



**Comprehensive Plan  
Citizen Advisory Committee  
Meeting #3 – Summary**

**October 27, 2010  
Council Chambers, City Hall  
4:00 pm – 6:00 pm**

**Members in attendance:** Sally Moncrieff (Chair), Dorothy Atwood, Tom Brennan, Christopher Clee, Doug Cushing, Tom Fahey, Bill Gaar, Nancy Gronowski, Liz Hartman, Jim Johnson, Tim Mather, Bob Needham, Teri Oelrich, David White

**Members not in attendance:** Lauren Irving

**Staff in attendance:** Sid Sin, Laura Weigel, Sarah Selden, City of Lake Oswego; Kirstin Greene, Cogan Owens Cogan, facilitator

**1. Public Comment.** There were no comments given at the beginning of the meeting.

**2. General Updates**

Christopher Clee shared input from neighborhood associations.

- Concern re: outlying neighborhoods and potential impact of city-wide density requirements, with specific question raised in the Forest Highlands neighborhood area.
  - Forest Highlands has had their existing comprehensive plan density since 1987. After much effort to try and reach consensus amongst the neighborhood, higher densities were placed along the edges/arterial roads. Staff is aware of these concerns and the issue of how to accommodate future growth will be discussed during this process.
- Suggestion of a message board to post comments/suggestions for whole of the committee
  - A message board would require more staff resources than available, but staff will distribute public comment (received via web site, e-mail, writing) in the CAC meeting packets each month. So far about 10 messages have been received. If appropriate, staff is following up with a response.
- Public comment session – reminded CAC of importance of listening to public comment.

Sid Sin noted that he added a CAC meeting on December 2 (Thursday), since there was a lot of information to discuss. This meeting is in addition to the design charrette or workshop planned for mid-December to start looking at alternative scenarios. The next meeting will be Wednesday, November 17.

**3. Workshop Summary**

The City had 832 respondents to the online survey, and 114 attendees at the 2 workshops. Themes through survey/workshop include:

- Multi-modal transportation, better options
- More diversity in businesses / housing (everyday goods, services, locate within walking distance)
- More community gathering places (link to commercial areas)
- Neighborhood identity

- Community culture/recreation – community center, year round covered recreation area out of rain
- Healthy ecosystem – incentives/disincentives for water quality/waste
- Market community – great place for family, affordable
- Inter-generational community housing, community, interaction
- Schools/education still at top of people’s minds

CAC members who attended the workshops shared their feedback:

- Respect for private property and government leading the way for stewardship of parks and national areas.
- There were new faces at the workshops, and a variety of neighborhoods represented.
- Question in one group re: lack of baseline information. Staff is preparing background reports on all of the topics in the existing comprehensive plan, which will provide in-depth information on existing conditions, and trends, and will be available by early 2011.
- Feedback on way out – participants felt they got to say what they wanted to say and everything was captured, listened to, great discourse, productive, good use of the participants time.

The next public meeting will be in February. CAC members were encouraged to share ideas for this meeting with staff.

#### **4. Draft Vision & Validation**

A first draft of the community vision statement was developed based primarily survey results and workshop feedback. The 2008 City Council vision, board and commission feedback on that vision, and vision statements from 18 different existing plans also informed the draft (a CAC member noted the Affordable Housing document was not included in the 18 existing plans, but does have a policy framework to be considered.)

After the CAC feedback has been incorporated, the draft vision will be posted online and available for the community to review and comment on through Survey Monkey. In January a 300 respondent statistically valid phone survey will be conducted to ensure the statement is supported by a representative group of the community. We anticipate cell phone numbers will be included.

#### **CAC Feedback on the Draft Vision Statement**

##### **INTRODUCTION**

- Unclear what the sentence about resilient and adaptable means
- Could do without the “harmony with nature” and “tapestry” language – too flowery
- Should use simple, concrete language or reader gets lost
- Cut the text in half
- Look at the Wordle: Schools are huge. Should give this importance in vision
- Harmony with nature is an important characteristic to LO

##### **COMMUNITY CULTURE**

- Be more explicit about education, i.e. LO schools are the best in the state of Oregon and why people move here
- More mention of the 50+ age group
- Cut text in half

