

MINUTES FOR THE REGULAR MEETING

ASHLAND CITY COUNCIL

June 7, 2016

Council Chambers

1175 E. Main Street

CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Stromberg called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. in the Civic Center Council Chambers.

ROLL CALL

Councilor Voisin, Morris, Lemhouse, Seffinger, Rosenthal, and Marsh were present.

MAYOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mayor Stromberg clarified Consent Agenda item #16 was originally under Ordinances, Resolutions, and Contracts on the City website.

City Administrator Dave Kanner explained Jackson County Vector Control District would attend the June 21, 2016 Council meeting to discuss mosquito control practices.

Mayor Stromberg moved agenda item #1 under Ordinances, Resolutions, and Contracts to Public Hearings as the first item.

Senora Chela explained the selection process to choose Ashland High School princesses to represent Ashland in Guanajuato Mexico. Kate Joss-Bradley and Halle Lowe introduced themselves, expressed their gratitude for the opportunity to represent Ashland, and described the dance and song presentations they would perform.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the Study Session of May 16, 2016, Executive Session of May 16, 2016 and Business Meeting of May 17, 2016 were approved as presented.

SPECIAL PRESENTATIONS & AWARDS

The Mayor's proclamations of June 14, 2016 as Flag Day; June 20 - 26, 2016 as National Pollinator Week; June 20, 2016 as Palo Alto Chamber Orchestra Day, and Proclamation thanking the City of Storm Lake, Iowa were read aloud.

Councilor Marsh announced the Ashland Emergency Food Bank would host an open house for their model pollinator garden Friday June 24, 2016 from 4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. during National Pollinator Week.

City Band Board Director Don Bieghler gave the annual presentation and explained the City Band would play concerts in Lithia Park every Thursday from June 16, 2016 through August 11, 2016 plus two events on July 4. The band was looking into traveling to Guanajuato to celebrate the 50th anniversary of Ashland and Guanajuato as sister cities.

Management Analyst Adam Hanks, Chamber of Commerce Executive Director Sandra Slattery, and Jim Teece, a member of the Business Retention & Expansion (B,R&E) leadership team gave the background on the B,R&E project, described the objectives and survey methodology used. Hired consultant Chuck Rund provided a presentation on the survey results.

PUBLIC FORUM

Matt Shennan/2090 Creek Drive/Thanked the Mayor and Council for making Ashland a Bee City USA.

Isaac Bevens/1257 Siskiyou Blvd #1168/Explained he was a member of the Climate Energy and Action Planning Committee and the Ashland Youth Climate Action. He shared his belief on optimizing wellbeing and saw climate change as the greatest threat to wellbeing. Sea level rise threatened coastal cities. Florida would most likely be under water by the year 2100 along with portions of New York and Bangladesh. Droughts in Syria led to the destabilization and the refugee crisis. US government was not taking action on climate change and recovery needed to occur at local levels. He strongly supported implementing the Climate and Energy Action Plan as an ordinance. Council had the potential to leave a legacy of taking bold action on climate change and the opportunity to go beyond a dysfunctional status quo and give the seven generations ahead the chance to experience the wellbeing Council had experienced.

Alexandra Allie Rosenbluth/730 Liberty Street/Continued the climate change discussion and explained the City of Eugene was the first city in the nation to pass a climate recovery ordinance. She described ordinance requirements. The City of Eugene also passed a climate and energy action plan in 2011 and updated it once the ordinance passed. She encouraged Council to adopt a similar climate recovery ordinance.

Claire Pryor/1221 Orchid Street/Spoke as a member of Ashland Youth Climate Action

Committee who strongly supported a climate recovery ordinance. An ordinance would make the plan socially equitable and explained why it needed some form of legal reassurance requirements that were equitable to disadvantaged people in the community.

Carson Barry/134 Church Street/Also spoke as a member of the Youth Climate Action Committee. To her, as a student, the impacts of climate change seemed terrible and irreversible. It was important to take strong action on climate change recovery and back it with an ordinance.

Carly Norton/190 S Mountain Avenue/Stood with the youth to support an ordinance accompanying the Climate Energy Action Plan. She wanted to ensure her future generations would be able to enjoy what she had enjoyed growing up in Ashland. She believed people were responsible for leaving the earth the way they found it and taking action now was vital.

