

PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA MARCH 26, 2015



Commission Members

Tim D'Alessandro
Norman Fincher
Chris MacMillan
Bill Mansfield
David McFadden
Mark McKechnie
Patrick Miranda
Jared Pulver
Alec Schwimmer

Regular Planning Commission
meetings are held on the second &
fourth Thursdays of every month

Beginning at 5:30 p.m.

City of Medford

City Council Chambers
411 W Eighth Street, Third Floor
Medford, OR 97501
(541) 774-2380



MEDFORD PLANNING COMMISSION **AGENDA**
March 26, 2015
5:30 p.m.

Council Chambers
411 West Eighth Street, Medford, OR

- 10. Roll Call**
- 20. Consent Calendar/Written Communications (Voice Vote)**
- 30. Minutes**
- 30.1 Approval of Minutes from the March 12, 2015, meeting
- 40. Oral and Written Requests and Communications**
- 50. Public Hearings**
- New Business**
- 50.1 DCA-15-014 Consideration of a Class 'A' legislative code amendment to amend Chapter 10 of the Municipal Code to provide provisions for beekeeping in the city limits. (City of Medford, Applicant).
- 60. Report of the Site Plan and Architectural Commission**
- 70. Report of the Joint Transportation Subcommittee**
- 80. Report of the Planning Department**
- 90. Messages and Papers from Chair of Planning Commission**
- 100. Remarks from the City Attorney**
- 110. Propositions and Remarks from the Commission**
- 120. Adjournment**



MINUTES
Planning Commission Meeting
March 12, 2015

The regular meeting of the Medford Planning Commission was called to order at 5:30 p.m. in the Council Chambers on the above date with the following members and staff in attendance:

Commissioners Present

David McFadden, Chair
Patrick Miranda, Vice Chair
Tim D'Alessandro (left at 10:05 p.m.)
Norman Fincher
Bill Mansfield
Jared Pulver
Alec Schwimmer

Staff

Jim Huber, Planning Director
Bianca Petrou, Assistant Planning Director
Kelly Akin, Principal Planner
John Adam, Senior Planner
Kevin McConnell, Deputy City Attorney
Terri L. Rozzana, Recording Secretary
Alex Georgevitch, Acting City Engineer
Joe Slaughter, Planner IV
Cory Crebbin, Public Works Director
Brian Sjothun, Parks and Recreation Director

Commissioners Absent

Mark McKechnie, Excused Absence
Chris MacMillan, Excused Absence

10. Roll Call

20. Consent Calendar/Written Communications.

- 20.1 CUP-13-139** Consideration of a request for a one-year time extension of the Conditional Use Permit for the following improvements in the Lone Pine Creek Riparian Corridor related to the construction of the Highway 62 Bypass: realignment of approximately 400 feet of the creek approximately 100 feet to the east; removal of the existing concrete lined channel and construction of a new channel constructed in a manner that more closely simulates natural conditions; construction of dual 6 foot x 10 foot box culverts countersunk with natural streambed material; and riparian area plantings. Subject site is located just west of Highway 62 approximately 830 feet southwest of Delta Waters Road. (Oregon Department of Transportation, Applicant; Janell Stradtner, Agent).
- 20.2 LDP-13-071** Consideration of a request for a one-year time extension of the tentative plat for a 3 lot partition on 1.36 acres extending between Sunset Avenue and Willow Brook Drive approximately 810 feet west of Orchard Home Drive within the SFR-6 (Single Family Residential – 6 units per acre) zoning district. (Linda Bevard, Applicant).

Motion: Adopt the consent calendar as submitted.

Moved by: Vice Chair Miranda **Seconded by:** Commissioner D'Alessandro

Voice Vote: Motion passed, 7-0.

30. Minutes.

30.1 The minutes for February 12, 2015, were approved as submitted.

30.2 The minutes for February 26, 2015, were approved as submitted.

40. Oral and Written Requests and Communications. None.

50. Public Hearing.

New Business

Chair McFadden stated that tonight's meeting will be conducted as a legislative hearing. There will be no statement from the Kevin McConnell, Deputy City Attorney. Mr. McConnell confirmed the statement.

50.1 **CP-14-114, Urban Growth Boundary amendment project, phase 2.** The City of Medford is proposing to amend the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) for the purpose of providing a twenty-year land supply based on the City's projected need for residential and employment land. The proposed changes include: amending (expanding) the Urban Growth Boundary, assigning General Land Use Plan (GLUP) map designations to the areas added to the UGB; amending the Medford Street Functional Classification Plan of the Transportation Element of the Comprehensive Plan to include the expansion areas; and amending some portions of the Urbanization and GLUP Elements of the Comprehensive Plan to accommodate the UGB amendment. (City of Medford, Applicant).

John Adam, Senior Planner, reported that the notebook that he had discussed in the study session was placed at the Commissioner's seats in order for them to take notes as people testify. There is also a sheet with the breakdown of the land uses by area that is contained in staff's recommendation. Also, there are materials that have been submitted since the publication of the staff report. Mr. Adam gave a background on the work that led to this hearing, including the land need determination and the adoption of an urban reserve.

Joe Slaughter, Planner IV, gave a staff report. He summarized the traffic, sewer, and water system analyses that formed the basis for staff's recommendation. He presented the criteria for urban growth boundary amendments, central to which are the land need and the boundary location factors in Statewide Planning Goal 14 (OAR 660-015-0000(14)).

Commissioner D'Alessandro asked if the proposed Highway 62 Bypass was a consideration in MD-1 during the filtering process? Mr. Slaughter replied yes.

Mr. Slaughter continued his presentation with a review of the staff proposal. He pointed out a couple of challenges to the calculated land need: 135 acres for governmental land uses counted in the housing need; and 18 acres overstated open space need. Furthermore, 22 acres owned by Oregon State University (MD-7mid) were incorrectly labeled as "unbuildable" due to standard methodologies for buildable lands inventories.

Cory Crebbin, Public Works Director, commented that the cost of providing service is not a problem, but rather capacity needs of the system. Public Works does not have any concerns with serving the proposed areas. Mr. Crebbin did ask that the Commission take into consideration the orderly and timely provision of services.

Commissioner Schwimmer asked how the capacity criteria differ between the City sewer service and Rogue Valley Sewer Services? Mr. Crebbin said that is a misconception he hopes to correct. Looking at the list of improvements from Rogue Valley Sewer, they include increasing the size of pump stations, extending lines, and increasing the size of pipes. They do not provide the cost for those improvements because developers pay for all those. There is no cost to Rogue Valley Sewer Service. The same principle can be applied to the City of Medford Sewer System. It is the developers that provide the majority of capacity. They are not evaluated on the same basis.

