



**Comprehensive Plan
Citizen Advisory Committee
Meeting # 23**

**April 25, 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, Tom Brennan, Christopher Clee, Doug Cushing, Tom Fahey, Nancy Gronowski, Liz Hartman, Jim Johnson, Tim Mather, Bob Needham, David White

Members not in attendance: Bill Gaar, Teri Oelrich

Staff in attendance: Sarah Selden, Beth St. Amand, Kirstin Greene (Cogan Owens Cogan)

1. Public Comment

Tom Cusack noted that he also spoke at the last CAC meeting. Lived in Mt. park for 31 years and served as the HUD director for OR and worked in single and multi-family development for many years. Attended the Council study session the previous evening and there was a discussion about Foothills Option B, where there would be an expansion of the rental housing stock by about 25%. Unfortunately there's no family income restricted affordable housing in any Lake Oswego urban renewal areas today, so this presents a rare opportunity. Foothills development will require an urban renewal area to be set up. Draft proposed policy C4 deals with affordable housing in urban renewal areas. The 2005 housing task force recommended there be a minimum set aside for affordable housing in urban renewal areas. Mr. Cusack suggested that if there's not a provision in the Comprehensive Plan that would require a minimum set aside, it would perhaps be a signal to some that there's not an interest in doing affordable rental housing in Lake Oswego.

2. CAC Comments

Jim Johnson announced that the Planning Commission adopted the findings from the Community Culture hearing, with two yes votes and one abstention. The Community Culture goals and policies will now be forwarded to the City Council.

Dorothy Atwood noted that May was Sustainability Action Month. She noted that Laura had sent out an e-mail about a dinner the first weekend in May, and it will be free. She encouraged CAC members to bring their board members, friends and neighbors to come out on May 5 at the WEB.

Chris Clee noted the types of items being discussed at his neighborhood association meeting, and that are of concern to the neighborhood board: tree cutting, and whether new construction is complying with development codes.

Tom Fahey spoke about the Transportation System Plan update. Tom has been trying to take TAB on the road to neighborhood meetings, and went to the Lake Forest Neighborhood Association meeting to look at maps of their neighborhood and identify issues. Tom offered to attend other upcoming meetings to help get the word out and gather more information.

3. Agenda Review & Announcements

Kirstin Greene reviewed the agenda.

Sarah Selden announced that Councilor Moncrieff was nominated for and won the Oregon Chapter of the American Planning Association's "Distinguished Leadership by an Elected Official" award. She thank those who had written letters of support: Dorothy Atwood, Tom Brennan, Chris Clee, Nancy Gronowski, Liz Hartman, Mayor Hoffman, Judie Hammerstad, Denise Frisbee, Denny Egner, and Kirstin Greene. Councilor Moncrieff will receive this award at the May 11 OAPA conference in Bend, and the City Council will recognize her award on May 15. CAC members are invited to attend the Council meeting.

On May 8 the City Council will hold a study session on the Community Culture goals and policies, to review the information before their June 6 public hearing. Sarah asked for CAC volunteers to attend this meeting and help present to the Council.

4. Update on Connected Community & Economic Vitality Events

Sarah Selden noted that staff has been compiling the results from the Connected Community Open House and the Economic Vitality Business Summit as well as their corresponding virtual summits. Approximately 80 people attended the open house and 12 responded to the virtual summit. There were 11 people who attended the Economic Summit and 22 responded to the virtual summit. The response to the virtual open houses were a little lower as was the attendance at the "real" event, so staff will try to boost attendance through new strategies for the next action area(s) community event.

Liz Hartman expressed some concern about the Economic Summit since there was low attendance and half of the attendees were neighborhood representatives, not business representatives. **Doug Cushing** said that he had made a push for the business community to complete the virtual open house. **Liz** suggested posting a question on Open City Hall. **Sarah** pointed out that we recently posted a question about commuting on Open City Hall. **Sarah** said staff would post an economic question on Open City Hall. **Doug** suggested creating a smaller survey for the business community to attend. There was a conversation about reaching out through the City's business license records. **Sarah** said that staff would think about other ways to reach out to the business community and report back to the CAC at their May meeting.