Sarah Lasoff/205 Piedmont Drive/Recently graduated from Ashland High School. She was a member of the Climate Energy and Action Planning Committee and the Ashland Youth Climate Action Group. Every progressive step taken to address climate change had an enormous impact on her generation and future generations. These actions effected the likelihood of her generation living in a safe and healthy environment in the future. It was imperative the City had some form of accountability to make sure it followed through with the actions in the Climate and Energy Action Plan. An ordinance would ensure the City addressed climate change.

Spike Breon/295 East Nevada Street/Spoke on the revised Transportation System Plan. The revision would be expensive. The City adopted the current Transportation System Plan in 2012 and the prior plan in 1998. He questioned what had changed in the last four years that required an expensive update.

CONSENT AGENDA

- 1. Minutes of boards, commissions, and committees**
- 2. Approval of theater corridor public art RFQ**
- 3. Authorization to apply for a grant to hire one additional police officer for three years**
- 4. Approval of a class-special procurement for asphalt patching**
- 5. Approval of a class-special procurement for fuel purchases**
- 6. Contract with Pathway Enterprises to provide janitorial services**
- 7. Approval of a class-special procurement for vehicle and equipment repairs and maintenance**

- 8. Approval of a change order in excess of 25% for concrete work at Reeder Hydro Powerhouse**
- 9. A resolution changing parking fees and fines and repealing Resolution 2016-03**
- 10. A resolution approving the formation of the Rogue Valley Heritage District**
- 11. Acceptance of trail easements**
- 12. A resolution authorizing a 2.5 MGD water treatment plant Infrastructure Financing Authority loan**
- 13. TGM Grant application approval for a Transportation System Plan update**
- 14. Declaration and authorization to dispose of surplus property in a sealed bid auction**
- 15. Intergovernmental Agreement with Jackson County for Forest Patrol**
- 16. Approval of a resolution titled, "A resolution of the City Council amending the 2015-2017 biennium budget to add 3.0 FTE to the Fire Department budget"**

Councilor Voisin pulled Consent Agenda item #13 for discussion.

City Administrator Dave Kanner addressed Consent Agenda item #9 and noted a scribner's error in the resolution for parking fees and fines. The all night parking permit should read 6:00 p.m. to 2:00 a.m. and the resolution showed 6:00 p.m. to 6:00 a.m. The garage was closed from 2:00 a.m. to 6:00 a.m. Councilor Rosenthal pulled Consent Agenda item #9 for further discussion.

Matt Warshawksy/2331 Morada Lane/Spoke to Consent Agenda item #9 and explained his wife worked at the Oregon Shakespeare Festival and often did not leave work until 1:00 a.m. The rate increase for Hargadine parking would increase costs significantly and create possible safety issues if she parked on Pioneer instead.

City Administrator Dave Kanner explained the proposed change for the all day and nightly permit was a request by the Oregon Shakespeare Festival (OSF), and recommended by the Downtown Parking Management and Circulation ad hoc Advisory Committee. The resolution proposed a \$25 evening permit limited to forty customers. He clarified Diamond Parking was enforcing parking in the evenings.

Engineering Services Manager Scott Fleury addressed Consent Agenda item #13, explained it was part of the strategic planning goals for the Council, and brought previously before the Council as a recommendation to update master plans on a five-year schedule. The City was applying for a \$150,000 grant from TGM for the Transportation System Plan update. The other money would match a study in the existing plan for refinements in the

transit chapter as part of a goal for the Transportation Commission. Work would begin 2017 and take approximately one year to 18 months to finalize the master plan update. The Transportation Commission and Planning Commission would work together on the update and hold public meetings. Public Works budgeted \$150,000 in the System Development Charges (SDC) Fund and the Transportation SDC Fund for the TSP update.

Joseph Kauth/1 Corral Lane/Commented on Consent Agenda items #8, #14, and #15. He thought Consent Agenda item #14 might involve property only available to the City and not used for other uses. He also did not think all the issues pertaining to climate change were addressed. Ashland was on a ridge that extended from Japan. A 25 square mile forest was recently thinned using a technique traditionally used by native cultures. Mr. Kauth exceeded his allotted time to speak and continued speaking.

Councilor Rosenthal raised a point of order noting the speaker had used his three minutes. Mr. Kauth continued speaking. Councilor Rosenthal raised another point of order stating Mr. Kauth was disrupting the meeting. Mr. Kauth quit speaking and left the meeting.

Councilor Morris/Seffinger m/s to approve Consent Agenda items. Voice Vote: all AYES. Motion passed.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Approval of a resolution titled, “A resolution transferring appropriations within the 2015-2017 biennium budget”

Administrative Services and Finance Director Lee Tuneberg explained transferring appropriations did not increase the overall budget, it moved money between appropriation levels.

