



**Comprehensive Plan
Citizen Advisory Committee
Meeting # 22**

**March 21, 2012
City Hall
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 (late), Tom Brennan, Doug Cushing, Tom Fahey, Bill Gaar (late), Nancy Gronowski, Liz Hartman, Bob Needham

Members not in attendance: Christopher Clee, Jim Johnson, Tim Mather, Teri Oelrich, David White

Staff in attendance: Laura Weigel, Sarah Selden, Kirstin Greene (Cogan Owens Cogan), Beth St. Amon, Denny Egnor

1. Public Comment

Tom Cusack described his professional background in dealing with affordable housing in Oregon. He referenced the analysis he did of the May 2011 draft Lake Oswego Housing Needs Analysis, which was in the CAC packet. He clarified that his analysis addressed discrepancies he saw within the Housing Needs Analysis with respect to what has occurred in housing in the last decade. **Laura Weigel** mentioned that staff would update the housing needs analysis with more current census data and in light of Mr. Cusack's suggestions.

Sarah Selden introduced **Beth St. Amand**, who was taking Sidaro Sin's place on the planning team.

Carolyn Jones, 2818 Poplar Way, indicated that she was a Glenmorrie Neighborhood Association Board member and a LO Stewards member. She referenced a citation that's be used since the beginning of the process that anything that went against the law could not be built into the Comprehensive Plan. She read policy number 9 from the proposed Community Culture Goals and Policies related to recreation that spoke to requiring dedication of public access easements within the greenway to the Willamette River during the development process. She mentioned the 2009 U.S. Supreme Court case that prohibited cities from requiring such dedications from citizens. She asked that the issue be withdrawn or a clear statement be made as to why the City should be above the law.

Sarah Selden responded that the policy is in the existing Comprehensive Plan. She indicated that the policy implements the Statewide Planning Goal 15 which aims to provide a continuous pathway for recreational purposes and environmental enhancement along the Willamette River. It's been the City's practice to obtain easements to complete gaps recreation and in the pathway when an appropriate opportunity presented itself to do so, such as an intensification of use on an affected property. Goal 9 is not new and it has been found to be consistent with State law. **Ms. Jones** asked who made that finding. She pointed out that the language said 'require,' and not 'acquire.'

2. CAC Comments

Tom Fahey reported on the first meeting of the Transportation System Plan Advisory Committee (TSPAC), which consisted of the Transportation Advisory Board (TAB), City staff, and representatives from TriMet, ODOT, Clackamas County, and Metro. He indicated that TSPAC would review and update the City's current Transportation System Plan (TSP) over the next 16 to 18 months. He mentioned that the first of four community outreach meetings was scheduled for April 12. He observed that the transportation issues ran through all the different areas and that the Comprehensive Plan CAC would ultimately have to pull TSPAC's work into the Comprehensive Plan. He remarked that they would also have to consider regional expectations regarding transportation connections in Lake Oswego, including rail.

Mr. Fahey reported on the Mayor's Meeting with the Neighborhood Association Chairs last Saturday. The consultant for the TSP project came to the meeting on his own time to discuss the project. Mr. Fahey spoke of the Chairs' interest in good connections, 20-minute neighborhoods, and network routes to move around the city. He mentioned that the Chairs wanted to be involved in the TSP update process, including having a representative on TSPAC. **Laura Weigel** stated that the TSPAC consists of the existing Transportation Advisory Board members and technical advisors. **Liz Hartman** noted that all TAB members live in neighborhoods and if the neighborhood chairs received all the TSPAC meeting notices that should be sufficient. **Ms. Weigel** noted that staff has already added the Neighborhood Chairs to the list serve and hoped that they would attend the summits. **Mr. Fahey** mentioned that TAB members would start attending more of the neighborhood association meetings.

Mr. Fahey also reported on TAB's meeting with Marylhurst and Marylhurst's desire to connect with the Lake Oswego community. **Laura Weigel** confirmed that Marylhurst had a limited shuttle system set up on a volunteer system, which Lake Oswego staff would track and see how it might tie into the TSP.

Sarah Selden indicated that she would send out to the CAC the minor changes and tweaks that the Planning Commission made to the Community Culture topic at its public hearing. She mentioned that staff would like some CAC members to help with the presentation of the findings at the City Council study session at the end of April.

Bill Gaar commented that the Planning Commission did not make substantive changes to the CAC's work but it did make some language changes. He reported that, although there was extensive public testimony at the hearing regarding the issue of lake access, the Planning Commission decided to stay with the status quo. He indicated to **Nancy Gronowski** that the Commission did not take up the issue of no zoning on the lake, as it was not a big issue in terms of the recreational component. **Sarah Selden** mentioned that zoning on the lake would be taken up as an issue during the discussion of Healthy Ecosystems.

