



**Comprehensive Plan
Citizen Advisory Committee
Meeting # 19**

**January 4, 2012
Main Fire Station
4:00 pm – 6:00 pm**

PLEASE NOTE: THIS SUMMARY IS NOT A WORD FOR WORD DOCUMENTATION OF ALL OF THE INFORMATION PRESENTED AT THE MEETING. TO SEE THE INFORMATION PRESENTED AND DISCUSSED PLEASE REFER TO THE MEETING MATERIALS ON THE CAC MEETING WEB PAGE <http://welovelakeoswego.com/citizen-committees/cac-meetings/>

Members in attendance: Sally Moncrieff (Chair), Katie Abbott, Dorothy Atwood, Tom Brennan, Christopher Clee, Doug Cushing, Bill Gaar, Nancy Gronowski, Liz Hartman, Tim Mather , Teri Oelrich , David White

Members not in attendance: Tom Fahey, Jim Johnson, Bob Needham

Staff in attendance: Laura Weigel, Sarah Selden, Kirstin Greene (Cogan Owens Cogan)

1. Public Comment

There were no public comments.

2. CAC Comments

Liz reported on the upcoming Fusion meeting where Councilor Moncrieff would be making a presentation and Liz would be there with the neighborhood associations. The topic for the event is the Comprehensive Plan.

3. Agenda Review & Announcements

Kirstin Greene asked for comments or changes to the last meeting summary. Sarah Selden said they were working to schedule the Oswego Lake Work Group meeting sometime in the next couple of weeks. The charge statement was included as Reference Material A in the meeting packet. The recommendation from the Work Group would be reported to the CAC at their next meeting on January 25.

Sarah Selden also asked if the CAC would be interested in going on a tour to see some a range of housing options in the Portland metro area, similar to what the Planning Commission and City Council had done. Housing examples they visited included cottage housing developments in Fairview and Portland. Accessory dwelling units and duplexes might also be included on the tour. A couple of CAC members expressed interest.

Laura Weigel reported on updates to the welovelakeoswego.com project web site, including a video from the Community Culture Summit. There is also a short survey online asking the community to share what places inspire them. The responses will be used to kick off the February 2 summit.

Kirstin Green thanked the CAC for the extra meeting that night, and noted that more time was needed to discuss goals and policies than was allocated at the December meeting for the Community Culture goals and policies, and future discussion would allocate 20-30 minutes per action area topic.

4. Follow-up on Community Culture Policies

Sarah Selden noted that at the December 14 meeting, the CAC reviewed and discussed draft goals and policies for 2 of the 6 Community Culture topics. The Planning Commission would hold a work session to review the draft community Culture goals and policies on January 9, and this draft was included as Reference Material 2 in the CAC meeting packet. At the January 25 CAC meeting, staff will share the Planning Commission's feedback on the draft goals & policies. Sarah asked if the CAC had any additional feedback on the draft goals and policies before the Planning Commission's January 9 work session. There were no additional comments.

Councilor Moncrieff noted that this review of goals and policies is the heart of what the CAC is doing, and wanted the CAC to be fully comfortable with the draft brought forward to the Planning Commission hearing. She also reviewed the process for reviewing the updated goals and policies, which would apply to all of the action areas:

1. CAC review
2. Planning Commission (PC) work session
3. CAC review of PC revisions & recommendation of goals & policies for PC hearing
4. PC hearing to make recommendation to City Council
5. City Council study session
6. City Council hearing with adoption of resolution noting

Staff said they'd work on a process flow chart for reference.

5. Community Summit February 2

a. Format

Laura Weigel described that the format would be similar to the last summit, with some improvements. It will be held at Lakeridge High School in the library and room below, which are quieter and will be better for group discussion. There will be 24 tables to keep discussion groups smaller, and there will be separate facilitators and note takers at each table with training for both. Laura described the outline for the meeting and the discussion table topics of Complete Neighborhoods, Housing, Inspiring Spaces/Urban Design, Annexation, and Urbanization.

b. Policy Questions/Complete Neighborhoods & Housing

Sarah Selden described that the Housing discussion builds off of the discussions the CAC has already had surrounding the Housing Needs Analysis, including ensuring there's sufficient land available for housing that's zoned appropriately to respond to population change and housing needs and preferences for future demographics of the community. A background overview with visual aids will be provided to summit attendees before posing the question.

Housing Questions:

Tom Brennan noted that the Goal 9 & 10 Work Group spent a lot of time discussing the Metropolitan Housing Rule requirements and thought that was important for people to understand. The CAC noted that it would help to suggest what strategies would be possible, and to provide some examples both in Lake Oswego and elsewhere, including housing development in foothills. The CAC asked if development constraints would be discussed, and staff noted that would be the next phase of plan development.

The CAC also noted that it would be helpful to provide maps and information on the opportunities for new development.

