

EXHIBIT SCHEDULE

FILE NO:	SUB 2020-001	APPLICANT:	TONY & TORY NIETO
HEARING DATE:	6/23/2020	HEARING BODY:	PLANNING COMMISSION
TIME:	6:30 PM	LOCATION:	ELECTRONIC VIA ZOOM

EXHIBIT NO	EXHIBIT PAGE	NATURE OF EXHIBIT
1	1	REQUEST FOR REMAND
2	3	APPLICANT'S SUBMITTAL
3	391	APPLICANT'S SUPPLEMENTAL SUBMITTAL
4	421	NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING AND PHOTO
5	425	NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING MAILING LABELS
6	426	NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING MAILTRIBUNE
7	429	AGENCY COMMENT, THROUGH 3/16/20
8	453	PUBLIC COMMENT, LAUPHEIMER, DATED 3/4/20
9	455	PUBLIC COMMENT, WALLACE, DATED 3/16/20
10	456	PUBLIC COMMENT, DAVIS, VANAKEN, DATED 3/16/20
11	461	PUBLIC COMMENT, DAVIS, TSUI, CUDDY, DATED 3/17/20
12	468	PUBLIC COMMENT, LAUPHEIMER, DATED 3/16/20
13	497	PUBLIC COMMENT, MATSUURA, RUBIO, DATED 3/16/20
14	501	PUBLIC COMMENT, ZUKIS, MCCOY, DATED 3/17/20
15	504	120 DAY WAIVER, DATED 3/19/20
16	506	PUBLIC COMMENT, HELLER, DATED 3/25/20
17	508	PUBLIC COMMENT, RUGG, DATED 3/25/20
18	509	NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING MAILING LABELS
19	510	NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING AND PHOTO
20	512	NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING MAIL TRIBUNE
21	513	AGENCY COMMENT, 3/17/20 - 6/15/20
22	515	PUBLIC COMMENT, BIZEAU, DATED 6/8/20
23	517	PUBLIC COMMENT, KREISMAN, DATED 6/4/20
24	518	PUBLIC COMMENT, LAUPHEIMER, DATED 6/8/20
25	520	120 DAY WAIVER, DATED 6/15/20
26	522	STAFF REPORT, DATED 6/16/20
27	531	PLANNING COMMISSION PROPOSED FINAL ORDER
28	594	PUBLIC COMMENT, DAVIS, HEARN, ANDERSON, TURNER, DATED 6/15/20
29	598	PUBLIC COMMENT, DAVIS, HEARN, ANDERSON, TURNER, DATED 6/15/20
30	700	PUBLIC COMMENT, KREISMAN, DATED 6/17/20
31	701	PUBLIC COMMENT, DAVIS, HEARN, ANDERSON, TURNER, DATED 6/16/20
32	706	PUBLIC COMMENT, ZUKIS, DATED 6/15/20
33	707	PUBLIC COMMENT, DAVIS, HEARN, ANDERSON, TURNER, DATED 6/17/20
34	713	PUBLIC COMMENT, DAVIS, HEARN, ANDERSON, TURNER, DATED 6/18/20
35	717	PUBLIC COMMENT, MIXSON, DATED 6/19/2020
36	718	MEMO TO PLANNING COMMISSION, DATED 6/19/20
37	720	APPLICANT COMMENT, CSA PLANNING, DATED 6/19/20
38	721	APPLICANT COMMENT, CABLE HUSTON, DATED 6/19/20
39	722	PUBLIC COMMENT, DAVIS, HEARN, ANDERSON, TURNER, DATED 6/21/20

From: [Cathy Kreisman](#)
To: [PublicTestimony](#)
Subject: Talent View Estates Subdivision Application
Date: Sunday, June 28, 2020 10:40:55 PM

As a Hilltop Road property owner, I wanted to respond directly to a question Commissioner Sherrill raised to Oregon Fire Marshall Margueritte Hickman at the June 23, 2020 public hearing relating to the Talent View Estates Subdivision Application (SUB 2020-001) (“Application”)--- paraphrased here: Why is the single access issue proposed by the Application not the same as the one already at Hilltop Road?

There are 2 independent reasons why the single access existing at Hilltop Road and the one proposed at Belmont Road are different. The magnitude of exposure is not comparable. There are 14 separate property owners being serviced by Hilltop Road. The Application proposes 49 lots with single residential dwelling units, but since those lots would be eligible to construct additional dwelling units, the exposure potentially doubles. Additionally, this Commission must consider the significant number of additional Talent residents and public that will be forced to use the single Belmont Road access when the Applicants seek similar development next door—their future landlocked 12+ acres Lot 900 which they have indicated are in their plans. Thus, the magnitude of Talent residents and the public put at severe risk with the single access issue at Belmont Road by this Application is exponentially greater than what exists at Hilltop Road.

A second reason why the single access safety issue is different between the property owners on Hilltop Road and those proposed by this Application is that this Commission has the opportunity, authority and duty to avoid the severe fire/life emergency/safety risks caused by a single access by denying this Application. Hilltop Road is an existing, smaller situation on Jackson County lands over which the Planning Commission and City has no authority. The situation is totally different with the proposed large-scale development of this Application. This Commission has the authority and duty under the City’s access safety regulations to prevent development where the safety risks are known and avoidable. That is exactly what we opponents of this Application are asking.

A second issue that arose in last week’s public hearing also deserves comment. Both the City and Applicants argued that this Application was merely the first development phase pursuant to the City’s Railroad Master District Plan (“RDMP”). First, the RDMP is merely a PLAN, nothing more. In fact, since I and the affected property owners whose property is required to construct the Collector Road from Rapp Road to Belmont Road have submitted evidence that we will not agree to provide our property for that purpose. All parties who developed the RDMP recognized the construction of the Collector Road was absolutely critical to the RDMP being implemented. Without the Collector Road being possible, the RDMP remains exactly which I described above, a FAILED PLAN.

Additionally, although the RDMP was adopted in 2007, the City more recently has modified or restricted some of the objectives reflected in that document. The City’s more recent 2019 Comprehensive Plan provisions recognize the lands planned for growth southwest of the railroad tracks (*i.e.*, the RDMP, including Lot 1001 in this Application) “will not be viable

without a new street network that **meets emergency service needs**, and new water, storm sewer and sanitary service facilities.” (2019 Talent Comprehensive Plan, Element F, at page F-2; emphasis added.) The 2019 Comprehensive Plan’s Objectives 10.1 and 10.2 along with Implementation Strategy 10.2.1 state any new RDMP development must anticipate all future facility needs, long-term public funding and resolve access safety concerns, including at a minimum, **shall** have 2 separate ingress/egress outlets. (2019 Talent Comprehensive Plan at pages F-17-18; emphasis added.) Thus, the City has already modified or restricted some of the objectives indicated in the older RDMP which this Application fails to satisfy, and as shown by the evidence already submitted by the neighbors, cannot be satisfied in the future.

--

Cathy Kreisman