2017. Moody explained that comments that were received before the Staff Report went out were addressed in the Findings; including comments from Fabricated Glass and Holtz in regard to buffering and conflicting uses. Staff feels those points were adequately addressed in the application and that it meets the standards for buffering conflicting uses.

Moody explained that the application for the 35 lot subdivision includes a variance request for lot setbacks and street width standards. Staff feels that in accordance with the Transportation System Plan (TSP), the narrow road request is not a problem. Staff has provided Conditions of Approval so that public improvements meet the intent of City code and standards are met. The Conditions of Approval also address plat requirements, landscape plan requirements, and require more specifics on tree and vegetation types. Moody emphasized that the Planning Commission has the latitude to be stringent on buffering requirements and that deliberations are the appropriate time for modifications to the proposed Final Orders.

Moody concluded by stressing that this consolidated application has to be approved in accordance with the *currently adopted* Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code. Bearing that in mind, Moody concluded by stating that Staff recommends Approval with Conditions for all four applications because they meet policies addressed in the current Housing and Economic elements of the Comprehensive Plan and other approval criteria, including state level criteria.

#### *Aesthetic and Affordability*

French asked if the development could have design characteristics matching a more industrial aesthetic due to its adjacency to industrial land uses (in accordance with Comprehensive Plan Element A – History, Policy 1 – A Sense of Place). Also, smaller scale housing and low/moderate-income housing may be in conflict with the applicant's proposal. Moody explained that staffs' take is that the proposal fits in with the resources of the core downtown. If this industrial parcel had been located in the Old Town District, perhaps the proposed aesthetic would be more of an issue. He added that the proposed houses are smaller, and the lots are smaller. His understanding is that smaller lots and building footprints will provide lowest costs.

#### *Application Consolidation and Separation of Final Orders*

Wise explained that in his mind, there are two major actions, (1) Comprehensive Plan/Zone Change (2) Variance, yet there is one Proposed Final Order. He asked if the Commission would want to separate the Final Order. Moody explained that there are no real standards in the Zoning Code in how to process/handle consolidated applications, except that when several applications are submitted at once (consolidated), they go to the highest land use process (Type 4). Wise asked since this application is consolidated, if Planning Commission gives its blessing and it goes to City Council and is approved, what happens if the developer is unable to complete the project? Would the parcel continue to be residentially zoned? Moody explained that there are no assurances that once land use approval is granted, the project is completed, however associated public improvements are protected by bond. Wise asked if the commission can separate the elements, in case the variance or some other portion is not approved. Moody explained that the Proposed Final Order is certainly capable of being modified by the Planning Commission. Moody recommended the applicant consider submitting consolidated applications, since historically commissioners have been wary of approving a zone change prior to seeing a site plan proposal.

#### *Appealing an Approval*

Riley asked if the City Council approval of the application is appealed, who would handle it? Moody explained it would go to Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA). Riley recommended separating the Proposed Final Order because if it is appealed, it could prove to be costly to the City. Moody explained that if a legislative application is appealed, the applicant is responsible for defending the application, not the City. Moody reiterated that the Planning Commission has recommended in the past (with the Truck Stop application) that they'd like to see the applications together to see what is going to happen. Riley

explained that to her recollection, applications were treated separately in the past, and that if an approval is appealed to LUBA, the City will then “own” the application. Moody explained that this is probably a better question for the City Attorney, and that as planning staff, his role is to make a recommendation to the Planning Commission, and the Proposed Final Order recommends Approval with Conditions, but the commission is the decision maker. If the Planning Commission doesn’t feel the application is in best interest of the City, they’re able to make their recommendation to City Council accordingly. Moody explains he can rewrite orders however the Planning Commission chooses, but in all fairness a decision hasn’t even been made yet. Moody recommended the Planning Commission hear the applicant side of these issues and public testimony before bringing those issues forward.

*Addressing the Housing Element in the Proposed Final Order*

Dolan explained that in the Proposed Final Order, where Element G is addressed, the findings don’t address affordability aspect, only the need for housing. Moody stated that he is happy to reword the finding, the intent of the finding was not to say this one subdivision would fix the housing problems in Talent.

The applicants were called forward.