Sarah Selden described the question of how and where can should different housing types be developed, and described some of the strategies that could be offered for discussion, including City program support, demonstration projects, and zoning changes. The CAC noted that the key word is “where” and the population coming to this meeting is going to want to tell you where you cannot put things rather than where you can put things. Kirstin Green described that we can use the 2035 Vision Map and Vision to validate if it’s right, for example to focus the greatest intensity in the centers and corridors.

The CAC discussed the question about housing affordability, a topic that is part of the current Comp Plan. The CAC discussed and clarified what is meant by and significant by the 80% MFI and staff clarified that the \$56,960 figure is 80% of MFI for Urban Clackamas County. The CAC discussed that this demographic group is not limited to those listed in the policy question but also includes seniors, and it may be better to just note the percentage of households than earn less than MFI.

The CAC discussed the difference between the housing affordability question, and the housing types question, and it was clarified that affordability and housing types/zoning are separate. The second question is intended to relate not just to whether the City should provide different housing types, but if the City should have strategies to encourage housing at affordable price levels.

Components of the housing discussion are where, what, and how. The CAC suggested the question could also be personalized to ask about the type of housing people need and want.

Complete Neighborhoods Questions:

The question about neighborhood hubs should include confirmation of whether the neighborhood hubs are in the right place, in addition to what’s needed to make them function. Kirstin Greene noted that we need to define where the hubs are, what makes the work now, what the hubs intended as. The CAC noted that maybe some of these neighborhoods don’t need a gathering place, and discussed that neighborhood hubs may also be parks, or somewhere to grab a beer. They noted that one confusing thing is that some of the hubs are very small commercial locations and some are not. The CAC discussed that what the hubs are really about is a place for social gathering and interaction, and these places may be very different across neighborhoods. The CAC asked what information we wanted to get out of this discussion. Staff noted they were looking for more detail on what people wanted to see in their neighborhoods, from which we’d see whether new strategies and Plan changes were needed to make that happen.

c. Policy Questions/Inspiring Spaces & Places

Community Design & Aesthetics Questions:

The first question is intended to be a fun opening question to get people thinking and inspired about Lake Oswego. The CAC then discussed the question about green building strategies and questioned what other cities are doing. The CAC noted this question is complicated – green building involves looking at both up front and long-term costs, is impacted by how development financing works, and is different for historic homes. The CAC also asked about how maintenance of existing housing as a “green” strategy relates to this question. There was discussion about the difference between incentives and requirements, and municipal vs. private projects, and broadening the question to ask more generally how the City should encourage

green building. It was decided that question #2 would be removed because it was already addressed in the Complete Neighborhoods question.

Annexation Questions:

The CAC noted that there are really not very many islands currently to annex and the policy should maybe outline annexation within five years of becoming an island. The question of efficiency from an administrative practice was also noted. A question was raised regarding whether the City did ever implement the currently policy of island annexation, and former planning director Tom Coffee sitting in the audience noted that it had never been practiced.

The CAC discussed the properties that are within the Lake Oswego School District boundaries, but outside of the Lake Oswego urban services boundary. School District liaison Teri Oelrich noted that there are many inconsistencies within the boundaries, and having properties outside the USB was not really an issue for the district. The CAC decided that this question did not need to be asked at the summit.

Urbanization Questions:

Staff and the CAC reviewed the Stafford question and the process that would be followed before the area could be urbanized, including determining jurisdiction and developing a concept plan. Former planning director Tom Coffee in the audience also shared the status of the Urban Reserve designation. The CAC discussed if the question about urbanization should be more general about whether the City should expand the USB, since the Stafford urban reserve would happen beyond the timeline of this plan.

6. Review New Structure, Scope and Content of the Comp Plan

Kirstin Green reminded the group that the Plan would conform with all state requirements and provide land use guidance, but also more broadly address the community's aspirations to implement the vision.

7. Public Comment

Tom Coffee noted that Metro no longer mandates that the City increase in population or increase density, but rather that we have no net loss in housing capacity. It's misleading to note that the City must accommodate its "share" of population growth. He noted that the City has repeatedly opposed the urbanization of Stafford including statistically valid community surveys.

Don Burdick stated that based on the map of the urban services boundary, Todd Prager does not live in the city limits. Another CAC member stated that was not correct. Mr. Burdick noted that the number of comments we've received encouraging public lake access did not demonstrate a community mandate, and was concerned that the issue was being driven by people outside of the community and it was an issue that could tear the community apart.

Charles B. Ormsby (Skip) expressed a desire to have the Birdshill NA's SW boundary re-examined, and wanted to know when the CAC would be discussing this. Mr. Ormsby also expressed concern over the discussion of annexation and not having a representative from Birdshill on the CAC.

8. CAC Comments

There were no comments from the CAC.