Brian Sjothun, Parks and Recreation Director, reported that his department is excited to have potentially 1,877 acres of park land inside the City of Medford, and to be able to develop those through the City's process. The Parks and Recreation Department completed the Leisure Services Plan in 2006 and it was adopted in 2010 to the Medford Comprehensive Plan. They are about to embark on updating the Leisure Services Plan and hope to have that completed in about a year from now. Mr. Sjothun is present tonight in order to answer any questions that the Commission may have or questions that may come up as part of the testimony regarding how this amendment may impact the Leisure Services Plan and whether there are needs for park land and trails that are identified within that Plan.

Chair McFadden stated that two of the proposals have indicated a value to the promotion of walking trails and places for the people in the City to exercise. The City, within the past several years, has purchased property to enhance and start those types of systems. Would Mr. Sjothun elaborate on how the Parks and Recreation Department sees those facilities in their Plan? Mr. Sjothun replied that the request for trails in their Leisure Services Plan was in the top three as far as facilities that the community wanted to see. The first one was sports fields, the second was an indoor aquatic facility, and the third was more trails to connect their neighborhoods and to connect themselves to parks.

Commissioner D'Alessandro asked how does Mr. Sjothun see the connectivity of the trails if MD-5 was excluded from Leisure Services Plan. Mr. Sjothun replied that if MD-5 was excluded it would probably be a long time before the Parks and Recreation Department connects to Chrissy Park or since it is outside the City, they could work with the developer through the County process to connect the trails to Chrissy Park.

The public hearing was opened and the following testimony was given.

MD-1

- a. Mark Carlton, 4350 Griffin Creek Road, Medford, Oregon, 97501. Mr. Carlton said that his 19.2 acres was included until the external study. The property borders the City limits. It has

Rogue Valley Sewer and City water is on the south border. It meets a lot of the criteria that are necessary to be developed and included. He would like his property included in the urban growth boundary.

MD-2

- b. Megan LaNier, Richard Stevens & Associates, P. O. Box 4368, Medford, Oregon, 97501. Ms. LaNier reported that Kim Parducci and Mark Bartholomew were with her to answer any questions the Commission may have for them. Ms. LaNier presented a slideshow outlining the Coker Butte Community Project in MD-2 south of East Vilas Road. The project is a functional and community-oriented conceptual master plan that offers solutions for improved traffic and utilities, and contains formal agreements with Medford's Parks and Recreation Foundation and School District 549C to gift land for city parks, a parks connective trail system, and a future school site.
- c. Brad Earl, 4509 Pinnacle Drive, Medford, Oregon, 97504-9462. Mr. Earl stated that he was present tonight representing the Medford School District. He said the Coker Butte Community Project is the only plan that thought about schools. They incorporated the gift into the Long-Range Facility Plan of the Medford School District that was adopted by their Board recently. It has been submitted to the City to be adopted into the Medford Comprehensive Plan. The schools are full in the northeast part of town. They are going to a full-day kindergarten next year and they have ordered five temporary buildings. They are at the point where they are already talking about future plans for a school. They are excited about the site in MD-2. They believe it represents where most of the growth is happening in the City. It is an ideal site for an elementary school.

MD-3

- d. Mike Savage, CSA Planning Ltd., 4497 Brownridge Terrace, Medford, Oregon, 97504. Mr. Savage reported that he was present tonight to discuss a 168 acre property located within MD-3. It is situated between Foothill Road and the potential northerly extension of McLaughlin Road. The property provides a much needed east/west connection for Owen Drive. This is a mixed-use development with walkable neighborhoods. This site could accommodate a future school. He supports staff recommendation to include this land. Mr. Savage added that he has spent a lot of time preparing urban growth boundary amendments, and working on housing elements and buildable lands analyses over the last fifteen years. He believes it would behoove the Commission if staff took a little time to further refine some of their analyses. There are some data gaps in the scoring methodology. They are on the right track. The bins they are putting these factors into are correct. There are gaps and discrepancies that warrant a closer look by staff.

Commissioner D'Alessandro asked Mr. Savage to be more specific on the gaps he is referring to in the scoring. Mr. Savage said he was referring to the scoring methods for proximity and parcel size. He combined the two scores in the MD-1 and MD-2 areas and the lands that staff excluded were not representative of the scoring. There may be valid reasons for excluding what they did but the data do not show or support that exclusion.

- e. Dunbar Carpenter, 4365 SW Patrick Place, Portland, Oregon, 97239. Mr. Carpenter stated that his property was farmed for many years by his father as an orchard. Unfortunately it can no longer be economically farmed. He requests that this land be included in the urban growth boundary. It is 73 acres, divided into four tax lots. It touches the City on the western and southern boundaries. There are approximately five acres of wetlands in the southern portion of the lot. The wetlands could serve as an attractive park for the residents living on the property.
- f. Clark Stevens, Richard Stevens & Associates, P. O. Box 4368, Medford, Oregon, 97501. Mr. Stevens was representing Mr. Steve Skinner, who owns property in the southeast corridor of MD-3 consisting of 40 acres. Within the agenda packet Mr. Stark had submitted information that supports this area within the urban growth boundary. Important factors for this area include the high scoring of public facilities, transportation and sanitary sewers. Water scored well. They have all the factors for inclusion. Street connectivity is an important aspect of this site. Mr. Skinner has requested reduction in the commercial land.
- g. Laz Ayala, 132 W. Main Street, Suite 202, Medford, Oregon, 97501. Mr. Ayala was present to represent Coker Butte Orchards LLC. The owner could not be present this evening. The owner is in support of inclusion of her property as proposed by staff with the exception of the zoning classification. More residential should be considered on her 40 acres.

Vice Chair Miranda asked what level of residential is he proposing? Mr. Ayala stated low to medium residential density, single-family, detached.

MD-4

- h. Karen Allan, 2895 Hillcrest Road, Medford, Oregon, 97504-7750. Ms. Allan is a member of the Carpenter family which owns 30 acres in MD-4. Raul Woerner, CSA Planning, will make their primary presentation. She said they have worked with Hillcrest to come up with a plan that meets circulation and density requirements, and fits the land's particular slope and aspect, which includes steep slopes at the north end and towards the east. There is a town center designed to be walkable. They plan to develop over time since it is a large block of land.
- i. Raul Woerner, CSA Planning Ltd., 4497 Brownridge Terrace, Medford, Oregon 97504. Mr. Woerner reported that he was engaged by the Hillcrest property owners and Cogswell Ltd. to put together a master plan that would provide the basis for the conceptual plan required by Regional Planning. He believes the concept plan needs to be adopted by the County as part of the urban growth boundary amendment process or prior to the planning process as early as possible. Those plans need to meet the requirements of the Regional Plan at the time of the urban growth boundary amendment. He is concerned hearing that some of this is being deferred out to annexation after the urban growth boundary amendment occurs. Mr. Woerner presented the concept plan on the overhead and submitted the plan into the record.