Scott Sinner, Scott Sinner Consulting, Inc. (4401 San Juan Dr. Medford OR)

Charlie Hamilton, Suncrest Homes (151 Max Loop, Talent, OR)

*Application Consolidation*

Sinner explained that the applications were consolidated to show the Planning Commission what their plan is in context. The applicants understand they have four applications but that City Council would be taking this as an entire package. Hamilton explained that he thought it was important for commissioners to see the proposed Comprehensive Plan Map/Zone Change in context. Furthermore, the applicants have no interest in going forward with only a Comprehensive Plan Map/Zone Change. They’re looking for approval on all four applications. He added, breaking up the applications isn’t helpful, if commissioners don’t like it, don’t vote for it. Hamilton asked the Planning Commission to look at the history and track record of the applicants, explaining that they survived the recession, they’re financially strong and reputable.

*Photos and Variance Request*

Hamilton provided photos of a past project to help explain the current proposal. He stated that the photos were from the Spruce Landing Subdivision, the photos showed that the setback is 10ft from the right-of-way. Hamilton stated that Spruce Landing is one of the most desirable places to live in Talent and this is what applicant is asking for variance-wise. Houses are pulled forward and garages are tucked back a bit. Side yard setback photos were also shown. Hamilton explained that Jackson County Fire Department 5 is ok with the proposed side yard setbacks. He concluded by stating that the applicants are not coming at the Planning Commission with something crazy, the setbacks are very reasonable.

*Affordability and Lot Size Requirements*

Speaking to housing affordability, Sinner explained that the proposal is a market rate development. Land costs and building footprints drive development costs. If you build smaller lots, it will by nature be more affordable than large lot development. Hamilton added that the desire was to provide an affordable range of lot sizes, but all are small.

Sinner explained that the applicants' only concern with Staff findings was with section 6d of the Proposed Final Order:

6. *Applicant shall provide Community Development with a revised preliminary plat including the following information:*
  - d. *Amend the lot widths of some, or all of Lots 2-8, 11-13, 22-25 and 28-29 to the 40' minimum lot width requirement or alternatively the applicant shall be allowed to only build single-family attached dwellings on Lots 2-8, 11-13, 22-25 and 28-29.*

Sinner explained that when the project was designed, a mixture of housing types was planned. On page C-17 of Talent Zoning Code (TZC) attached or zero lot line townhouses or row houses may be on individual pad lots smaller than 1800 sqft lot threshold. Some of these dwelling units are zero-lot-line; they feel that they meet standards. Hamilton elaborated, under Single Family Attached, it says attached, or zero-lot-line. Applicants respectfully argue that there is no minimum lot width requirement as interpreted.

#### *Non-Remonstrate Agreement*

Sinner explained that the Holtz family, nearby property owners, had discussion with applicants regarding the project, Holtz wanted it to be clearly stipulated that a non-remonstrance agreement will be forwarded to all customers. Hamilton explained that Oregon Shakespeare Festival, Microtrains, Fabricated Glass and Sawyer Paddle have all reviewed the non-remonstrance and are onboard with it. The Applicant is asking that it is a Condition of the Final Order. However, the Codes Covenants and Restrictions (CCRs) will also state this. French asked how the non-remonstrate agreements would be monitored. Hamilton explained that it would be (1) on the Preliminary Title Report (deeded document that runs with property) and (2) the CCRs.

#### *Future Phase – Apartments*

Milan asked if the applicants would be willing to commit to apartments for the future project phase. Hamilton explained that as of right now, he is 100% committed to apartments during the future phase but cannot make guarantees because he does not know what the future holds. Dolan asked if phase 2 could become phase 1 due to an urgent need for housing. Hamilton explained that this would be incredibly difficult due to infrastructure requirements (sewer and water) on Stage Way. French asked what could the City do to motivate the applicant to move phase 3 to phase 2. Hamilton explained it's not so much a City imposed limiting factor as it is a lack of time. He can only take on so much risk at one time. The first two phases will help to fund the apartments. He reiterated that his business has survived the recession by being cautious and prudent. Hazel asked what is the intent, to sell or rent our apartments? Hamilton explained that they have not made a decision on this yet.

#### *Narrow Road*

Wise asked the applicant if, with a proposed 50ft right-of-way, will it allow for two-way traffic with parking on one side, with room for bikes/pedestrians/vehicles. Hamilton answered in the affirmative. He added that statistics indicate that the wider streets are, the faster people drive, therefore, applicants prefer narrower streets for slower traffic speeds.

#### *Timeline*

Pastizzo asked for a timeline for the phases. Hamilton explained that he hopes to be back in 6-8 months for the final phase, he added that this first application included about 150 pages of documentation, and that he can only do so much at any given time. He explained that the City site design requirements for apartments are intense and therefore requires a good deal of time to plan out.