Chair Moncrieff reported on the National League of Cities Conference in Washington, D.C. She discussed the seminar she attended on Making Great Places by integrating transportation, housing, and sustainability. She mentioned the trends of a shift from a manufacturing economy to a knowledge-based economy and the smart people look first for a place to live consistent with their values of education, transit and walkability, culture, sustainability, affordable housing, smaller homes, entrepreneurship, and technology, and then focus on finding a job. She discussed Lake Oswego's answers to the three questions that a city should ask when looking to create a Great Place: why are we here, who are we now, and what could we aspire to be. She spoke of playing to Lake Oswego's strengths and acting now in order to affect what would happen 50 years from now.

3. Agenda Review & Announcements

Kirstin Greene reviewed the agenda.

4. Update on Connected Community & Economic Vitality Events

Sarah Selden discussed the format of the business community summit scheduled for April 5 as a public meeting on the Economic Vitality area. She asked for CAC feedback via e-mail on the six draft questions that staff would send out to the CAC. She asked for CAC volunteers to facilitate and take notes at the business summit, to which staff planned to invite business community people from the various business organizations and business owners from all over the city. She mentioned continuing the Virtual Summit online to allow the general public to respond to the questions.

Laura Weigel explained that the primary focus of the open house would be the Connected Community topic because of the amount of information that the team needed to gather in order to start working on the TSP. However, she pointed out that there would be an Economic Vitality station where the community would have the opportunity to discuss the same policy questions that were posed to the business community. She discussed the change in format for the Connected Community meeting to an open house with self-guided stations. She mentioned that the mapping exercise stations would be split into 4 city quadrants, citywide and regional maps. She asked for CAC volunteers to help work the April 12 event at the West End Building.

Ms. Weigel reported that TSPAC received the background report and was currently revising the policy questions, which revisions she would forward to the CAC for comment before the summit. **Kirstin Greene** mentioned that the mapping stations would include the work done in the neighborhood plans over the last twenty years. **Ms. Weigel** indicated that the mapping stations would reflect all the planning work done by the City, including the Lake Grove Village Center Plan and the Downtown Plan.

5. Complete Neighborhoods & Housing

Sarah Selden indicated that the feedback the team heard from the community regarding this topic confirmed the CAC's discussion: the community wanted to preserve the detached single-family neighborhoods and to allow a greater range of housing options within the employment areas and mixed-use town centers/neighborhood villages. She summarized the responses in the Summary of Public Comment in the CAC packet.

She presented the proposed revisions to Goal 10, Housing. She confirmed that, in order to avoid redundancy, staff proposed removing the existing Comprehensive Plan policies that the Community Code Development revision addressed.

The CAC discussed using stronger policy language that directed active movement (focus, provide) instead of nebulous language (encourage, explore), and retaining broader direction within the policies while putting specific actions in the implementation items.

Doug Cushing observed that the City currently did not effectively implement Policies B.2 and B.3. **The CAC** discussed creating flexibility using discretionary development review processes and removing impediments in order to allow changes in housing options that a future population might desire, yet without losing the town's character.

The CAC indicated that the members would review Mr. Cusack's comments regarding the Affordable Housing policies and respond to staff via e-mail. **Sarah Selden** asked the CAC to think about how to define affordable housing and about the level of affordability that they were targeting. **Bob Needham** advocated for setting a number because affordable housing could mean all sorts of things. He mentioned that affordable housing designers could design the housing to fit into a neighborhood. **Ms. Selden** indicated to **Chair Moncrieff** that she would send to the CAC the latest affordable housing numbers from Clackamas County.

The CAC discussed Policy C.2 in terms of retaining the inclusive criteria and making a strong and clear statement in support of the Fair Housing Act and non-discriminatory practices in affordable housing.

The CAC discussed revising Policy C.8 to read "Partner with non-profit organizations, developers, and others . . . and Metro. Work with the public agencies including Clackamas County and Metro." **Sarah Selden** indicated that staff would work on clarifying the policy language in this policy.

The CAC discussed whether Policies C.7 and C.11 said essentially the same thing. **Sarah Selden** indicated that staff would combine the two policies.

The CAC agreed on the following changes:

- a. in Goal c., separating the phrases "using land and public facilities . . ." and "facilitating . . ." into two sections
- b. revise Policy A.4 to read, "Provide incentives for the development of medium and higher density housing in Lake Oswego town centers and neighborhood villages as a component of commercial development. Add housing within employment centers for a greater mix of uses."
- c. revise Policy B.2 to read, "Create an expanded menu . . ."
- d. revise Policy B.3 to read, "Provide incentives for the development of secondary dwelling units to increase opportunities for small scale housing. . ."
- e. revise Policy B.1 to read, "Provide the opportunity for housing that accommodates . . ."
- f. delete "lifestyles" from Policy B.1
- g. restore "current" to "current and future residents' in Policy C.1
- h. revise Policy C.10 to read, "Set measurable goals now for the production of affordable housing units in Lake Oswego and meet the goals by 2035."