- j. Carol Parsons Hashimoto, 3285 Hillcrest Road, Medford, Oregon, 97504. Ms. Hashimoto is the President of Hillcrest Corporation. She read and submitted a letter from the Hillcrest Corporation Board of Directors into the record. The letter affirms that the Hillcrest Orchard Property (MD-4) will be available to meet the future urban needs of the City of Medford should MD-4 be included within the urban growth boundary.

MD-5

- k. Chris Hearn, 515 East Main Street, Ashland, Oregon, 97520. Mr. Hearn was representing a group of three property owners of 95 acres adjacent to the east side of North Phoenix Road. The area is directly across from Centennial golf course. Mr. Hearn presented a tentative conceptual plan for Haya Park. he pointed out an 11.7-acre adjacent site that was purchased by the school district in 2010 for an elementary school. Centennial is an active adult community 55 or older. A balance would be a place of young families to buy affordable starter housing. Their plan is a mix of commercial, high-and medium-density multi-family residential. Mr. Hearn noted that his presentation had already been included in the agenda packet.
- l. Carl Bartlett, 2829 Kari Circle, Medford, Oregon, 97504. Mr. Bartlett submitted a letter that was provided to the Commissioners before the meeting (but not in the packet), which he then proceeded to read into the record. The letter urged the Planning Commission to consider including land in Medford's southeast area to keep expanding what has become Medford's finest place to live.
- m. Mike Montero, 4497 Brownridge Terrace, Medford, Oregon, 97504. Mr. Montero was representing Harry & David Holdings and Duke Mahar Southstage Properties LLC. They are joint owners of the property that is immediately south of Centennial golf course. It has been master planned as a world-class employment campus with no residential property. They concur with staff's assessment of the property. They have done a study on all the utilities and feel that it can be adequately served. This is a project worthy of inclusion into Medford's urban growth boundary.

The Planning Commissioners took a 15 minute break. The meeting reconvened at 8:00 p.m.

- n. Debbie Vincent, 3570 Shamrock Drive, Medford, Oregon, 97504. Ms. Vincent and her neighbors have been looking forward to the bike and walking trails that will go from the Southeast Plan area to Chrissy Park and Prescott Park. Staff has excluded the area where the trails that lead to Chrissy Park from the "village" and ultimately from the Greenway through Larson Creek Bikeway to the village and up to Chrissy Park and Prescott Park. It scored low in water and sewer. Ms. Vincent submitted a letter detailing all the items she did not have time to discuss.
- o. John Hanson, 23 Newtown, Medford, Oregon, 97501. Mr. Hanson spoke about six acres that he owns on Cherry Lane. The property is adjacent to the Medford city limits. He believes that

his property and the surrounding property should be included in the urban growth boundary. Mr. Hanson submitted a letter that goes into greater detail.

- p. Greg Hathaway, 520 SW Yamhill Street, Portland, Oregon, 97204-1335. Mr. Hathaway was representing Rogue Valley Manor and Pacific Retirement Services regarding the Centennial property. He noted that in the audience were Sue Kupillas, Chair of the Rogue Valley Manor Board of Directors, other Board members, and Brian McLemore, CEO of Pacific Retirement Services. They are requesting that the Centennial property to be included in the urban growth boundary so that they can do an active adult retirement community. Mr. Hathaway submitted a letter from the Rogue Valley Manor Board into the record.
- q. Bruce Bauer, P. O. Box 1604, Medford, Oregon, 97501. Mr. Bauer stated that he has not heard police mentioned in this. It is his opinion that they should be considered. He said he has not heard mention of a traffic study on the entire project. He added that the fire department should be contacted. He said water scored different on projects. Can Medford Water Commission handle 20,000 more people? A big issue for him is climate change. Are there going to be specifics on houses that are being built, such as solar cells on roofs? Behind his property is a marsh. There is a drain pipe that goes under his property to the marsh. What is going to happen to that drain pipe or the marsh? Are they allowed to develop to the back of his fence? In the marsh area there is a lot of wildlife.
- r. John Hanson, 23 Newtown, Medford, Oregon, 97501. Mr. Hanson now spoke as a representative of a group of people who are urging the inclusion property owned by Mahar Homes and him in the urban growth boundary. Mr. Hansen said that the property owners he was representing are already in the urban growth boundary and the city limits, but they cannot develop their properties until the sanitary sewer system is constructed. It is necessary to include the Mahar/Hanson properties in order to construct a gravity sanitary sewer system to serve his clients. Mr. Hanson submitted a letter into the record that goes into greater detail.
- s. Roy Bergstrom, 5480 Hillcrest Road, Medford, Oregon, 97504. Mr. Bergstrom supported the inclusion of Chrissy Park and Prescott Park.
- t. Darlene Hansen, 5500 Hillcrest Road, Medford, Oregon, 97504. Ms. Hansen is the trustee of the Dorothy Whittle Trust, which donated Chrissy Park to the City of Medford. One of the stipulations for the Park was that it be developed primarily for equestrian and trail use. Ms. Whittle was very supportive of the Bear Creek Greenway project from its inception. It was her dream that eventually the Greenway would run through Chrissy Park and connect with Prescott Park on the other side of her property. The Hansens hired CSA Planning to prepare a proposal for inclusion of their land into the urban growth boundary. It is in coordination with the Mahar Homes proposal on the other side of Chrissy Park. Their property on the southeast corner of Hillcrest Road and Cherry Lane is approximately 97 acres. It facilitates the trail extension from the Southeast Plan area to Prescott Park access road. The proposal has already been submitted to the Planning Department. Ms. Hansen submitted a technical memo into the record that CSA Planning Ltd., prepared for them.