5. Review Revised Complete Neighborhoods and Inspiring Spaces and Places Revisions

Complete Neighborhoods

Sarah Selden noted that she wanted to give the CAC an opportunity to comment on any of the changes to the draft Complete Neighborhoods & Housing goals and policies made by the Planning Commission at their work session. In addition, she brought their attention to a few specific items where additional CAC feedback was needed:

Policies A 4-6 were added back in from the existing plan. **Jim Johnson** noted that he was not at the meeting, but from experience he guessed the policy responds to neighborhood concerns about compatibility. **Doug Cushing** asked what would be expected to implement these policies. **Sarah** noted that staff had recommended removing policies A-4 and A-5 because they have already been implemented by the development code. **Jim** noted that the

Commission sometimes wants to ensure that the Comprehensive Plan provides policy guidance to back up the code.

Bob Needham asked how policy A-6 about energy efficiency and renewable building materials would be implemented. **Sarah** noted that this would be a new implementation item. The policy was being updated to say “provide incentives” instead of “encourage” to reflect the CAC’s past direction to be more direct and avoid the word “encourage.”

Doug Cushing raised a question about Policy A-1, and whether it would limit the ability to develop future medium-density housing. **Tom Brennan** noted that the HNA calls for most new medium-high density housing to go in mixed-use areas. That category should be added. **Sarah** noted that the existing policy addressed only residential zones, but mixed use can also be called out. **Chris Clee** said that he was uncomfortable with grouping the low and medium-density zones together in a policy with the high-density residential zones.

Nancy Gronowski asked if “designated for” means zoned for. **Sarah** explained that the Comprehensive Plan Map designates all land, including that which is not yet annexed. When an unincorporated parcel gets annexed, the Comp Plan Map designation gets applied for the zoning. **Dorothy Atwood** asked where the mixed-use would be incorporated. It was discussed to add this as a new section C. **Chris** raised again his concern about lumping medium- and high-density together under the same criteria. He suggested pulling out R-5, R-6, and R-7.5 as medium density. **Sarah** asked what other CAC members thought about separating medium and high density into two policy sections. **Bob Needham** raised the question about how density was defined, and how the transportation impacts in the same zone may differ, for example, depending on who lives there. **Jim Johnson** clarified that this is a policy for siting zones, and the regulations for what can happen in that zone is defined in the development code. The policy is not changing what’s allowed in these zones. He noted that we’ll need to think about how the criteria are different between the two. **Kirstin Greene** and **Sally Moncrieff** noted that how the policies are read and perceived is important. **Bob Needham** raised a question about the evolving definition of medium vs. high density zoning/lot sizes. **Dorothy** brought up the 20-minute neighborhood concept, and whether the policy precludes this from happening.

Bob said there are a couple of places within the USB that are very concerned about being brought into the city limits because of the zoning vs. existing large lot sizes (Skylands and Forest Highlands neighborhoods). The current plan supports these larger lots being divided into smaller lots. He asked whether the character of these larger lots & neighborhoods should be maintained. **Sarah** noted this is a comprehensive plan map designation question, which is a conversation the CAC will have in the near future.

Sarah explained that the Planning Commission had some different ideas on how much to spell out in the policy about secondary dwelling units (SDU). **Tom Brennan** thought that Option 3 was too much, Option 1 was too little, and Option 2 was just right. **Bob** and **Nancy** agreed. **Dorothy** said she liked Option 3, that having examples even if they’re not all inclusive, gave her an idea of what it means. However, if this was done for all the policies the Plan would be huge. **Jim Johnson** said he wasn’t at the meeting, but based on past discussions with the Commission they may have wanted to help describe what an SDU is because there’s some sensitivity on the topic of adding another unit to a lot. **Doug Cushing** said that if you look at B-4 and B-5, which call for flexibility, that Option 1 or 2 would suffice. There was a CAC consensus for Option 2. **Tom Fahey** asked what the impact would be of having another unit on the lot, and it was noted that there were a lot of variations on who would live in an SDU and why a homeowner would like one. As an example, **Doug** noted that a family could create an SDU for an aging parent, and when they’re no longer around it might be rented out. **Sarah** noted the Planning

Commissioners suggested they might want to spell out some ideas for implementing this policy as part of their findings.