Public Hearing Open: 8:26 p.m.

Public Hearing Closed: 8:26 p.m.

Councilor Rosenthal/Lemhouse m/s to approve Resolution #2016-15. Voice Vote: all AYES. Motion passed.

2. Public hearing and approval of resolutions titled, “A resolution certifying that the City of Ashland provides the following four or more municipal services enumerated Section 1, ORS221.760”

Administrative Services and Finance Director Lee Tuneberg explained the public hearing

would certify the City was qualified and wanted to receive state subventions, revenue sharing from monies collected by the state. This allowed the City to receive approximately \$500,000 per year. He made a correction to the date on the resolution declaring the cities election to receive state revenues. The Budget Committee meeting occurred May 21, 2015, not May 15, 2015. He went on to explain the ordinance that would levy taxes for the fiscal year on operating taxes and debt service.

Councilor Marsh/Seffinger m/s to approve Resolution #2016-11 to receive State Revenues. Voice Vote: all AYES. Motion passed.

Councilor Rosenthal/Lemhouse m/s to approve Resolution #2016-12 certifying the City provides municipal services. Voice Vote: all AYES. Motion passed.

Public Hearing Open: 8:33 p.m.

Public Hearing Closed: 8:33 p.m.

Councilor Voisin/Seffinger m/s to approve First Reading of an Ordinance levying taxes and move to Second Reading. Roll Call Vote: Councilor Morris, Lemhouse, Voisin, Marsh, Seffinger, and Rosenthal, YES. Motion passed.

2. Public hearing and first reading by title only of an ordinance titled, “An ordinance modifying the Verde Village Subdivision’s Development Agreement to allow changes to the property lines, building envelopes, number of detached and attached units, approved landscaping plan, and approved public/private space plan for Phase II, the single family portion of the subdivision” and move onto second reading

CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Stromberg read the procedure for a Public Hearing for Land Use Hearings and opened the hearing at 8:38 p.m.

ABSTENTIONS, CONFLICTS, EX PARTE CONTACTS

Councilor Voisin talked to staff. Councilor Morris also talked to staff, went on some site visits, and received questions from citizens. Councilor Lemhouse, Rosenthal, Marsh, and Seffinger had nothing to declare. Mayor Stromberg noted one ex parte regarding citizen concerns he received that the plan was no longer the same development agreement the Council approved initially.

Applicable substantive criteria included:

- The requirements for a Statutory Development Agreement are described in ORS Chapter 94
- The requirements for a City Ordinance are described in Article 10 of the City Charter
- The requirements for Outline Plan approval or modification are described in the Performance Standards Options chapter of the Ashland Municipal Code in section 18.3.9.040.A.3
- The requirements for Final Plan approval or modification are described in the Performance Standards Options chapter of the Ashland Municipal Code in section 18.3.9.040.B

CHALLENGES - None

STAFF REPORT

Community Development Director Bill Molnar provided history on the project. Council approved the Verde Village subdivision in 2007. This included annexation of the properties, modification to the zoning, and the development approval allowing a 68 unit residential development to move forward. It was also a land exchange. The project incorporated green development practices and a mix of housing types. The development agreement was the first used in the City for a land use approval. The development agreement memorialized specific public improvements and a timeframe along with a public path. Tonight Council would consider an amendment to the development agreement.

Associate Planner Derek Severson further explained the development agreement Council approved in 2007 allowed the City to govern the development to completion. The agreement had a detailed timeline Council modified and had taken to the 15-year maximum allowed by state law. It also had a net zero energy performance standard adopted as part of the subdivision and modified since. A presentation included the following:

Modifications Proposed for Phase II (Single Family portion)

- **Property Lines.** Original plan did not include lot lines for 25 of the 28 proposed single family residences, and simply identified conceptual footprints on a larger common property. Applicants request to add clear property line boundaries to delineate ownership and avoid confusion between property owners.

- **Building Envelopes.** Original plan showed conceptual house footprints. Applicants request to instead identify building envelopes within the property lines to identify the limits of where a home might be built on each lot to provide flexibility in designing and placing homes.
- **Number of Detached and Attached Units.** Original plan showed six attached units. The current proposal reduces this by four, noting that this would provide for more of a mixture of housing types within the subdivision.

Councilor Lemhouse/Rosenthal m/s to extend public hearing until 10:30 p.m. Voice Vote: all AYES. Motion passed.

