



**Comprehensive Plan  
Citizen Advisory Committee  
Meeting #7 – Summary**

**January 26, 2011  
Council Chambers, City Hall  
4:00 pm – 6:00 pm**

**Members in attendance:** Tom Brennan, Christopher Clee, Doug Cushing, Tom Fahey, Bill Garr, Nancy Gronowski, Liz Hartman, Lauren Irving, Tim Mather, Bob Needham, Teri Oelrich, David White

**Members not in attendance:** Sally Moncrieff (Chair), Dorothy Atwood, Jim Johnson

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

**1. Public Comment**

No public comment.

**2. CAC Feedback**

Christopher Clee raised some concerns about the review process. Clee is consulting with the neighborhood associations to document their concerns and bring them to the table.

Clee, on behalf of LONAC members, felt that the CAC needs to endorse the population projections in the FCS report before making any land use decisions because the projections are fundamental. Clee felt that there were inconsistencies in the analysis or the analysis may just need to be explained more thoroughly. The population forecast of 43,000-50,000 residents may be reasonable, however the trend in growth appears to be slowing, resulting in a growth of 4000 instead of 7000.

There was motion for a detailed explanation of the population study. Additionally, the CAC should endorse the population forecast once the information has been explained and the CAC should endorse the population projection as a prerequisite to any decisions on land use. The motion was approved. Todd Chase the author of the report will be invited to attend the February CAC meeting and/or provide a written explanation to email to the group. Todd is working closely with Economic Development and Housing work group where they have been and will continue to discuss the numbers.

**3. Draft Vision Statement** (see meeting materials)

Sid Sin reviewed the results of vision validation survey and asked for the CAC recommendation to City Council on vision endorsement. Sin also explained why creating and validating a vision is an important part of the process. The vision outlines where the community wants to be in 2035. Without that vision it is difficult for residents to explain to one another how the community feels about the future of the City. The vision compactly and succinctly explains the community's aspirations. Additionally developing the vision statement has been one way to implement the public involvement goals for the process, including reaching out to community members that do not normally attend public meetings.

The overall statement (introductory paragraph) received an 8.2 which indicates strong support for vision statement. Sin reiterated that the CAC is being asked to recommend that the vision be endorsed by City Council now, but that it can be slightly modified over time. Sin also stated that the vision statement is not intended to be confirmation to pursue certain projects: It's an over arching vision for the community. Further into the process the vision will be translated into goals and policy.

Christopher Clee referring to page 19, said the survey indicates that the City is performing up to expectations although there are some gaps (referring to upper left quadrant).

- a) How should the CAC build an analysis of those gaps into the process if the CAC determines that those gaps are significant? Facilitator Greene responded that the gaps should be analyzed and there were no objections.
- b) Should the CAC consider modification of the vision statement based on the survey variation in importance and significance of place on responses? CAC decided that all of the statements scored high and should not be removed. Clee and Liz Hartman wanted to get more feedback on the report from the neighborhood associations before recommending endorsing the vision. Comments from the associations will be submitted to staff by January 30. The CAC voted to provisionally endorse the vision statement as is.
- c) Survey used term “danger” zone, which isn’t objective. Staff will ask CDRI to revise the report.

#### **4. Draft Scenarios (see meeting materials)**

Phil Worth gave a brief overview of the maps that were created for each theme during the CAC design meeting on January 6, 2011.

##### *Entrepreneurial –*

Employment is “organic” – brain trust originates in LO. Create opportunity to stay here. For example, corporate headquarters stay in LO when the company gets larger, but the production occurs somewhere else. Executives recognize the value of the City.

*Global LO* – deliberate in trying to attract business. Serves local to global and everything in between. No value in the numbers placed on the map.

*Learning Community* – quality of educational system. Reaches beyond high school – lifelong learning community. Embrace Marylhurst, PSU, Lewis and Clark, OHSU – become the educational hub of the region. People associated with those institutions find LO a unique place.

*Vibrant Centers* – parallel to Metro identified “centers” – where would LO have centers. Each has an identity serving the neighborhood and beyond. Represents mixed uses.

*Eco Vibrant Entrepreneurial* – blend three scenarios – submitted after the design workshop by landscape architect.

*Eco Employment* – networks and linkages with business and activities in community. Some obvious/natural, synergistic – others rely outside community for linkage (Sysco – ships food to schools – rely on outside sources, conversely if allow opportunity to grow/produce locally, capture process in an “eco friendly” opportunity to use local instead of internationally – enable them to occur locally – more efficient, less impact and create more activities).

*New Theme* – more thoughts than drawing. Please refer to the notes in the meeting materials.