Sarah brought the CAC's attention to policy C-3. She noted that the City Attorney's office noted that the policy should not direct another agency (the Lake Oswego Redevelopment Agency) to take a specific action, but rather any policy related to urban renewal plans should call for the City to work with that agency. Sarah noted that she followed up with LORA staff for their review of the policy, which confirmed the complicated nature of this policy. Staff would like to do some additional research to inform policy language about affordable housing in urban renewal areas, to ensure it will be effective and provide clear direction for implementation. Sarah shared some working draft policy language as an option to provide more general guidance on strategies for affordable housing provisions, if the details were to be worked out in the next Action Planning phase: "Promote the development of affordable housing in locations near public transportation and commercial amenities through incentives such as fee waivers, reductions or deferrals; expedited review processes; density bonuses; or urban renewal funds." This would modify Policy C-3 in the CAC packet.

Tom Brennan said that the language in C-4, Option 2 was intended to reflect a real process of negotiation that LORA participated in, and the new option does not incorporate that idea. **Dorothy Atwood** asked why limit where affordable housing can happen? **Sarah** commented that the intent is to focus incentives in these locations. Affordable housing types are multi-family, and the places where we should be focusing multifamily housing is near transit access and commercial amenities. This is consistent with the Vision Map and with existing zoning. **Councilor Moncrieff** commented that the Council received public comments regarding their Foothills discussion asking for more affordable housing, specifically rental apartments. Dorothy wondered if in 20 years the comp plan should provide more flexibility, like affordable single family homes that are not near transit. **Doug Cushing** thinks that Option #1 provides flexibility: the word "strategies" provides for a range of options to provide affordable housing. Doug also liked the expansion of C-3 regarding incentives, but removing mention of urban renewal funds.

Katie Abbott asked for some background on how the policy originated. **Sarah** explained that the Planning Commission had suggested listing some of the potential incentives for affordable housing that were suggested or supported through the summit. The general strategies for affordable housing came from the Affordable Housing Task Force along with the existing Plan. The locational language is new, and an effort to be consistent with the Vision Map.

David White suggested removing the "all" in Option 1, to just say "as part of Lake Oswego Urban Renewal Agency plans."

Tom Fahey noted that there are locations where there will, and where there will not be affordable housing opportunities. Liz Hartman agreed with Tom. **Nancy Gronowski** liked the last phrase of Option 2, what calls for tailoring the specifics to each district. She also thought that the locational direction made a lot of sense. **Bob Needham** thought there needed to be policies to provide incentives in specific locations. Developers are looking to make money on land that is available, not to satisfy people's needs. We see it from the other side. Interested what the expedited permitting process can occur, where the timeline is already tight. **Chris Clee** agrees that we should be specific about the location for affordable housing. He asked for "near" transit to be defined, because that was too subjective. He suggested that there should be a map that identifies locations, along with a map of the current inventory. **Tim Mather** said that affordable housing should be close to mass transit, since

transportation costs are the second largest household cost. **Jim Johnson** agreed with that the city should not be one big mixed-use zone – which is not to say mixed-use is not a good thing because it is. Jim agreed with the direction of the rest of the CAC, but was concerned about the map idea. He thinks the lines shouldn't be definite.

Under Goal 2, **Tom Brennan** suggested removing "...commensurate with needs of anticipated and desired..." and say instead "commensurate with the housing needs analysis for current and projected residents..."

Chris Clee asked for clarification as to whether a goal could be included that says something like "attract young families to the city." **Kirstin** said that it can be, but suggested looking to the vision for guidance. **Bob Needham** raised the question about whether that would be exclusionary.