*Consolidated Application Clarification*

Schweitzer asked the applicant to clarify their request to have commissioners make a single decision on the project, rather than application-by-application; are the applicants not interested in a partial approval if that is all that the Planning Commission can offer? Hamilton explained that he didn't mean to make the request sound like an ultimatum. However, if the subdivision isn't approved, they have no interest in going forward, and if commissioners don't approve the Comprehensive Plan Map change, it won't work, and without a variance...the project won't work. He reiterated, please keep the project all as one decision.

*Low Income Housing*

Dolan asked if the applicant can set aside some units for Low Income Housing. Hamilton explained that there are no City policies (codes, ordinances, city staff, etc.) for these programs. He added that even if some Low Income Housing policy was in place, the price burden is essentially pushed onto all of the other units.

Harvey Holtz, Fabricated Glass (1641 Veranda Park Dr., Medford OR)

Holtz explained that based on the non-remonstrate agreement, that would satisfy what he would need to have.

Dorian Hastings (100 N. Pacific Hwy., Talent OR)

Hasting explains that she is from New Orleans and has a doctorate in Urban Studies. She has worked in areas of affordable housing, and stated that Talent's community must decide: will it be a wealthy bedroom community, or will it preserve housing for traditional residents of Talent. Reviewing the demographics, approximately 20% are below the poverty line, in just 3 years, property values have increased considerably. While this plan is very nice, Hastings believes it is the responsibility of the government to preserve and protect those that live here. In New Orleans, they looked for developers who could meet needs of the City. She closed by asking the commissioners to consider what kind of development is needed to serve Talent residents?

Darby Stricker (221 E. Rapp Rd., Talent OR)

Stricker explained that she is a huge fan of Hamilton's neighborhoods, she acknowledged the challenges based on density but explained that the houses are lovely. Further, Hamilton is a business owner in the community. She explains that there are two issues: (1) until recently, she was under impression that this would be handled separately, not consolidated. (2) As a resident, Stricker is concerned that rezoning would isolate this property, Light Industrial is right next-door. If this gets approved, there are other pieces of property that remain Light Industrial. Based on recent findings, high density housing is a critical need for the community. Stricker added that the City can initiate Comprehensive Plan Map/Zoning changes nearby. She explained that the Planning Commission has the opportunity moving forward to rezone the entire area. She encouraged the Planning Commission to think about this area holistically. Stricker is a proponent of high-density housing and if Talent is going to go with high density housing, this is the place to do it. The commission should carefully consider how to use this property and how will it impact us moving forward. If the property is rezoned, it will sell, to do everything at once seems a little hasty.

John Steinbergs (328 Talent Ave., Talent OR)

Steinbergs explained that he has been a resident of Talent for 21 years. He was a participant in the Housing Needs Analysis (HNA) and has been following it as a citizen and local real-estate broker. He explained that he wants to put his support behind this project. He has worked with a number of people who have not

been able to find homes in Talent. He concluded by urging the Planning Commission to move forward with the project.

Greg Goebelt (1110 Lithia Way, Talent OR)

Goebelt explained that there is lots of diversity in the neighborhood he lives in. He explained that he will be talking about the Talent housing market. Homes between 2004-2007 are \$350k. Average price is \$375k, range in years 1993-2010. Point being, low \$300k, is affordable for a new house. If Charlie is going to be building in high 200's and low 300's, that is affordable for a new house, no one is doing that. If those home are sold, people won't be looking to buy those older homes built in the 1990's and 2000's for as much. This slows down the rate of appreciation. Today, in Talent \$250k buys a 3-bed/1-bath 1993 1000sqft home that is approximately 47% less efficient than homes built today. What is affordable? Most families are buying in \$325k-\$350k range. Based on comps, anything in the twos would be affordable. Goebelt added that the location of the proposed development is ideal, especially as related to parks. When you do mixed use with apartments, and variety of home sizes, it keeps community together. This type of project helps avoid: "that's the apartment area of town." Goebelt concluded that with these homes available, there will be more slightly older homes on the market to increase the affordable housing stock.

Schweitzer explained that \$299k for a home seems pretty expensive for moderate income earners, she asked Goebelt where Talent home seekers are currently living. Goebelt explained he is serving mostly locals, some from Ashland. He explained that if there were enough homes to buy in all ranges, more homes will stabilize the Talent housing crisis. Older homes for \$250k-\$270k, frees up new for \$200k-\$299k.