##### *Comments*

- Vibrant centers... future zoning could build on little neighborhood commercial hubs to keep people in the neighborhood. There are little businesses there today, but mostly serve to accomplish quick errands. Folks are in and out quick, need a reason to stay.
- No one really talked about downtown improvements and it will likely continue to develop as is now.
- More focus on Lake Grove and Centerpoint (Kruse Way).
- Marylhurst has expressed a desire to be more linked to the City. Marylhurst representatives should be consulted more.
- Shoreinstein (Kruse Way developer) should be invited to participate at some point as well.

- Working group for goal 9 and 10 may need to have ad hoc group. Important stakeholders could be invited to participate.

Worth then presented the features of scenarios A and B along with the baseline scenario, today's Comprehensive Plan. Phil explained that after the workshop on the 6<sup>th</sup> staff and the consultants analyzed all of the maps that were drawn at the workshop (including a "new" mapped submitted by workshop attendee Jim Figurski) and developed scenario A and B based on the similarities and differences. The scenarios were also developed to reflect the draft vision and both assume the same growth.

#### *Scenario A*

- Creating the 20 minute neighborhood,
- Building upon/growing the existing nodes
- Very strong emphasis on keeping neighborhoods the same
- Kruse Way continues to stay much as it is today
- More internal transit than transit out and in of the community
- Objective is a 20-minute neighborhood walk from living situations with services that meet needs and wants. If not being met, establish more – centers grow to purpose of neighborhood needs.

#### *Scenario B "Glocal" (Global/Local)*

- Emphasis is concentrated in a few areas
- Eastside is the cultural heart and hub of the City
- Develop west side of town due to already established corridors
  - Have more retail and new residential on west side
  - Could become 2<sup>nd</sup> civic area
- Connect East and West sides with commuter rail from east to west
  - Maybe a trolley connection
- Kruse Way/Lake Grove does not adversely impact neighborhoods
- Significant transportation facilities
- Edge of the city

#### *Questions/Comments:*

- Where does Marylhurst go in Scenario B. Need to more strongly identify the role of Marylhurst in LO
- Need to explain infill distinctions
- Like the Kruse Way emphasis... uses it as economic engine to keep neighborhoods the way we like them and makes sense in connecting to the region
- Maybe add transportation options to Scenario A
- Add node to Rosewood in A
- Make node circles consistent in representation
- What about schools? How should they be distinguished?
  - Be careful about how schools are noted on the map....blue stars currently do not represent all the schools.
  - Define more things than schools as education centers (ACC, library)
- What about parks and open space? What are the differences in the scenarios?
- Where do people want more emphasis? Decentralized or centralized?

On Feb. 23 the CAC will see the fleshed scenarios and provided feedback before the Community Open House scheduled for March 29. After the 29<sup>th</sup> the scenarios will be measured against the vision, sustainability and a broad fiscal analysis.

## **5. Goal 9 Economic Development & Goal 10 Housing (see memo)**

Sarah Selden provided an update on the work process and timeline. Selden then went through the draft Community Economic Development Objectives that were drafted by the work group and asked for comments. The working group noted that none of the CEDO's address home based businesses and asked the CAC if language should be included on the topic and the consensus was yes. It was suggested that the word "grow" be added to the first objective. The CAC wants to discuss the City's industrial needs. Bill Gaar felt that not enough attention is being paid to natural resources, watersheds, and transportation corridors in the objectives.

## **6. Public Comment**

**Carolyn Jones** stated that she finds it hard to participate in the meetings. She also asked for a written response to her comment made at the December 2, 2010 CAC meeting, which is restated below:

**Carolyn Jones** stated that her review of the last three bullets of the vision statement reveals an omission of any reference to private property rights. She stated that without sustainable property rights, quality of life is compromised and economic development is also compromised because people who are informed will not want to risk buying property in Lake Oswego. She feels that respect for private property rights needs to be incorporated so the vision is based on truth and so that Lake Oswego, as a community, is genuinely a safe place to live as the vision statement suggests.

*Staff response: The two primary sources for the development of the draft vision statement was the input received from the vision/values survey and at the workshops. In early December, the CAC discussed the idea of including a reference to private property rights in the draft vision statement, however concluded not to include the reference because it was marginally raised during the survey and the October workshops. It did not receive the same high level of remarks as other topic areas that were included in the draft vision. In addition, the question was raised as to why private property rights needed to be singled out, out of all of the other inherent rights (free speech, etc) that the comprehensive does not specifically address.*

## **7. CAC Comments**

Laura Irving, the "young" adult member of the CAC, submitted her resignation due to the fact that she is moving out of Lake Oswego. Irving stated that she loves living in Lake Oswego, but as a young person with a young person's income it is more affordable for her to live somewhere else. She bought a townhome in Tualatin. She wanted to express how important it is to provide housing opportunities for younger people so they can stay in LO.