The group discussed needing another chance to wrap up the Complete Neighborhoods & Housing review and discussion.

Tom Brennan suggested adding language under C-1, "With interim 5-year targets" to the policy.

Nancy noted that policy D-1 seems to address transportation, rather than neighborhoods, and doesn't make a lot of sense here.

Inspiring Spaces & Places

Beth St. Amand and **Sarah Selden** recapped the CAC's last ISP discussion: because many of the urbanization policies addressed service provision, annexation, and future extension of services, those policies were removed and placed in Public Facilities and Services. The text highlighted in yellow shows Planning Commission changes. Now, the ISP chapter focuses on capturing the vision and future urban form, putting the inspiring into the chapter. It also includes language that recognizes the value of having a rural buffer between Stafford and what's in the City (policy B-2). The majority of Stafford policies will remain in urbanization (Public Facilities & Services).

Doug Cushing questioned the reference to color in Policy A-1.a. He said that the City recently spent time and money on a consultant for downtown to talk about using different colors on buildings. He mentioned that he's seen places worldwide with great use of color and asked if the policy indicates that the color all be the same.

Beth clarified if color should be removed from the policy, as it talks about complementing the existing environment. **Doug** responded that he felt it was too limiting by including it.

Doug then addressed policy A-3 on preserving views and cited past incidents regarding cutting of trees for private views; his concern was that preserving views can become a little too selective. **Jim Johnson** responded that it should clarify if the policy talks about all views or public views. He asked if the language referred to a view from a road straight down to see Mt Hood or private views. He did not think that the City wanted to get into private views; this policy really addresses private views. **Kirstin** confirmed that the policy should then add the word "private" to views, and Jim and Doug concurred. **Chris Clee** said the policy should also make it clear to delineate between trees and not building a skyscraper in between the views. **Jim** concurred. **Beth** confirmed that language should add "built environment" to the language. **Nancy Gronowski** said that this will probably lead to a discussion identifying and preserving certain views; **Beth** suggested adding language referring to view corridors and identifying them in the follow-up work.

Jim Johnson then returned to policy A-1a. regarding color. He said that from his experience, there are two different sets of factors in this policy: size, scale and bulk are different from color, materials and architectural design. When talking about policy, it is demonstrated with infill where the discussion is focused on mass, not color. Color tends to get into design districts, if that's what the CAC wants. He asked what was the policy trying to do here? He proposed not grouping it all together.

Nancy addressed the language "use regulations" in the policy. She said that instead of using regulations, don't regulations have to be developed? Also, there's a need to have some consistency assuming that the existing built environment is one you want to complement. It kind of leads you down a path where you might be stuck.

Kirstin Greene then did a time check and said the ISP and CNH discussions would be continued at the May meeting, and the Planning Commission schedule will also be pushed back to provide more time to consider these topics.

Beth addressed Luscher Farm as a topic under discussion at the City. The City applied to Metro to bring 93 acres into the City for parks including the farm. The current county EFU zoning limits uses. Metro has the application; Clackamas County submitted a letter that said it was not in support. The City is still in those discussions and asked Metro for a continuance. Sally added that it's in process.

Process Update – Roles & Schedule

The process update and schedule conversation item did not occur due to time constraints.

Staff roles: Beth clarified that **Laura** will continue on the TSP and the Connected Community Action Area, is the primary CAC liaison (emails and materials come from Laura), and primary outreach staff person. However, Beth noted that CAC members can contact any of the staff at any time. **Sarah** works on Community Culture, Complete Neighborhoods and Housing, Neighborhoods and Special District Plans, the DLCDC housing grant. **Beth's** focus is on periodic review, schedule, Economic Vitality, ISP, and Public Facilities and Services.

6. Climate Smart Communities - Metro

Kim Ellis from Metro presented a powerpoint on the program. Kirstin noted that the Phase I report was in the CAC meeting packet.