Milan asked if, since the proposed development is surrounded by Light Industrial, would it be a hindrance to the demand? Goebelt explained that a large percentage of Talent is affected by the train, some portions are affected by highway traffic. He added that the demand is still there to buy. As long as people know ahead of time, he thinks most people would still consider it.

#### *Applicant Rebuttal*

Hamilton explained, to summarize Greg, there is an issue with supply and demand. Talent has no supply. There are no new homes. Will the proposal fix all problems? No, but it will have some small impact. He explained that the HNA public comments asked for more housing. When talking about Urban Reserves or Urban Growth Boundary, Talent has control as to how that land is brought in. This property has RM-22 right next to it (across from Talent Ave.). Hamilton explained that he respectfully disagrees with Stricker, and that it doesn't make sense to change zoning for anyone who is already actively using their parcels (all 3 industrial neighbors are already developed). He concluded by requesting Planning Commission recommendation for approval.

#### *Noticing Requirements and Geographic Information Systems (GIS)*

Riley asked if notices were sent to nearby properties. Moody explained that staff uses GIS for consistency to notify nearby property owners. If the subject property is even partially within 250ft of a neighboring property, that neighboring property will be mailed a noticed. Moody offered to provide a notification list to interested parties. Riley asked why one GIS would say something different from another one. Moody explained that different GIS programs uses different methodologies. Moody added that in addition to mailings, staff has noticed this land use action through other venues, to include: newspaper advertisement, conspicuous postings throughout City, and a sign posted on the subject parcel itself. Hamilton added that the Shakespeare property is 275ft wide, so people beyond it, wouldn't have been notified.

### *Density and Code Criteria*

Riley asked why the City would want to develop RM-22 at a density less than what is possible. Moody explained that developers are not going to get 22 units per acres even with apartments due to open space and other infrastructure requirements, maybe 22 units per gross acre. Moody added that staff has to make sure the applicant can meet intent of City code. The Planning Commission can approve or deny the variance, but the Commission doesn't have much of an opportunity to add conditions of approval such as affordability because there's no criteria in land development ordinance or subdivision code. Moody explained that conditions of approval must be crafted carefully and be based on code criteria.

### **PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED**

### *Deliberations*

Wise understands bundling applications requires a higher degree of scrutiny. He accepts the fact that project won't work if only partially approved. He expressed concern about "putting cart before horse," the City can't demand affordable housing or subsidized before policies are in place.

French expressed concern that the HNA and Inclusionary Zoning discussions were not completed before being asked to make a decision on the subdivision application.. Moody explained that the order of the agenda is for the public to make comment first, then City business can be discussed after, as a courtesy to the applicants/public etc. He emphasized that the basis of decision here has to be on what's currently adopted in the Comprehensive Plan (new Economy element, old Housing element), the City has to use that criteria.

Wise asked if there is a time limit to this application. Moody explains that this is a legislative amendment, so there is no time limit, but there is an obligation to the applicant, it would be bad optics for the City to sit on the application just because it's legislative.

Moody explained that TZC Section 8-3M.160(D)(2) talks about consolidated apps, when proceedings are consolidated, findings should be separated out, but there should be one Final Order. He added that a decision has to be made for the Comprehensive Plan Amendment before the Subdivision. The Planning Commission can direct staff to write separate Final Orders, one for CPA/REZ one for SUB/VAR. Moody reminded the Planning Commission that any motion made won't be for a final decision, they're making a recommendation to City Council. Moody explains that if Planning Commission feels additional Conditions of Approval are needed, they must make sure code criteria or standards are present to back it up.

Wise asked if taking the Proposed Final Order and splitting it into two, to separate out the CPA/REZ from the SUB/VAR would require another meeting since document content would be altered. Moody explained that it is common for the Planning Commission to propose additions/modifications to the Final Order prior to the document receiving the Chair's signature, merely splitting the findings of the Proposed Final Order into two documents would not necessitate another Planning Commission meeting.

Milan stated that the concept of going into a large area and rezoning is attractive and compelling, but even if it was rezoned, that Light Industrial area won't disappear any time soon. No plan commissioners can come up with that will be perfect, the HNA doesn't need to be completed for them to make a decision, they can see the need for the type of housing that is necessary for Talent.