- u. Suzanne Hawley (address was not given and did not return phone call to staff attempting to get the address). Ms. Hawley is also a trustee of the Dorothy Whittle Trust. She was also representing the Quail Run Ranch and Hollywood Farms Incorporated on the east side of Medford. She said there needs to be a place to put their horse trailers and horses. According to the Mahar/Hanson development there has already been an agreement to put the trail through for the hikers, bikers, and horses to Prescott Park.
- v. Raul Woerner, 3965 Fieldbrook Avenue, Medford, Oregon, 97504. Mr. Woerner reported that he is speaking for himself as a resident of the Southeast Plan area. He said Cherry Lane needs frontage improvements. He said that the fourth Goal 14 boundary location factor needs to be looked at: one has to consider the lands that will remain outside the urban growth boundary; agricultural buffering standards are not the whole answer to that factor. There are other induced impacts. Traffic through farm areas where there is a lot of farm equipment that is going back and forth. It needs to be compatible. Agricultural use along Cherry is horse ranching; an equestrian park is going to be there; that is absolutely compatible. The fourth factor has to be reviewed. It is part of the whole.
- w. Dave Wright, 4036 Fieldbrook Avenue, Medford, Oregon, 97504. Mr. Wright stated that location, livability, and schools create a desire for people coming to the area. He opined that MD-5 will be needed in the future to continue to fill in the Southeast Plan in order to have a desirable area in Southeast Medford. He would like to see the connection of west Medford and the downtown core all the way up to Chrissy Park and Prescott Park and have the trails finished. He added that people are now paying more attention to "walk scores." Medford has a walk score of 35, Ashland is 51, and Portland is 70. Medford is very dependent on cars.
- x. Roger Hall, 3541 Princeton Way, Medford, Oregon, 97504. Mr. Hall owns approximately 37 acres south of Cherry Lane that is inside the urban growth boundary. It is up the street from Summerfield. He was disappointed to find out that it would be difficult to develop this area because sewer is unavailable. He offered that it does not make sense to add other agricultural land when this land (northern part of MD-5) has no agricultural use. He urges that pressure be put on whoever builds sewers not to trap this area for another 20 years. Mr. Hall submitted his letter into the record.
- y. Dennis Weiler, 4935 Cherry Lane, Medford, Oregon, 97504. His property was brought into the urban growth boundary in 1990 and annexed into the City in 2007. He reported that they have been waiting 36 years on their one tax lot and 28 years on their other tax lot for sewer and water to come up and meet them.
- z. Donna Andrews, 3821 Fieldbrook Avenue, Medford, Oregon, 97504. Summerfield is a jogging, walking, bike-riding, baby-buggy-pushing neighborhood. They applaud the Southeast Master Plan with its well-lighted streets, riparian greenways, trails and parks leading to Chrissy Park. There is a need for connection. She spoke on the property that lies between the existing Summerfield and Chrissy Park. If this land is excluded from the urban growth boundary it would be a large divot; it eliminates everything to Chrissy Park.

- aa. Craig Stone, CSA Planning Ltd, 4497 Brownridge Terrace, Medford, Oregon, 97504. Mr. Stone was representing Mahar Homes regarding their property in northern MD-5. He said their project would produce a complete trail solution, beginning at Bear Creek Greenway, traversing east Medford through the existing southeast area, to the commercial center, through the proposed property to Chrissy Park, north through Mr. Hanson's property with linkages to Prescott Park. Without this, he said, the trail system will come to an end and dump all trail travel on Cherry Lane. On another point, he argued that without development in the city limits, there will be no Systems Development Charge (SDC) revenues. Those SDCs are the source of municipal revenue that can be used to upgrade the sanitary sewer system. He added that transportation needs to be re-evaluated for this property.
- bb. Mike Mahar, 815 Alder Creek Drive, Medford, Oregon, 97504. He said it was a surprise to him that his property was not included in the expansion of the urban growth boundary. With the inclusion of his property people will be able to ride their bicycles from Ashland to the top of Roxy Ann. He wants to make the Southeast Village Center vibrant, to be the best it can be; everything dovetails into it. Mr. Mahar submitted a letter into the record.
- cc. Randy Jones, 815 Alder Creek Drive, Medford, Oregon, 97504. Mr. Jones is a partner at Mahar Homes. He reported that he has been working on this area since the late 1980s. He said there is an area north of Cherry Lane, 244 acres in extent, that has been waiting since 1993 for services. He said the engineering solutions for these areas are excessive, which is why they have not been done. He reported that Mahar Homes has finally gotten to the outer edges of the Southeast Plan to the east, and in less than five years they will be able to start sewer lines to serve those areas with two different access points. They will be able to develop the land if their area of MD-5 is included. Mr. Jones submitted written information into the record.

MD-6

- dd. Matt Sekreta, 118 S. Stage Road, Medford, Oregon, 97501. Mr. Sekreta is opposed to any inclusion into the urban growth boundary. He does not understand why the area between Reader and Starlite will be zoned service commercial.
- ee. Clark Stevens, Richard Stevens & Associates, P. O. Box 4368, Medford, Oregon, 97501. Mr. Stevens reported that he was representing the majority of property owners in the south portion within MD-6. They are proposing commercial in their development area. It provides benefits for street connectivity by providing a public street from South Stage Road to Anton Drive. It also helps Harry & David with their circulation. They can provide east/west circulation. Water is in close proximity. There is sanitary sewer existing on the property. This is an employment inclusion for heavy industrial and commercial.
- ff. Elena Broadway, 2400 Starlite Lane, Medford, Oregon, 97501-8735. She stated that her property would be considered industrial under the staff proposal. She said she and her neighbors like their quality of life and do not want change. They want to be excluded from

the planned development.

MD-7

- ii. Mike Naumes, 1899 Carpenter Hill Road, Medford, Oregon, 97501-9656. Mr. Naumes stated that his family has 57 acres located in MD-7 both east and west of Kings Highway and bordered on the south by South Stage Road. His sister has an additional five acres on the corner of Kings Highway and South Stage Road. He thanked staff for the inclusion of MD-7 into the urban growth boundary. The inclusion provides some balance between the east and west sides of Medford. There is a great need for affordable housing and his plan address that issue. It fits into future transportation plans with limited public investment. It offers mixed-use employment and commercial opportunities along with four neighborhood parks. It includes a donation of land to Kids Unlimited. They would also be donating land to the City of Medford for a new no. 6 fire station .

MD-7 and MD-8

- gg. Mark Knox, 485 W. Nevada Street, Ashland, Oregon, 97520-1043. Mr. Knox is an urban use planner. He spoke about both MD-7 and MD-8. He said both areas meet the Transportation System Plan. There are connections for water and sewer services. Both MD-7 and MD-8 relate to Goal 14 and addresses all the ESEE categories. They concur with staff's recommendation.
- hh. Laz Ayala, 132 West Main Street, Suite 202, Medford, Oregon, 97501. Mr. Ayala commented that MD-7 and MD-8 are areas proposed for growth by staff. These areas ranked high in transportation connectivity, water and sewer availability. These areas will provide much needed affordable housing.