7. Public Comment

Duke Castle stated that he wanted to bring up a perspective that he isn't sure gets to the CAC very frequently. He mentioned he was glad that Katie Abbott is on the committee to represent the younger persons point of view. Castle stated that when he looks out to 2035 he probably won't be alive nor will most of the people in his generation which he sees as being against new ideas. He thinks that the CAC needs to be listening to what younger people are looking for in the future, in particular in transportation. He referenced the recent failure of the streetcar making its way to Lake Oswego which indicated that cars will continue to be the primary mode of transportation and the community does not see that changing and that somehow people perceive that they are being asked not to drive their cars. He stated that he thinks it is interesting to see how young people view transportation. In 2004 with gas prices rising the number of vehicular miles travelled started dropping and have continued to fall since then. Bike sales in 2009 exceeded the number of new car sales. There is a shift happening. It's painful to see the cut backs in Tri-Met because the ridership continues to increase. Castle quoted some statistics. "More than a quarter of people 34 and younger who could get drivers licenses have not done it, which is a significant increase from a decade ago. Drivers aged 21 -34 are driving 12% miles less than they were in

1995. 46% of drivers below the age of 24 said they would rather put their money towards having internet access than owning a car.” He said that car companies are getting a little nervous so the New York Times published an article last month. The headline read “Young lose interest in cars.GM turns to MTV for help.” He stated that is not only was it an interesting article, but there are a number of interesting comments regarding the article. First quote: “Others have said it, but it’s worth repeating. I’m 25. My generation doesn’t care that much about cars because we don’t want to destroy the environment and spend a lot of money on maintain a car.” Second quote: “Finally someone realizes that my generation really doesn’t care about cars. People may call millennials dumb, but I completely disagree. There is no dumber investment than in a car. It depreciates every day you own it. It’s a money pit. Third quote: I’m a millennial; aged 25 and it’s interesting to see what the older generations thinks we want. In reality I find it somewhat comical. To me a car is an annoying money drain which gets me from point A to point B. Fourth quote: “When you turn to an MTV guy you know the game is up.” He closed with the observation that last summer some of the city councilors wanted to cut back on funding sustainability. During the public testimony a 22 year old man, Duncan Reid, talked about how when he and his friends graduated from college the drove around the country to make connections and talk about sustainability with people their age. Reid grew up in Lake Oswego and stated that he loves the community and that he hopes that it will be as good or better when he comes back. Reid stated “you hold my future in your hands.

Jim Bolland asked the CAC to remember that Lake Oswego is a built out community. There is mostly infill development and that implementation strategies and ordinances that will need to be written to implement the goals and policies will have a direct impact on existing neighborhoods. Lake Oswego isn’t a blank slate and he asked that they don’t forget that. He also asked the CAC to respect the planning processes that have occurred in the city up to this point, specifically neighborhood planning. He said that his neighborhood First Addition/Forest Hills did the first plan in Lake Oswego. There are several other neighborhood plans. He noted that the process they went through took almost three years. The citizens in the neighborhood were very involved. There were several surveys and many meetings. He jokingly said that they must have been at the planning commission 20 times. The neighborhood hammered out the issues with the Planning Commission. He pointed out that the CAC is at the 40,000 ft. level and the neighborhood was down in the trenches. At the time the plan was developed they were discussing new urbanist strategies because the neighborhood edges the downtown. In the EC zone there is R-O zoning which is high density, so they created an R2 zone between the EC zone and single family zone to serve as a buffer and transition. An R6 zone was also created based on the size of the lots in the grid in FAN. Bolland stated that he gets nervous when he hears the CAC discussing housing because the neighborhoods with existing plans went through a rigorous process to discuss these issues and asked the CAC to respect that process. He also referenced the study session on April 24, 2012 regarding Foothills and the topic of whether affordable housing should be included in the plan. According to Jim, the developer pointed out that his firm had done a 240 unit affordable housing project in the Pearl and the urban renewal contribution to that one project was 30 million dollars. Bolland recommended having a finance person discuss any recommended goals and policies for affordable housing to understand what might be feasible.

8. CAC Comments

There were no CAC comments.

Chair Moncrieff adjourned the meeting.