Hazel explained that the town has expanded and what was once the outskirts is now at the core. Public discourse has led her to believe that area should be residential. She has reservations since HNA isn't yet completed but hopes that apartments happen if the project does go through.

Schweitzer acknowledged that the Planning Commission is making a recommendation, not a decision. But she takes this decision-making very seriously. The character of Talent and affordability are very important issues. Commissioners must realize these decisions do affect the long-term; even with a small subdivision like this.

Pastizzo explained that he likes the concept and takes the bedroom community concerns to heart. He acknowledged that the bus stop location, park and downtown are close-by. He added it could be a great location for apartments and knows there is a housing crisis in Talent.

Riley stated that if a motion is made to approve she'd vote no; she explained the proposed project is not mixed-use, and there are other not-for-profit developers out there other than Housing and Urban Development (HUD). She added that the City has to use land for its highest and best use. If this is high density, they'd be squandering the land. She believes there might be a health risk with heavy metals in glass production next to homes and model train fumes are sometimes strong. The City shouldn't take away rights to access justice via endorsing non-remonstrance agreement. Riley stated that the project doesn't address worst need for housing and there is no topographical excuse for a variance; variances should only be granted for extreme circumstances.

Wise explained that the commission has the opportunity to envision another use in terms of what else could be done, such as apartments.

Hazel asked the Planning Commissioners for a motion.

Moody explained that if the commission recommends denial, the motions don't need to be separated. If the commission recommends approval, two motions need to be made for preparing Final Orders, one for the Comprehensive Plan Amendment and Rezone, and one for the Subdivision and Variance request.

**Motion:** *Schweitzer moved to recommend the commission not approve the application. Riley seconded. The motion was passed by roll call vote with Members Schweitzer, Milan, Pastizzo, French, Riley and Dolan voting for, and Member Hazel voting against.*

Moody explained that the Draft Minutes will go to City Council along with the Proposed Final Order that was presented to the commission. He added that the City Council has an opportunity to make a decision opposite to the Planning Commission, and there will be a Public Hearing at that City Council meeting for this application. If the City Council denies the application, the applicant would then have the opportunity to appeal that decision.

Moody stated that there is not enough time to talk about the HNA decision, but the commission does have enough time for Planning Commission goals if they'd like to have that discussion.

## **VI. Action Items**

### **Planning Commission Goals**

Moody explained that the goals are divided into sections based on goals completed, goals in progress and potential new goals. He added that some of the year one goals that were prepared are reflective of the new HNA; the commission could decide to adopt all of the year 1 items from the Housing and Economy Element.

Hazel suggested the Planning Commission prioritize implementing a trail system. Moody recommended that issue be forwarded to Parks Commission for their consideration from *Citizen Hazel*, as it would be more likely to gain traction going through that commission first, rather than Planning Commission first.

Moody took feedback from the commissioners to draft the following Planning Commission *New Goals* for Fiscal Year 2017-2018:

1. Develop Citizen Involvement element to be added to Comprehensive Plan
2. Implement Year 1 policies from the Housing and Economy Comprehensive Plan elements (prioritizing and addressing affordable housing issues)
3. Develop overlay standards for industrial buildings and residential mixed use buildings
4. OR 99 Master Plan (within City Limits)

Moody asked the commissioners if they could provide a motion for the new goals.

**Motion:** *Schweitzer moved to recommend the goals to Council, Fiscal Year 2017-2018.*

*Riley seconded and the motion carried.*

**VII. Discussion Items**

None

**VIII. Subcommittee Reports**

None

**IX. Propositions and Remarks from the Commission**


None

**X. Next Meeting**

The next regularly scheduled meeting will be held on February 23, 2017.

**XI. Adjournment**

There being no further business to come before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 10:00 p.m.

Submitted by:  \_\_\_\_\_

Date: 2/17/2017 \_\_\_\_\_

Attest:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Zac Moody, Community Development Director

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
David Pastizzo, Vice Chair Hazel

\*Further information on the Code amendments is available at the Community Development office.

Note: These Minutes and the entire agenda packet, including staff reports, referenced documents, resolutions and ordinances are posted on the City of Talent website ([www.cityoftalent.org](http://www.cityoftalent.org)) in advance of each meeting. The Minutes are not a verbatim record: the narrative has been condensed and paraphrased to reflect the discussions and decisions made.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact TTY phone number 1-800-735-2900 for English and for Spanish please contact TTY phone number 1-800-735-3896.