- **Open Space Treatment.** Original Plan included a Landscaping Plan and a Proposed Public/Private Space Plan that delineated those portions of the common area that were to be landscaped areas managed by the owners' association, single family passive open space and play areas, and privately-maintained landscaped areas adjacent to the individual homes. The applicants propose to define the plantings for the project open space, and to grant a public easement over the path through the open space. Applicants propose envelopes with standard rear setbacks to reduce building massing around the open space, and fence height restrictions would be included in the CC&R's to limit fence heights to four feet so that the common open space areas would retain a sense of openness. Overall, the applicants contend that the proposed modifications to the treatment of the open space areas provide more open space than originally planned and do so in a more useable manner with homes that now face the open space and the street and provide eyes on the open space for a comfortable enjoyable recreational experience.
- **Maximum House Size.** Original Plan included conceptual plans ranging from 1,450 square feet to 2,581 square feet in size, and there was a condition that the homes not exceed 2,500 square feet. As approved by the Planning Commission, the current limits each home to no more than 2,500 square feet not including porches and garages may be up to 540 square feet.
- **Solar Access Requirements.** Original Plan and current Planning Commission approval require compliance with standard Solar Access requirements. The applicants emphasize that the subdivision's original efforts to maximize solar orientation would remain unchanged; that they would provide Earth Advantage® Platinum homes (where only Gold is currently required) that are Photo-Voltaic Ready

with conduit and circuit breakers installed; that homes would be designed with optimum roof pitch and area for solar, and include an identified solar reserve area on building plans; and that an outlet with a 240-watt circuit breaker would be provided in each garage to accommodate an electric car charger.

- **Conceptual Housing Mix from Original Application – Chart**
- **Conceptual Elevations Single Family Home ‘H-J’ – Illustration**
- **Conceptual Floor Plan Single Family Home ‘H-J’ – Illustration**
- **Proposed Typical Singly Story Home (Lot 38) – Illustration**
- **Proposed Typical Two-Story Home (Lot 47) Elevations – Illustration**
- **Proposed Typical Two-Story Home (Lot 47) Perspectives – Illustration**
- **Solar/Energy Efficiency**
 - **Original Approval** Development Agreement included applicants’ “Exhibit K-3” which detailed a customized net zero energy performance standard.
 - **As Currently Modified** Homes shall be constructed to Earth Advantage Gold standards and be Photovoltaic Ready.
 - **Proposed** Phase II shall be constructed to Earth Advantage Platinum standards; be Photovoltaic Ready; be designed with optimum roof pitch and area for solar, and include an identified solar reserve area on building plans; and include electrical vehicle charging stations in each garage as proposed by the applicants.
- **Development Agreement Modifications for Phase II – Original Plan – Illustration**
- **Development Agreement Modifications for Phase II – Proposed Public/Private Space - Illustration**
- **Development Agreement Modifications for Phase II – Single Family Home – Illustration**
- **Development Agreement Modifications for Phase II – Building Envelopes with Overlay and Proposed Footprints - Illustration**
- **Development Agreement Modifications for Phase II – Landscape Plan - Illustration**
- **Modifications Proposed for Phase II**
 - Property Lines

- Building Envelopes
- Number of Detached and Attached Units
- Open Space Treatment
- Maximum House Size
- Solar Access Requirements
- **Planning Commission Decision & Recommendation.** The Planning Commission approved the land use application subject to conditions. With regard to modification of the Development Agreement, the Commission did not make any decision on issues regarding the Development Agreement because they felt these were policy matters. The Planning Commission recommended that the Council carefully consider whether the current proposal meets the Councilors understanding of the intent of the original Development Agreement.

Mr. Severson clarified open space was community managed and theoretically, people could move between the houses to the open space from anywhere on the streetscape. He addressed lot sizes and explained every lot size could be 2,500 sq. ft. with a 540 sq. ft. garage as long as it met lot coverage, solar and other requirements. The blue area on Sheet A17 indicated the house/envelope and the green area depicted open space. New lots backed into the creek path. The level of landscaping on the creek concerned the Parks and Recreation Department and they subsequently reduced the amount required. It was the responsibility of the developer to plant trees to shade the creek. The City would verify they were installed according to the plan and specifications then the Parks and Recreation Department would provide maintenance. City Attorney Dave Lohman clarified landscape changes occurred in the previous amendment and development agreement. The Mayor requested further clarification on optimum solar orientation and fences from the applicant.