Sarah Selden presented the Complete Neighborhoods policies (p.7). She noted that the intent of the policies was to support the vision and add a neighborhood component to the vision map. The CAC discussed re-wording some of the goals. **Bill Garr** asked staff to go in and revise the language to reflect an active voice and remove prepositional phrases.

6. Inspiring Spaces & Places

Kirstin Greene introduced **Denny Egner, Long Range Planning Manager**. He presented the proposed revisions to the Goal 14 policies.

Mr. Egner described the staff work to re-write the goal language to speak of growth in a more positive way. He noted the reorganization of the policies into four basic groups: Urban Services Boundary (USB) and Urban Growth Boundary (UGB), Stafford, annexation, and planning issues. He discussed Policy A and the existing exceptions to expanding into Stafford prohibition. He noted that the potential language in Policy A-1.c was inconsistent with the City's current policy language and conflicted with the Stafford policies drafted in Section B. He explained that he removed the Metro RUGGOs policy because those have been fully incorporated into Metro's Functional Plan.

The CAC discussed strengthening the language of the goal and making it read more like the policy language. **Chair Moncrieff** presented Doug Cushing's question on why the reference in Policy A-1.a to "Tier 1 urban reserves as of February 1998" was in there.

Tom Coffee (a citizen in the audience) presented an historical perspective. He pointed out that Goal 14 was Urbanization and about the expansion of the UGB to add new territory. Lake Oswego was not enthusiastic about that policy. He observed that Lake Oswego was urbanized and focused on issues of infill and redevelopment. He argued that to include a statement taking a positive approach to growth was to fundamentally change the City's policy. He commented that this work was trying to make the past policy stick (given that there was no up swell to change it) while incorporating new, positive approaches to growth, which were naturally inconsistent. He contended that the CAC would have this dilemma as long as it did not address the fundamental issue of whether the City was going to oppose urbanization or not.

Kirstin Greene indicated that the main intent of this conversation was to check and see if the CAC was on track, having heard the public comments, to say that it was going to affirm the internal redevelopment and betterment of the city focus as opposed to urbanization through expansion.

Dorothy Atwood commented that she saw two ways to accommodate population increase: increase the density within the city's fixed boundaries or expand the city's boundaries. **The CAC** discussed how to affirm more proactively in the goal that, as population increased, the City should be internally focused on accommodating the growth, as opposed to focusing externally (outside the UGB). **Staff** concurred with **Ms. Atwood** that including the UGB, Stafford, and annexation was not a good fit in this topic area of Inspiring Spaces and Places. **Kirstin Greene** commented that what was missing was the transition to urban design and community character and amenities. **Laura Weigel** suggested flipping the goals' order and starting with the current Goal 2 (Community Design and Aesthetics). **Chair Moncrieff** pointed out that Inspiring Spaces and Places was about the community's vision and not about meeting requirements.

Denny Egner indicated that Policies A-1. a, b, and c came from Council and staff discussions about the UGB over the past five years. He mentioned that he included Policy A-1.c as an option but he did not suggest putting it in.

The CAC discussed **Chair Moncrieff's** suggestion to eliminate Policy A-6, opposing the formation of new service districts within the USB. **Denny Egner** commented that he thought it was a good policy that concentrated the urban services in the USB. **Kirstin Greene** pointed out that it was a strong statement that prohibited the City Council from considering a new service district. **Nancy Gronowski** mentioned that, from the standpoint of

sustainability, the provision of services could change in the next 20 to 30 years from a concentrated service to a distributed service.

Chair Moncrieff confirmed that her concern focused on handcuffing the Council. She observed that there were different forms of providing services. **Mr. Egner** mentioned that the City often had trouble incorporating annexed areas whose service providers had provided a lower level of service than the City expected. He indicated that he would rewrite the policy to provide more flexibility.

Denny Egner indicated that he included Policy B, Stafford Basin, as a way to formalize the Council direction in its 2009 statement submitted to Metro in advance of the urban reserves process. He noted that it was not official policy. He acknowledged the lack of a definition on what constituted the “upper Stafford Basin” and clarified that the Borland area lay south of the river.

Dorothy Atwood suggested swapping the sentences in Policy B.1 and starting out with “Support the retention of . . .”. **The CAC** discussed rural versus urban development. **Mr. Egner** mentioned his assumption that rural level development meant septic systems, while urban level development meant a sewer system. **Kirstin Greene** pointed out that Metro saw urban level development as 10 units per acre. **The CAC** indicated that a definition of ‘rural levels of development’ would be helpful.