MD-9

- jj. Tim Cummings, 141 NW C Street, Grants Pass, Oregon, 97526. Mr. Cummings is a property owner of a parcel in MD-9 South. He had a petition to enter into the record that represents approximately 14 tax lots in MD-9. He had another handout showing that MD-9 South is along the furthest, most westerly portion of the urban growth boundary, and it encompasses the area along the north, east, and south sides. It is adjacent to Oak Grove Road and Stewart Avenue. Mr. Cummings addressed the scoring criteria. MD-9 had high scores for proximity, sewer, water, and transportation. The parcel size scored more in the middle and low ranges. He believes the scoring on the parcels is as good as any of the ones he has seen. He reported that they have had several neighborhood meetings. The wells are going dry. It would be an opportunity to provide affordable housing on the west side. They agree with the City regarding zoning and open spaces.
- kk. Deb Ruberto, 157 Clover Lane, Medford, Oregon, 97501-2105. Ms. Ruberto said she wastestifying on behalf of the 50 homeowners on Clover Lane. There is undeveloped property all around Clover Lane. They would rather give MD-9 to the people on the east side who want City services. Their concern is as the undeveloped land gets developed and the

urban growth boundary expands it will increase the urban density. They enjoy living on a street that does not have urban density. They do not have the connected streets that have been planned for this area [i.e., the unadopted West Main circulation plan]. Clover Lane is still in Jackson County. The want to stay in Jackson County.

- ii. Joe Brooks, 2704 Stearns Way, Medford, Oregon, 97501-1800. Mr. Brooks spoke on MD-9 north. MD-9 scored high on everything but parcel size. Mr. Brooks owns three lots for a total of 18 acres. Property on the west side of Medford provides a better opportunity for affordable housing. Mr. Brooks asked the Commission to support staff's recommendation to include the area in the urban growth boundary.
- mm. Nick Lazzareschi, 196 Clover Lane, Medford, Oregon, 97501-2106. Mr. Lazzareschi requested that the Commission not include Clover Lane in the annexation [*sic*], mainly for the reasons of cross streets. He has irrigation rights and that would go away if Meadows Lane were extended through. The wildlife is important to the people that live on Clover Lane. The majority of the people that live on Clover Lane are retired. He asked that the Commission not include them in the annexation [*sic*].
- nn. Charlie Smith, 8486 Rogue River Highway, Grants Pass, Oregon, 97527-4351. Mr. Smith said he owns property in MD-9 South. He showed a map (that was included in the information that Mr. Cummings submitted) that is a representative of all of the land owners in that area that have agreed to offer this property to the City as one piece. They would like to be included in the urban growth boundary.
- oo. Jim Zundel, 744 Cardley Avenue, Medford, Oregon, 97504-6184. Mr. Zundel said he was speaking on behalf of Chris Galpin, who works in the same office as he. Mr. Galpin had to leave during testimony on MD-5. He said they have met with the land owners in MD-9 South several times. Mr. Zundel thinks the Commission should accept staff's recommendation. It is a great place for affordable housing. The commercial plus the high and low density makes for a nice mix with the 100 acres. With the transportation and services in place they will meet the 6.6 units per acre density requirement of the Regional Plan.

General Comments

- pp. Greg Holmes, P. O. Box 2442, Grants Pass, Oregon, 97528. Mr. Holmes is the 1000 Friends of Oregon representative for southern Oregon. He reported that 1000 Friends is a statewide nonprofit that watches planning issues like what is being presented; they have no financial interests in any of the lands that are being considered. Mr. Holmes noted that he had already submitted a letter that is already in the record. He said there have been lots of good arguments for inclusion to the urban growth boundary proposal both in the staff recommendation and by property owners who were not included in the recommendation. At this point it comes to considering trade-offs. The trade-offs have to be made in a framework of city, county and state regulations. An urban growth boundary expansion proposal cannot exceed a reasonably calculated number. There are several steps that need to be addressed: 1) There are excess acres already in the proposed staff's proposal. Somewhere there needs to be acres that come out of their proposal, and 2) If the Commission entertains requests to add

land that are not in the proposal, there will have to be considerable consideration of all of the impacts of adding those lands and taking lands out. An equivalent number of acres will have to come out and the equivalent type of acres.

Commissioner Schwimmer asked what the philosophical downside is to including too much land than is needed? Mr. Holmes replied that there are several factors. If there is more acreage in the City's boundaries than can reasonably develop over the given time period, the development patterns that can result can be very inefficient. The City will end up investing more in infrastructure which is not covered by the Systems Development Charges and in many cases not in the increased tax revenue. It ends up costing cities a lot to expand further out from the core than need be.

Commissioner Schwimmer stated that the Commission has heard a lot of testimony about MD-5, and the east side versus the west side. It is his opinion that there is a need to create affordable housing. Most of the testimony about MD-5 was about parks, trails, and the ability to get to City parks. It is really difficult to weigh those esoteric improvements to a community versus the need to improve the viability and livability from affordable housing. How would Mr. Holmes suggest that the Planning Commission deal with that? Mr. Holmes reiterated that these are trade-offs to consider. There were good arguments for all of those things. As this process moves forward, the Planning Commission and the City Council will have to balance the issues. The Housing Element does recognize that there is a significant lack of affordable housing to meet the needs today. Just to catch up to that will require a lot of units being built.

- qq. Joe Brooks, 2704 Stearns Way, Medford, Oregon, 97501-1800. Mr. Brooks asked to add one more point about MD-9 north, which is that he is separated from the city limits only by another 18 acre parcel to the south, which he also owns. It has approximately six acres of land to be developed. The six acres is not part of MD-9. He is not planning on annexing his mobile home park until he is able to annex MD-9 as well.

The public hearing was closed.

Bianca Petrou, Assistant Planning Director, suggested the option of having a study session to talk through the testimony or to wait until the next possible hearing date, which would be no sooner than April 9, 2015. They discussed several possible dates to hold a study session.

Motion: Keep the public hearing closed but allow an additional 14 days for submitting written material, and hold a special study session on Monday, April 6, 2015.

Moved by: Commissioner Mansfield Seconded by: Vice Chair Miranda

Voice Vote: Motion passed, 7-0.

60. Report of the Site Plan and Architectural Commission.

- 60.1 Commissioner Schwimmer reported that the Site Plan and Architectural Commission met on

Friday, March 6, 2015. They heard the application for construction of a 3,750 square foot In-N-Out restaurant and associated exception request seeking relief to minimum front yard setback requirements. The subject site is located on the southeast side of Crater Lake Highway (Highway 62) approximately 500 feet northeast of Route 99 (Pacific Highway). The Site Plan and Architectural Commission approved the application with a discretionary condition requiring a pedestrian path from the mall.

