

All Comments from Comment Forms		Notes for Hybrid Features (Village Centers +)
1	<p>LOconomy scenario does the best in terms of providing transit and middle/high income opportunities. It also will enable Lake Grove Village Center to realize its full-potential. While Village Centers does provide more walkable/complete neighborhoods, it does not provide these 2 essential elements (listed above). A LOconomy scenario with a bit more development of the neighborhood centers might be the most viable. It would also be good to have more mixed-use development and amenities on the west side of the city.</p>	Loconomy: Transit
2	<p>Existing neighborhood character needs to be respected. There are other areas where growth and development can occur. Improved highway 43 transit (streetcar) will drive improved E-W L.O. transit. It seems large scale commercial development will be limited. But Foothills and the west side as new neighborhoods is inviting. The grading/scoring/evaluation process is too complex for anything other than the most interested and involved.</p>	
3	<p>The current Comp plan is satisfactory for accommodating any future growth. The two other scenarios can be worked into the current comp plan without starting from scratch. The only difference between the current comp. plan and that proposed is density, transportation alternatives, and developments of Stafford.</p>	
4	<p>Stafford Triangle needs to be brought into the UGB, SW Industrial area under utilized-by whose definition? Landlords? , community design standards shift over time, Better access to fresh and local foods is mostly about the market conditions, Best way to relieve pressure on natural areas within the USB is through density and an increase in the UGB, Economic vitality needs to be more flexible enough to bed with larger economic forces that we have no control over, Does connected communities take into account consideration the need for trucks to move goods to and from businesses? Avoid using the plan to force people out of their cars or into smaller cars, Without mandating price controls or subsidized housing LO will have great difficulty achieving the goals for opportunities for 1st time home buyers and housing for a variety of income levels (i.e. first time home buyers</p>	

	All Comments from Comment Forms	Notes for Hybrid Features (Village Centers +)
5	<p>I wish Lake Grove Town Center was "fatter" and West Lake Grove was more defined. Right now the West Lake Grove mixed use area doesn't appear to have the zoning to foster mixed used. Boones Ferry from Kruse Way to Pilkington seems to foster linear "glorified strip mall" development instead of a center with depth and density. The opportunity for light rail isn't readily apparent. If HCT came to the SW corridor, where would LO's station area be? Perhaps the mixed-use districts shown at Bangy/Bonita should be closer to Kruse/Carmen/Quarry where jobs and housing currently intersect.</p>	<p>Lake Grove TC should be bigger West Lake Grove better defined Change zoning in West Lake Grove to foster mixed-use Perhaps the mixed-use districts shown at Bangy/Bonita should be closer to Kruse/Carmen/Quarry where jobs and housing currently intersect.</p>
6	<p>Sustainability Filter: Recommend not using the word "eliminate" in item 1-4. Reduction is a reasonable goal that would be acceptable in the broader community. All homes on the 5,000-6,000 s/f lots should be counted as medium density regardless of the underlying zone designation or area of the city.</p>	
7	<p>Shuttle to the WES would be great.</p>	
8	<p>I feel, as representing the Bryant neighborhood, the vision should be somewhere between Village Centers and Loconomy. I fear that if too much emphasis is placed on SW employment district the surrounding neighborhoods will lose their village/neighborhood feel. Love the 20 minute neighborhood idea, but safe roads/pathways/ traffic speeds are key to this being successful. For example, safe routes to LG Village Center</p>	
9	<p>Loconomy allows for too much growth-no longer be Lake Oswego as we know it in any way.</p>	
10	<p>No light rail</p>	
11	<p>1.) Please consider attracting a "branch" of Marylhurst to a small campus at Foothills to "bridge" the university into downtown Lake O. 2.) Please consider making the Comp Plan "be the plan" envisioned in Oregon Goal 5 for natural and historic resource protection</p>	
12	<p>Thank you for your efforts! I like the idea of the village centers, but worry that we don't have the density, topography, or infrastructure to make them work. Can small neighborhood businesses survive? Can Marylhurst support an academic community? Can Lewis and Clark?</p>	<p>Will LO have density, topography, infrastructure to make village centers work?</p>