The CAC questioned calling Stafford out specifically. **Denny Egner** confirmed that Stafford was the only adjacent area outside the UGB, as the land in all other directions was inside the City’s USB. He commented that the Stafford area needed broader policy direction. He spoke of a stronger set of policies to direct staff on how to deal with the Stafford Basin. He acknowledged that the City did not necessarily have to address this controversial area because its development in the next 40 to 50 years was outside the planning time frame of the Comprehensive Plan, yet the Comprehensive Plan was the place to put these kinds of policies.

Chair Moncrieff mentioned the community’s long held concern that whatever happened in Stafford should not impact Lake Oswego’s vision by greatly increasing traffic congestion. **Liz Hartman** observed that this was an urban reserve that was currently rural in nature. She spoke of a big picture policy stating that they wanted to preserve the rural cushion of space and to prevent the city from being surrounded by urbanized areas. She wondered if this might be their only opportunity to actively pursue that desire. **The CAC** agreed with Ms. Hartman’s direction.

The CAC discussed the proposed annexation policies. **The members** agreed with the concept in Policy C.6 of encouraging voluntary annexations. **Chair Moncrieff** commented that annexation was a complicated subject that deserved more time than the CAC could give it right now.

Dorothy Atwood asked if the policies under Policy D, Planning and Coordination Policies, should be moved to a different section. **Kirstin Greene** indicated that she would provide CAC with a report on what sections staff would move where. She mentioned that she still needed feedback from CAC on Goal 2, Community Design and Aesthetics.

The CAC agreed to the following changes:

- a. delete Policy A-1.c regarding properties located within the Lake Oswego School District boundary
- b. move Policy A, Urban Service Boundary and Urban Growth Boundary Policies, to the Public Facilities section

7. Public Comment

Carolyn Jones asked whether private properties would be included on the maps for the map exercise at the Connected Community Open House to identify future pathways. **Laura Weigel** indicated that all properties in the city would be on the maps. **Ms. Jones** asked private properties be taken off in respect for private property rights.

Sherry Finnegan, 28 Condolea, indicated that she was here as an observer for the League of Women Voters. She expressed her concern at the exclusion of the general citizenry from the Economic Vitality summit. She pointed out that limiting the general public to the Virtual Open House also excluded those who did not have computers. She advocated for taking the time to provide everyone with an opportunity to participate. **Laura Weigel** clarified that the meeting was open to the public.

Tom Coffee, 4183 Fruitwood Court, mentioned his concern that the urbanization statement with its comment about taking a proactive and positive approach to growth was inconsistent with the current Comprehensive Plan's philosophy of a skeptical approach to growth and an inward protection of the community. He indicated that the CAC's discussion sounded like its direction was more consistent with the current Plan's philosophy. He concurred with Dorothy Atwood's comment that the concept in urbanization of limiting expansion was part of the Inspiring Spaces and Places.

Mr. Coffee concurred with the CAC's deletion of the School District issue, as the Council and the CAC earlier indicated that they did not want to go there. He contended that specific direction on Stafford was more appropriately a City Council policy as opposed to a Comprehensive Plan policy, especially given the current uncertainty about the urban reserves designation due to the court case. He advocated for putting back into the discussion the cost of the urbanization and expansion of Stafford as a significant factor. He expressed concern about eliminating the service districts, citing Washington County's situation of having no governance yet needing to serve the half a million people now living in its unincorporated areas.

Jim Bolland, 804 Fifth Street, concurred with Mr. Coffee regarding the CAC discussion about the urbanization of Stafford. He held that they did not need Policies B.2, 3, and 4 in the Comprehensive Plan. He commented that discussing how to plan for Stafford implied that the City wanted to be involved in that effort, yet the City's policy was to support retaining Stafford as a rural enclave. He indicated that he liked the first B.1 and Dorothy Atwood's suggestion to start with "Support the retention of the area . . ." . He observed that annexations, depending how much infrastructure work was needed, could cost the City more than it would ever take in tax revenue. He suggested including policy language addressing the issue of annexations that could end up hurting the City financially.

8. CAC Comments

Bob Needham addressed the issue of allowing people at a public meeting to look at private property and ask for public access across it. He recalled a situation when the Development Review Commission disagreed with staff. The DRC found that the intensification of use on a certain property was not sufficient to provide the nexus required constitutionally to allow the City to take the land. He mentioned that one objection from the public had been that the City had no plan for pathways.

Dorothy Atwood commented that she has gained some clarity on the CAC's direction with respect to urbanization and expansion. She mentioned her sense was that the community wanted to preserve Stafford. She pointed out that more people moving to Lake Oswego had ramifications in terms of density and changing how the city looked. She remarked that they could not have it both ways if more people moved to Lake Oswego.

Chair Moncrieff adjourned the meeting.

DRAFT