APPLICANT'S PRESENTATION

Mark Knox/45 West Nevada Street/Explained two points in the proposal. One was the energy efficiencies and conservation standards related to the application. This project would be the only zero net energy ready subdivision in the state. The application had changed a couple times. The last change went to Earth Advantage Gold. He addressed the open space between the units. The agreement would not allow a homeowner to expand beyond the property line without having to get approval from the Home Owners Association, the Planning Commission, and then Council. They were proposing envelopes that would allow a house to maneuver within that envelope. Restrictions of house size,

solar access, lot coverage that defined how and where a house should go. It also required porches. The applicant was proposing to push the garage back and bring the porch forward. Currently the back bedroom and bathroom were 10-feet from the bike path. All lots were zero net energy ready with only one or two that might not be feasible.

Troy Hamilton/328 Talen Avenue, Talent, OR/Further addressed orientation and passive solar. The proposed modifications would allow for backyard living, views of the open space, the creek, front, and back orientation and make it zero net energy ready through the Earth Advantage. Currently the subdivision was Earth Advantage Gold with unique footprints locked in facing the side yard and no orientation. They would model the house and have the solar company calculate there was enough optimum roof area to generate power. The houses would be net zero ready and an option to the buyer. The home without zero net energy was already beyond platinum. Not everyone could afford a zero net energy ready home. A house with more glazing might have to go to 8-inch walls, or a different heating/cooling system and would require additional solar.

Valerie Williams/744 Helman Street/

Shawn Schreiner/330 E Hersey/Explained fixed, glazed, silicone panels for solar were the “workhorse” of the industry and what they saw in the future. Truth South Solar panels used innovative technology. Solar power had evolved in steady incremental improvements and doubled the power than the ones installed eight years prior.

The applicants clarified achieving zero net ready homes would not take up additional open space and actually added more. Fencing would be no greater than 4 feet, transparent for the backside of the lot. Fencing in the front would be 2.5 feet high. Fencing on the side could go up to 6-feet for privacy and pet ownership. They strongly supported orientating the houses with front porches, nice landscaping, and open areas. Backyard fencing would mostly likely have gates to the path along the creek area. Council thought a pathway through the middle of the homes would provide additional access for the inside of the development to get to the creek. The applicants indicated there were three routes to access the creek. They supported Council giving staff the ability to allow a path in between homes and move access.

THOSE WISHING TO PROVIDE TESTIMONY – IN FAVOR AND OPPOSED

Rick Harris/190 Oak Street #1/Strongly supported the modifications and questioned whether Council wanted a project that was feasible and that people would pay for or did they want a concept. A conceptual footprint was an idea. They were making orientation

and roof pitches solar accessible and adjusting open space to make the homes street friendly. He questioned if Council would live in a neighborhood where everyone could walk through their yard at any time and the footprint of the house was the extent of their ownership. There were 68 units with 15 deed restricted affordable housing. Twenty-four units would be 500 to 1,400 square feet. The remaining in the Phase II modification could go up to 2,500 square feet. The restrictions would drive down the size of the homes. The modification made it more practical, deliverable, affordable and better available to the market place for people who would buy. He urged Council to accept the modifications and adopt the ordinance.

John Zupan/2850 Seckel Court, Medford/Explained he owned a real estate company in Ashland. Inventory in Ashland was 20% down from 2015 and that was down from the year before. Currently the market was 3-5 years out from catching up to where they should be for the need of houses in Jackson County. No new construction effected existing home inventory, increased prices, and subsequently affordable housing. Any kind of construction will develop more affordable housing by lessening the strains on the inventory. There were three phases, the Affordable Phase, the Cottage Phase, and now the Single Family Residential Phase. Initially the project was conceptual with actual floor plans developed later. The cottages had lot lines and that was supposed to apply to this phase. The project would help the entire community and be the greenest project in the area and possibly in the whole state.

Barb Barasa/183 W Nevada Street/Lived in Ashland for 20 years and explained how her life intersected with Verde Village in three different ways. She worked for the original planner. Years later, she participated in the affordable housing portion as one of the original homeowners and put in a lot of construction. Currently she lives a block from the development and now had an interest because she was a neighbor. In 2006, solar was expensive so they orientated the homes for passive solar and that was no longer necessary. Public benefits included the affordable houses already established, and the ability to go zero net energy.