	All Comments from Comment Forms	Notes for Hybrid Features (Village Centers +)
13	<p>Why no neighborhood hubs in south shore, Palisades, and West Stafford Rd? BIG GAP. High speed rail should use existing tracks through Oregon City, not Lake Oswego. I tend to support the 20 min. neighborhood concept. If you want economic development job, convert Foothills to light industrial high tech (look at Wilsonville) , so people can walk to work. Why was the Foothills shown as industrial on the "current comp plan"? I feel mislead and manipulated and increasingly suspicious.</p>	<p>Need neighborhood hub at South Shore/Palisades/West Stafford Road. Foothills as light indust. High tech.</p>
14	<p>The focus on Marylhurst in Village Center and Loconomy scenarios is totally misplaced. Taxpayers do not want to invest in the outskirts of town. All energy should be in existing neighborhood centers. Marylhurst is it's own separate business and profit center. Any changes to the comprehensive plan would focus on how we can preserve what we have now in LO; great neighborhoods, access to Willamette River, views of the Lake, and existing parks. New uses in Kruse Way corridor, could use more housing and commercial because it is a dead zone after 5 pm. The rest of the City is excellent as is. Adding high rise housing in foothills area is a bad direction for the city. We are not an intense urban area now and should not aspire to add big areas of high rise (over three stories) in Lake Oswego.</p>	<p>Don't focus future development at Marylhurst: private and on outskirts. New housing and commercial alogn Kruse so not dead after 5 p.m.</p>
15	<p>I think that the existing comprehensive plan is fine. It has worked very well and it suits the community action areas very well. In short, it is an excellent plan. The village centers plan has some good features that can possibly complement and enhance the existing plan.</p>	<p>Existing comp plan enhanced by village centers</p>
16	<p>My preference is for a hybrid scenario that provides for more extensive public transit.</p>	<p>Hybrid with more extensive transit.</p>
17	<p>Agenda 21 (United Nations) is where this type of planning comes from. I do not support it. It take away individual property rights "guaranteed" by our constitution.</p>	
18	<p>Please remember existing plans in the comprehensive plan represent well vetted community compromised. Up zoning in West Lake Grove may reduce redevelopment potential in the Lake Grove commercial area. Both plans took into account stakeholder consensus building that should not be lost in the process. Action plans in the LGVC plan and neighborhood plans should be rolled into next phase of this planning process as they reflect priority projects. Sustainability from my perspective low impact and energy efficient building design (LEED) Please focus on this in the next phase goal/policy development.</p>	<p>Upzoning in W. Lake Grove may detract from LGVC</p>

	All Comments from Comment Forms	Notes for Hybrid Features (Village Centers +)
19	<p>I like the idea of combining both village center and strong development on both east and west ends. However, I'm not sure we will ever have the density to support businesses in all the village centers, or that our patters of choosing business/professional to patronize will change enough to make location close to home be the deciding factor. I suspect we will continue to want/need to travel to services and jobs, so an enhanced transit system will be essential in either scenarios. I'd like Village Centers to work, but question how practical it is to decentralize things like the farmer's market, which requires a certain level of support to work. I honestly don't think that a mixed use development is the highest use of the land at Mary's Woods/ Marylhurst. Those services all exist 20 minutes/ 1.5 miles away in Robinwood. The green space is good for the soul while driving highway 43. I'd rather it stay green until there is real need to develop it. Mary's Woods may need their land for the baby boomers.</p>	<p>Enhanced transit Mary's Wood may need land for more senior housing, rather than mixed-use center.</p>
20	<p>Public transportation: shuttle bus to Bridgeport and Kruse Way Businesses. (Unclear comment)</p>	
21	<p>Our extended family includes young people who live in San Francisco and Vancouver B.C. Transit services and neighborhood stores are well-established and handy. Granted, we do not have the density level of those cities, but if we're going to try to up the # of young people in LO, we need to provide some of those amenities. Village Centers would help this happen but do we have enough people to sustain small businesses? I hope so. Keep pushing the "buy local" please!</p>	<p>Transit and neighborhood stores</p>
22	<p>Village Centers idea is the best. It promotes walkable areas and the best sense of community. The key is creating mixed use areas where people can live, work, and play in close proximity. Careful placement of these zones can also act to protect the existing neighborhoods. Thanks for the good work!</p>	
23	<p>Twenty-minute neighborhoods only work 50% of the time. Consider Palisades, Lake Forest, Mt. Park-Not going to happen! Transit service needs to be better to Lake Grove-Kruse Way-besides downtown LO. Concentrate there-Trolley. Try to refrain from being and using negative phrases. Shows your bias.</p>	<p>Better transit, including Boones Ferry/Kruse Way</p>
24	<p>I generally support a combination of the existing plan and village centers concept.</p>	
25	<p>Public transportation has to be improved within LO. West End and Palisades suffer from lack of and poor transportation.</p>	<p>Better transit in W. end and Palisades</p>