70. Report of the Joint Transportation Subcommittee. None.

80. Report of the Planning Department.

80.1 Jim Huber, Planning Director, reported that there are three items on the Planning Commission study session scheduled for Monday, March 23, 2015. Discussion will be on the airport master plan, overlay text amendments that go along with the airport master plan and beekeeping text amendment.

On March 5, 2015, City Council approved a wetland contract. The Planning Department has a contract with the environmental consulting firm that will do a wetlands inventory related to the urban growth boundary amendment.

On March 19, 2015, City Council will hear the text amendment regarding minor and major revision approvals that come from the Planning Commission and the Site Plan and Architectural Commission.

Kelly Akin, Principal Planner, sent the Planning Commission a sample questionnaire from Stockton, California regarding appointments to a city.

90. Messages and Papers from Chair of Planning Commission. None.

100. Remarks from the City Attorney. None.

110. Propositions and Remarks from the Commission. None.

120. Adjournment.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:12 p.m. The proceedings of this meeting were digitally recorded and are filed in the City Recorder's office.

Submitted by:

Terri L. Rozzana
Recording Secretary

David McFadden
Planning Commission Chair

Approved: March 26, 2015



CITY OF MEDFORD

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

STAFF REPORT – LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE AMENDMENT

Date: March 19, 2015

To: Planning Commission for March 26, 2015, hearing

From: Carla Angeli Paladino, Planner III *CA*

Reviewer: John Adam, AICP, Senior Planner *JA*

Subject: Beekeeping Amendments (File No. DCA-15-014)

BACKGROUND

Proposal: The proposal will amend Chapter 10, Articles I, III, and V of the Municipal Code to allow provisions for beekeeping in all the single family residential zones as well as all commercial and industrial zones. The use will be prohibited in the multi-family residential zones.

History: On two occasions in the last two years, citizens have approached City Council, City staff, or both regarding the issue of beekeeping. The requests were to modify the code in order to make beekeeping a permitted use in a larger number of zoning districts within the city limits. Currently, the Development Code only permits beekeeping in zones that have the Exclusive Agricultural overlay. The E-A overlay only covers approximately 120 acres on the parcels located west of Hillcrest Orchard. Beekeeping elsewhere is not permitted.

The topic of urban agricultural, which includes beekeeping, chickens, and other animal uses is not a new subject and has gained approval in many small and large cities across the country. Bees play a critical role as pollinators for one third of the world's crops. These small insects are important to food production and the allowance of urban beekeeping is one more way citizens can help sustain the bee population. Other cities in the Rogue Valley that allow beekeeping include Ashland and Talent.

The Planning Commission discussed this topic at a study session in July 2014 and authorized the staff to move forward with a text amendment for urban beekeeping.

Authority: A Land Development Code Amendment is a Class 'A' legislative decision. The Planning Commission is authorized to recommend and the City Council to approve amendments to Chapter 10 of the Municipal Code under Sections 10.102, 10.110, 10.111, and 10.122.

Criteria: Medford Land Development Code 10.184(2)

"Working with the Community to Shape a Vibrant and Exceptional City"

Lausmann Annex • 200 South Ivy Street • Medford OR 97501
Phone (541)774-2380 • Fax (541)618-1708

COMPLIANCE WITH APPROVAL CRITERIA

10.184(2). Class 'A' Amendment Criteria - Land Development Code Amendment.

The Planning Commission shall base its recommendation, and the City Council its decision, on the following criteria:

Criterion 10.184(2)(a). Explanation of the public benefit of the amendment.

Findings: The allowance of urban agriculture has become an important topic in recent years as a focus on where food is grown and how it is grown has increased. Urban beekeeping is not a new concept and more and more cities across the country and globe are recognizing the positive impacts and necessity of honeybees. It is recognized that honeybees pollinate one third of the world's crops and humans' and animals' diets would be significantly altered with the loss of such insects. Research has shown that urban beekeeping is successful in helping to produce better tasting and more diverse honey and the survival rate of honeybees in urban environments is higher than in rural environments.

The amendment to allow for beekeeping in the city limits of Medford is beneficial to the environment, the local beekeepers interested in maintaining hives on their property, and the diverse flora that exist within the city limits and immediately adjacent.

Conclusion: The amendment provides changes to the code provisions to allow urban beekeeping within the city limits of Medford. Local beekeepers and honeybees benefit from this modification which in turn benefits the plant life and local food economy in the city and in the surrounding area. Criterion 10.184(2)(a) is satisfied.

Criterion 10.184(2)(b). The justification for the amendment with respect to the following factors:

Criterion 10.184(2)(b)(1). Conformity with applicable Statewide Planning Goals and Guidelines.

Findings: The following indicates compliance with the applicable Statewide Planning Goals. The applicable goals addressed include Goal 1: Citizen Involvement and Goal 2: Land Use Planning. Staff finds Goals 3–14 do not apply to this application and Goals 15–19 are not applicable to the City of Medford.

1. Goal 1 – Citizen Involvement

The City has an adopted Citizen Involvement Element in compliance with Statewide Planning Goal 1. This proposal highlights citizen involvement at its best. The topic was raised by concerned citizens on two different occasions and it was brought forward and discussed among the Planning Commission members (a citizen-based Commission), who then initiated the amendment. City staff engaged members of the Southern Oregon Beekeepers Association early in the process to discuss the proposed language and help ensure the best product.

Proposals such as these follow an established process that seeks to inform and involve the citizenry. Proposals are sent to the State (Department of Land Conservation and Development) for review and comment. The draft language is posted on the City's website to receive citizen input and feedback. Hearing notices are published in the Mail Tribune and posted on the City's website along with meeting agendas in order to engage citizen participation in the process and

provide comments. The review bodies (Planning Commission and City Council) will consider and vote on the proposed amendment during televised public hearings, providing an open forum to discuss the proposal.

2. Goal 2 – Land Use Planning

The City of Medford has an adopted Comprehensive Plan and Development Code that provide the basis for decisions and actions taken on land use matters. This proposal amends the code to expand the areas where urban beekeeping is permitted in the city limits. It is important to review land use regulations and make changes as necessary to further the goals and policies of the City's Comprehensive Plan.

Conclusion: The proposal is specific to modifying the Development Code rather than making changes to Comprehensive Plan policies. In broad terms, the proposal meets the Statewide Planning Goals identified above. Also, it highlights citizen involvement at its best. Criterion 10.184(2)(b)(1) is satisfied.

Criterion 10.184(2)(b)(2). Conformity with goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan considered relevant to the decision.

Findings: The goals in the Comprehensive Plan noted below identify some of the broad categories addressed with the Development Code changes.