Fred Gant/715 Sunrise Circle/Explained he was a state licensed energy assessor, and a licensed rater and verifier. He tested and certified almost 400 homes in ten years and specialized in representing Earth Advantage, the Energy Trust of Oregon, and Energy Star and LED homes. It was a privilege to support the Verde Village project. Science showed the future of the planet was everyone's responsibility. Zero net was the future of building, and mandated statewide for Washington by 2030 and 2020 for California. This was a unique project. The value of the project far outweighed the modifications. He was excited

to support a zero net ready project.

Bryan Sohl/283 Scenic Drive/Was a member of the Conservation Commission and the Climate and Energy Action Plan ad hoc Committee but spoke as a private citizen. He noted the project began in 2006, was approved 2007 and went through the economic downturn in 2008 that made the green components of the project no longer economically viable. Now the plans no longer had the passive solar emphasis making the original footprints no longer necessary. The developers were asking for flexibility in the footprint and the plan and were willing to commit the homes to Earth Advantage Platinum and zero net ready. He asked Council to decide whether the advantages proposed by the developers outweighed any of the negatives.

REBUTTAL BY THE APPLICANT

The applicants addressed how growing marijuana effected the development. The project had shadow restrictions for vegetation. A resident would not be able to grow marijuana in the backyards that faced the open space.

They went on to clarify the Planning Commission approved the new building envelopes, setbacks, and the fencing. The understanding was the Commission wanted Council to review the changes to see if it met the original intent. This concern related to 2.8. The modifications changed open space between homes to a conventional subdivision. The developers agreed with the Commission and thought the modifications were a drastic improvement. Front porches and homes that orientate to the open space outweighed space in between houses. The modifications increased livability.

The applicants addressed the expense, noted the original one-site plan that called for the Home Owners Association to maintain all of the space between homes, and explained it would have been expensive. Having more of the land in between as private would have homeowners maintaining their own space and would be less costly.

Greg Williams explained that one of the biggest costs with the prior project was the ground source heat pump that was no longer in the plan. The modified project would not cost more and might be less expensive in some areas. There was a huge technology change over the past ten years. The applicants were not asking for any exceptions or variances. The plan met all the criteria. They just wanted to amend a modification in the development agreement. This was a better plan.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED – 10:23 p.m.

REQUESTS TO SUBMIT FINAL WRITTEN ARGUMENT - None

ADVICE FROM LEGAL COUNSEL AND STAFF

Mr. Severson addressed the Planning Commission decision and clarified they wanted Council to look at the development agreement carefully. They debated whether to include staff's concerns as a reflection of the discussion that happened at the meeting. They specifically stated they were not making a recommendation in that regard. The original approval focused on community by design and had a specific character around the site plan. The applicant was proposing a significant change to that character. Staff wanted to ensure Council reviewed the proposed modification in terms of the original approval to make sure it was acceptable. Mr. Molnar added the applicants were proposing the net zero ready modifications for the first time this evening and had not at the Planning Commission meeting. If Council approved the development agreement, staff would incorporate those changes into the agreement as well as any interest in giving staff the flexibility to work with the applicant and move the pathway. This was an adjustment.

Mr. Lohman explained if Council did not approve the agreement it would return to the current development agreement and the Planning Commission approvals would be void. This was a contract and Council could negotiate changes. Mr. Severson commented if Council approved the ordinance, they would add the net zero energy ready language so it matched the development agreement.

Councilor Lemhouse/Marsh m/s to continue the item to the next Council Meeting.

DISCUSSION: Councilor Marsh requested staff work with the applicant on the reorientation of the path, the incorporation of the correct net zero energy ready language, and remove the Planning Commission's cap on size. **Roll Call Vote: Councilor Voisin, Morris, Lemhouse, Seffinger, Rosenthal, and Marsh, YES. Motion passed.**

COUNCIL DELIBERATION AND DECISION

Continued to next meeting.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. **Approval of a resolution titled, "A resolution of the City of Ashland, Jackson County, Oregon, to submit to Ashland electors at the November 8, 2016 General Election an advisory question to encourage the 2017 Oregon Legislature to design an improved comprehensive healthcare system for all Oregon residents,**

that would ensure choice of provider; have effective cost controls; provide timely and equitable access; emphasize prevention and be affordable for families, businesses, and society”

Item delayed due to time constraints.

NEW AND MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS (None)

ORDINANCES, RESOLUTIONS AND CONTRACTS – (None)

OTHER BUSINESS FROM COUNCIL MEMBERS/REPORTS FROM COUNCIL LIAISONS

ADJOURNMENT OF BUSINESS MEETING

Meeting adjourned at 10:30 p.m.