

Addendum to attached composed after the CAC meeting today

Thank you Sally and Laura and all of the CAC! I appreciate your consideration of natural resource protection as an integral part of the Inspiring Places and Places section of the Comprehensive Plan. I have a few comments on the comments that were made relative to my submission.

The first comment I would like to make is that what Sally (Councilor Moncrieff) quoted is really true, we have forgotten the Measure 100 impacts and take Oregon's land use policies for granted without really going back and looking at the details of how earth-shaking they were and how prescient. The previous Comprehensive Plans, as Sally indicated, did explicitly follow the Oregon Goals. And as Sally also mentioned, certainly there is tremendous concern by the Planning Commission that details will be lost in translation to the new format and in fact that is exactly what my message was intended to prevent, a loss of the Goal 5 protection in the Comprehensive Plan regarding inventory and protection of "Open Spaces".

When Beth mentioned that A-1 type natural resource protections ("...enhance the natural environment...") and "view corridors" are included in the Inspiring Spaces and Places, I think there was a misunderstanding about what "Open Spaces" are exactly. They are not literally spaces, they are not viewing corridors or a vague community resource called "natural environment" but actual pieces of property that are to be inventoried, delineated and protected as needed according to Goal 5 and these are in fact so identified on the Parks Plan and other documents. The Comprehensive Plan, in this very location, not under a future determined "Health" Section as Kirstin suggests, should say that Open Spaces will be conserved as part of the planning process to protect the natural resources they support and provide. (It would actually be good if this paragraph further indicated that one methodology for doing this is the Natural Resources Advisory Board since this is part of the NRAB charter.)

The definition of Open Spaces should be right there, part of the text, and consistent with Goal 5 so there is no possibility of adding confusion. The present Comprehensive Plan has a Glossary, as Beth suggested would be compiled later in the process. This only leads to confusion and two different understandings of the meaning as used in the text. The clear definition should be right there next to the words about how development is restricted from Open Spaces and if included in a glossary later the exact same words should be used to avoid misunderstanding such as we have now!

I apologize for not being clear and I hope that it might be possible to add in a few sentences in A-2 that will clearly reflect the Goal 5 direction with no mistaking what exactly is meant so that we can continue to protect the identified, inventoried and delineated Open Spaces shown on the Park Master Plan and do it in a way consistent with community values as I suggest in detail.

Clearly there are properties that were deeded to the City to be maintained as Open Space and there are others that have been designated as Open Space. Effectively eliminating these from the Open Space inventory and/or not specifically indicating protection in the Comprehensive Plan (which was created to implement Measure 100!) will be a mistake, inadvertent, but still a mistake and likely be noticed on review as a loss by using the new format.

Including natural open spaces under the Health section of the Comprehensive Plan is a good idea. But certainly it must be included in Inspiring Places without fail because these are the core of the inspiration of Lake Oswego and it is always mentioned as such when that question is asked in an open fashion.

Please consider adding a few sentences in A-1 reflecting the Goal 5 protection from development of "Open Spaces" as a minimum. These should include a viable definition of the term "Open Spaces" that is accurate per Goal 5 and agreeable to all. It should be made clear that these are specific and real properties that are clearly identified and that the community strongly wishes to protect as part of our heritage and that of generations to come.

Again, thank you and please reconsider...

From: Craig Stephens, May 23, 2012, re Inspiring Places

Although I do serve on the Natural Resources Advisory Board as co-Chair, I am writing this as an individual citizen comment to request inclusion of what might be termed “Oregon Goal 5 Natural Resource Protections” in this section of the Comprehensive Plan. This seems consistent with the inclusion of the other aspect of Goal 5, namely Historic Resources Protections in this section and the core idea of “inspiring places”. Specifically I suggest what might be termed “clarity” in this regard. Hopefully this suggestion will be viewed as feasible, legal (compliant to all regulations, goals and titles), helpful to the process and completely in accord with the vast majority of the community (I would say *all* but nothing is 100%) and will therefore be considered to the extent that the CAC feels appropriate to protect natural resources in this fundamental manner and preserve these “inspiring spaces” in our community to prevent “Nature Deficit Disorder”.

Comprehensive Plan Update Clarity

Questions about the Comprehensive Plan during community discussions at the Summits and other venues almost always stem from lack of clarity or inconsistency in definitions. Clarity and one and only one definition for any given subject is fundamental. The following are suggested:

Define “open space” to be consistent with the Goal 5 concept of area within the planning district that is inventoried, delineated and set aside from development, whether public or private.

Goal 5: “Development should be planned and directed so as to conserve the needed amount of open space.”

Define “open space” as undeveloped land with trails, benches, interpretive stops, access signs, parking adjacent and “suitable plantings” but not landscaping. Suitable plantings should include, initiation of tree grove habitat, sanctuary (for song birds, bees and/or butterflies, typically) plantings, organic farming and gardening and the term “organic” defined. This has typically meant meeting certain certification requirements which should be specifically indicated. It should be made clear that “developed park uses” or conversion to developable space of open spaces requires community agreement to override the Comprehensive Plan map designation of “open space”. The present definition of open space includes “landscaped yards” and this is clearly not consistent with the concept of undeveloped land.

Define “sensitive lands” in such a way as to be clear and not conflicting with the protection of “open spaces” and to be compatible with code restrictions for development, an entirely different, but

equally valid, concept to that of protecting some undeveloped areas as “open space”. Open space has been previously determined by the community as “needed” and should clearly shown on the updated Comprehensive Plan Map and called “open space” or, as has been suggested recently to add clarity, “natural open space”. In many cases the overall public space (aka “Park”) will have both an open space area set aside for protection from development (typically nearly undevelopable for various reasons) and an area to be used as a developed park. The request is to delineate the open space area and include in the inventory and on the Comprehensive Plan map. In any case please use the defined terms consistently throughout the Comprehensive Plan to avoid future confusion.

This clarity and single definition for critical terms will be valuable immediately and for generations to come.