Environmental Element – Physical Characteristics, Goal 1: To improve and maintain the quality of life in Medford by using land use planning strategies that has positive effects on the natural environment.

Environmental Element – Natural Resources, Goal 7: To preserve and protect plants and wildlife habitat in Medford.

The introduction of urban beekeeping within the city limits of Medford will make positive impacts on the natural environment because of the pollination services bees provide to local plants and trees. The allowance of small scale beekeeping is an important step in helping the natural environment and promoting the many benefits provided by bees.

Conclusion: The proposed amendment broadly addresses some of the goals of the Comprehensive Plan and is necessary in order to modify the Development Code in order to make beekeeping a permitted use in a majority of the zoning districts in the City. Criterion 10.184(2)(b)(2) is satisfied.

Criterion 10.184(2)(b)(3). Comments from applicable referral agencies regarding applicable statutes or regulations.

Findings: The original draft proposal was e-mailed to the Department of Land Conservation and Development on January 30, 2015. The DLCDC acknowledged receipt of the text amendment but no additional comments have been provided to Planning staff. The applicable local referral agencies identified in Section 10.146 of the Land Development Code were sent copies of the draft language on February 19, 2015. Planning staff has not received any comments from those agencies on the proposal.

Conclusion: Criterion 10.184(2)(b)(3) is satisfied.

Criterion 10.184(2)(b)(4). Public comments.

Findings: The amendment was proposed by a Medford resident and beekeeper and initiated by the Planning Commission at a study session in July 2014. Planning staff solicited comments on draft language from members of the Southern Oregon Beekeepers Association and a personal contact who is also a long time beekeeper. The final draft language was posted on the City's website on March 2, 2015, providing an opportunity for the public to submit additional feedback on the amendment.

Conclusion: Criterion 10.184(2)(b)(4) is satisfied.

Criterion 10.184(2)(b)(5). Applicable governmental agreements.

Findings: There are no governmental agreements that apply to the proposed code amendments.

Conclusion: Criterion 10.184(2)(b)(5) is not applicable.

DISCUSSION: The amendment is proposed to make beekeeping compatible with other urban uses. The use is permitted in all zoning districts except the multi-family residential districts, where the density of these zones may not be appropriate for beekeeping. Beekeepers are required to maintain setbacks per the code. There are provisions to regulate flight paths. Other provisions, such as the beekeeper's responsibility to replace aggressive queens, are also included in the proposal in order to make this use compatible with other permitted uses.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Based on the findings and conclusions that all of the approval criteria are either met or are not applicable, staff recommends the Planning Commission initiate and forward a favorable recommendation for adoption of DCA-15-014 to the City Council per the staff report dated March 19, 2015, including Exhibits A through C.

EXHIBITS:

- A Proposed Code Amendment
- B Planning Commission Study Session Minutes, July 14, 2014
- C Public comment submitted via e-mail received on March 10, 2015

PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA: March 26, 2015

EXHIBIT A
Beekeeping Amendment

The use of **Bold** text indicates new language and ~~Strikethrough~~ text indicates language to be removed.

**Section 10.012 Definitions, Specific.
Beekeeping Terms.**

Bee. Any stage of the common domestic honey bee, *Apis mellifera*.

Beekeeper. A person who raises honeybees; apiculturist.

Beekeeping. The rearing and breeding of honeybees; apiculture.

Colony. A hive and related equipment and appurtenances including bees, comb, honey, pollen, and brood.

Hive. A shelter constructed for housing a colony of honey bees.

Swarm. A group of bees when migrating with a queen to establish a new colony.

Section 10.314 Permitted Uses in Residential Land Use Classification.

PERMITTED USES IN RESIDENTIAL ZONING DISTRICTS	SFR 00	SFR 2	SFR 4	SFR 6	SFR 10	MFR 15	MFR 20	MFR 30	Special Use or Other Code Section(s)
6. NONRESIDENTIAL SPECIAL USES									
(n) Beekeeping	Ps	Ps	Ps	Ps	Ps	X	X	X	10.813 (C)

Section 10.337 Uses Permitted in Commercial and Industrial Zoning Districts.

02 AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION-LIVESTOCK. This major group includes farms, ranches primarily engaged in the keeping, grazing, or feeding of livestock for the sale of livestock. As used herein, the term livestock refers only to cattle, sheep, and goats; also included are animal specialties, such as horses, bees, fish in captivity.

		C-S/P	C-N	C-C	C-R	C-H	I-L	I-G	I-H
021	Livestock, except Dairy and Poultry	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
024	Dairy Farms	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
025	Poultry and Eggs	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
027	Animal Specialties	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
0279	-Beekeeping	Ps	Ps	Ps	Ps	Ps	Ps	Ps	Ps
029	General Farms, Primarily Livestock	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

The special use reference for beekeeping corresponds with Section 10.813, Agricultural Services and Animal Services.

Section 10.707 Exceptions to Yard Requirements.

(5) Beehives may be placed within a front yard setback when a minimum of ten feet of setback is maintained from a street right-of-way.

Section 10.813 Agricultural Services and Animal Services.

C. Beekeeping.

The City recognizes the many benefits of bees including pollination services and useable products such as honey and wax. The keeping of bees is permitted in the single-family residential districts, and commercial and industrial districts in the city limits subject to the following standards:

1. Registration with the Medford Planning Department is required in order to keep beehives within the city limits.
2. Number of Hives Permitted.
 - a. A maximum of three hives on a property less than one acre.
 - b. A maximum of six hives on a property one acre or greater.
3. A beekeeper who owns five or more hives is required by the State to register them with the Oregon Department of Agriculture.
4. Bees shall be kept in hives with removeable frames or combs, which shall be kept in sound and usable condition.