## **COMPLETE NEIGHBORHOODS AND HOUSING**

- Delete part about older housing stock
- Are we missing demographic groups – only mentions young families and seniors
- Do we need to spell out every group? That would be a long list
- Should describe diversity of age groups in more general way
- Suggested housing needs for the span of a lifetime
- Are we talking about diversity of age only, or affordability, too?
- Delete transportation concepts – included in that action area

## **A CONNECTED COMMUNITY**

- Need to address how we connect to the region, as well as get around town
- We need to think not only about how LO residents get outside of LO to work, but people who don't live in LO and come here to work

## **ECONOMIC VITALITY**

- Mentions home-based business. Should we mention this explicitly? Many have concern about the associated neighborhood impacts.
- Maybe it should talk about working at home.
- A member clarified that this was a strong idea that came out of the workshop discussion table, and it was specific to home-based businesses.
- Could test idea through validation survey or this specific idea might be something to move to a policy rather than broad vision.
- The statement leaps from the city to global – there is a geographic gap. We should at least mention the region, and check with Jane Blackstone on the connection to the Global Economy for LO businesses.

## **HEALTHY ECOSYSTEMS**

- Should add something about the services provided by the ecosystem, or green infrastructure
- Should say City leads community as stewards of the natural environment
- Natural systems interweave with the urban environment, rather than garden of natural beauty language
- Reflect balance of concern about private property rights

## **HEALTHY, SAFE PEOPLE**

- The title is confusing. Are people safe, or is the community safe?
- Consider revising title. Safe communities, healthy people?
- Use word “Living” rather than “lifestyle” – we don't want to dictate the latter

## **INSPIRING SPACES AND PLACES**

- Talk about open spaces generally, not specific ones
- This topic was hard for people to grasp at the workshop tables
- We need a vision for what the community wants regarding growth.
- Portland is one of the bigger words in the Wordle. Need to address LO's place within the region.
- Should put in a placeholder to define this in the vision statement.

## **GENERAL**

- Surprised how little sustainability was called out in the statement.
- Sustainability is reflected more in the concepts embodied in the vision, rather than with the word sustainability or its definition.

## 5. Demographic Overview

Laura Weigel reviewed key points from the demographics report prepared for the City by FCS group. The full report is available on the CAC web site, and is an important foundation for the Plan update.

- Mega trends: Metro expects 600,000 new residents by 2030.
- Lake Oswego has 37,000 residents in City Limits, 43,000 in urban services boundary.
- Population rank #13 in state
- Median age is rising, real income levels high, but falling
- 2600 residents meet federal poverty level, double 2000 level
- 52,000 residents projected for 2035, requiring 138 – 188 new dwelling “units” per year
- Most growth projected in over 65 age group

Housing supply/demand/gap strategies will be discussed in coming weeks. CAC members passionate about dwelling units & employees per acre were encouraged to volunteer for a housing and economic development work group to review background reports and give staff and the CAC feedback on key questions over the next several months. On November 8 staff will give the Planning Commission an overview of the Housing (Goal 10) and Economic Development (Goal 9) elements of periodic review and ask for their participation in this work group.

The next meeting will be November 17 and the CAC will preview of 3-5 conceptual future scenarios to meet the community vision.

## 6. Public Comment

Tom Coffey, former CD director and assistant city manager for Lake Oswego:

- The vision should talk about what Lake Oswego wants for its physical development. City currently has a vision for no development in Stafford, and this should be part of new vision. Stafford helps define Lake Oswego’s sense of place.
- Vision is on the shelf, in the comp plan, needs to be continued – allows City to say if it wants to be different (is continuous growth a wonderful thing to do). Allows Stafford to be a boundary – been saying that to Metro since 1992. Metro has only given the city money for south shore purchase. LO has developed the downtown on its own.
- Metro is no longer saying there is a need for higher density. Time to get to specifics.
- Community center is included in draft vision, but from the survey results only 38% support an active indoor center. Where did support come to put this in the vision?

*Staff response to last question: The vision attempted to strike a balance between broad concepts and generalities, and enough specifics to make it unique to Lake Oswego’s community aspirations. Please note the mention of specific projects has been taken out of the 2<sup>nd</sup> draft of the vision statement. The desire for a community center was brought up at the four Community Culture discussion groups at the October workshops, and there were 76 comments in open-ended survey responses describing the need/desire specifically for a community or recreation center.*