5. For each colony permitted to be maintained under this ordinance, one temporary nucleus colony in a hive structure not to exceed one standard 9-5/8-inch-depth, ten-frame hive body may also be maintained on the same property.
6. Hives shall not be placed within a required side, rear, street side, or buffer yard.
7. Hives shall be kept ten feet from any street right-of-way, except for along alleys where standard yards apply.
8. When a beehive is located less than 20 feet from a property line, a flyway barrier at least six feet in height shall be maintained parallel to the property line for a minimum of five feet in either direction of the hive. The flyway barrier may consist of a wall, fence, dense vegetation or a combination thereof, such that bees will fly over rather than through the material to reach the colony.
9. A constant supply of fresh water shall be provided for the colonies on site within 15 feet of each hive.
10. Each beekeeper shall ensure that no wax comb or other material that might encourage robbing by other bees are left upon the grounds of the property. Such materials once removed from the site shall be handled and stored in sealed containers, or placed within a building or other insect-proof container.
11. If the beekeeper serves the community by removing a swarm or swarms of honey bees from locations where they are not desired, the beekeeper shall be permitted to temporarily hive the swarm on their property for up to 30 days from the date acquired, at which time the hive limit requirements of Section C.2 apply once more.
12. Products generated on site by bees, such as honey, shall be permitted to be sold on the property per applicable business license and/or home occupation regulations; however, no outdoor sales are permitted.
13. A beekeeper shall not locate or maintain a hive on property owned by another person without first obtaining permission from the property owner or person lawfully in possession of the property.
14. A beekeeper shall immediately replace the queen in a hive that exhibits aggressive characteristics, including stinging or attempting to sting without provocation.
15. Only docile common honey bees shall be permitted. African honey bees or any hybrid thereof are prohibited.
16. Any person found in violation of the above standards is subject to the nuisance abatement laws identified in the Municipal Code (Section 5.520 or as amended).



MINUTES
PLANNING COMMISSION STUDY SESSION
July 14, 2014

The study session of the Medford Planning Commission was called to order at 12:00 p.m. in Room 151 of the Lausmann Annex on the above date with the following members and staff in attendance:

Commissioners: Michael Zarosinski, David McFadden, Bill Christie, Bill Mansfield and Alec Schwimmer (arrived at 12:05).

Staff: Bianca Petrou, Kelly Akin, John Adam and Carla Paladino.

Guest: Jesse Botens

Subjects: 1. Discussion of possible beekeeping Code amendment (per citizen request).

John Adam, Senior Planner, reported that twice in the past few months a citizen has approached the City requesting that the Planning Department change the code to allow beekeeping as an urban use. Staff is looking for the Planning Commission to either recommend initiation or put in on the next agenda for the Commission to initiate it as a Code amendment. Mr. Adam reviewed briefly the public safety, utility, duty, nuisance, scope and scale of beekeeping.

Commissioner Christie stated that he sees no use in beekeeping. His store sells a lot of bee supplies. It is an on-going adventure with the bee industry. He does not know about bringing them into an urban setting. He does not see the need.

Commissioner McFadden commented that if beekeeping was regulated in an SFR-10 or greater area the probability of problems increase dramatically. If a person has an acre of land in the City he may not be noticed.

Commissioner Christie reported that where he lives everyone has large lots. It is a rural setting. There are beehives in that area. He is thinking of neighborhoods in general whether it is acceptable. Bees swarm, the hives will move and they are agitating to see beehives in trees. Some people are allergic to bees.

Chair Zarosinski asked if the discussion was regarding people being able to put beekeeping in their back yards and rent them out or as a hobby. Mr. Adam said he understood it to be for hobby purposes, but with the ability to sell their excess honey.

Mr. Adam reported that Mr. Botens sent him an example of what some cities are limited to. Most cities limit it to three boxes; over an acre they were allowed no more than six boxes. A commercial operation would have hundreds or thousands of hives. He has raised bees in urban Seattle. They disburse four to five feet away.

Chair Zarosinski asked if beekeeping gets registered with the Department of Agriculture. Mr. Botens said varies by city and state. Most recently Ashland required registration and Portland has a registry.

Commissioner Mansfield stated that he tends to favor this. Is there any data about the danger to people in neighborhoods? Mr. Adam reported that he did not have any data at this time. Mr. Botens also reported that he did not have any data.

CITY OF MEDFORD
EXHIBIT # B to PC Report
File # DCA-15-014

Commissioner Mansfield inquired whether honey bees' swarm and attack people? Mr. Botens replied that they do not swarm and attack people. The swarm to procreate and split the hive.

Commissioner Mansfield asked if there were a lot of folks in the area that would like to do this. Mr. Botens replied that he has found a lot of support. It is good for gardeners in the area. He has noticed in the last several years there are less and less bees in the area.

Chair Zarosinski state that there needs to be more information on beekeeping.

Bianca Petrou, Assistant Planning Director, inquired whether there was a lot size minimum that Mr. Botens would suggest. Mr. Botens replied that he supplied language as a starting point to Mr. Adam.

Commissioner Mansfield commented that the Commission should initiate the code. It is a healthy debate for the community.

Commissioner Schwimmer agreed. There needs to be reasonable management, lot size, best use and minimum issue regarding number of units.

Mr. Adam asked if this was the sort of item to put on the Planning Commission's agenda consent calendar as an initiation or what? Kelly Akin, Principal Planner replied that it is done all at once as an initiation and recommendation. There would be a study session on the text before the public hearing.

Commissioner Mansfield stated that if it goes to a public hearing he hopes that the proponents would bring data about health and safety that counter against the general fear that people have.

Mr. Adam has contacted the Oregon Beekeepers Association to see what resources they have.

Ms. Akin reported that staff had received Paul Shoemaker's resignation on Friday, July 11, 2014. He has moved out of the City.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:27 p.m.

Submitted by:
Terri L. Rozzana, Recording Secretary

Carla G. Paladino

From: Praline M. McCormack
Sent: Tuesday, March 10, 2015 9:00 AM
To: Carla G. Paladino
Subject: FW: "Legalize" beekeeping in Medford, Oregon - file number (DCA-15-014)

-----Original Message-----

From: Planning Department
Sent: Tuesday, March 10, 2015 7:39 AM
To: Praline M. McCormack
Subject: FW: "Legalize" beekeeping in Medford, Oregon - file number (DCA-15-014)

-----Original Message-----

From: P. Keith Newberry [mailto:pknewberry@comcast.net]
Sent: Sunday, March 08, 2015 6:30 PM
To: Planning Department
Subject: "Legalize" beekeeping in Medford, Oregon - file number (DCA-15-014)

I am writing in support of Legalizing Beekeeping in Medford, Oregon. I have been a beekeeper for 3 years and continually learn the importance of our bee populations.. In most instances, because of new threats (hive beetles, mites, wax moths, and other new diseases), bee colonies cannot survive without the direct assistance of beekeepers. These are very new threats not experience 10-20 years ago. Think what the nation would be like without the help of our bees? A huge percentage of farmer's crops would not be pollinated and would be subject to huge crop loss. Honey bees, if treated correctly, are very gentile and provide a very valuable service to us.

We are in a critical stage with honey bee populations. Please do some research on the plight on the honey bee. We need your help in doing the right thing.. Legalize Beekeeping in Medford, Oregon..

Thanks in advance for your consideration!!!

P. Keith Newberry
4402 Dove Cove
Corinth, MS 38834
662 287-0112

CITY OF MEDFORD
EXHIBIT # C to PC report
File # DCA-15-014