



**Comprehensive Plan  
Citizen Advisory Committee  
Meeting # 27**

**August 23, 2012  
Council Chamber of City Hall, 380 A Avenue  
4:00 pm – 6:00 pm**

PLEASE NOTE THIS SUMMARY IS NOT A WORD FOR WORD DOCUMENTATION OF ALL 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), Jim Johnson (Vice Chair), Dorothy Atwood, Tom Brennan, Christopher Clee, Doug Cushing, Bill Gaar, Nancy Gronowski, Liz Hartman, Patty Zebrowski (substitutue for Teri Oelrich).

**Members not in attendance:** Katie Abbott, Tom Fahey, Bob Needham, Tim Mather, Teri Oelrich and David White

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

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

##### First Addition/Forest Hills Neighborhood Survey Results

Carole Ockert, Chair of First Addition/Forest Hills Neighborhood Association Coordinating Committee, and [Mr.] Karl Ockert provided a copy of the survey results report. The Committee had conducted the survey last February. They sent out 1,285 survey forms to association members in FAN, Forest Hills and the business district north of A Avenue. 331 (26%) were returned. The survey asked about potential use of the library site if the library were moved; how people felt about housing density and neighborhood character; and what issues people were concerned with on their block, in their neighborhood and in their City. The results showed the most preferred library replacement use was a new park and a close second was to revert back to single-family housing. Less than 10% would increase density to provide multifamily housing. During the questioning period, the neighborhood representatives clarified that the survey did not ask whether responders wanted the library moved or not and how they would feel if the only way to move it was to use the site for multifamily use. The Committee had used a neighborhood enhancement grant to pay for the survey. CAC members observed 26% seemed to be a very good response rate. The neighborhood representatives noted that Forest Hills' response rate was 50%, but it was a relatively small portion of the neighborhood. CAC members asked if the library site would normally revert back to R-6 zoning. They confirmed the library site would normally revert back to R-6. Councilor Moncrieff advised that a zone change would be necessary to make the site anything other than R-6. Staff observed the survey results were consistent with the community vision.

*Staff note: The library site is zoned PF (Public Functions) and would continue to be zoned as such until there was a zone change request.*

#### **CAC COMMENTS**

None.

#### **REGULAR BUSINESS**

- **Agenda Review & Announcements**

The CAC agreed to use this meeting time to focus on the items the Planning Commission had commented on and the survey questions to be asked at the upcoming fair. They would postpone discussion Access to Local Food until September. Staff asked them to submit any comments about the July 25 meeting summary by the end of the week. Otherwise it would be incorporated into the record.

Mayor's Quarterly Neighborhood Chair Meeting- At the last monthly meeting of neighborhood chairs the chairs had talked about garbage service. They had scheduled an extra meeting the following Saturday in order to talk about Planning Commission recommendations related to Complete Neighborhoods and Housing policies.

Mr. Gaar and Mr. Johnson were going to attend the Council study session on September 11 to talk about the Commission discussion. The Council hearing on Inspiring Spaces & Places was September 18.

- **August 25 Community Fair**

Ms. Weigel went over the volunteer schedule for the fair and submit the following Saturday. The online survey was to be posted the next day and would be up until September 16.

### **Second Review of Goals and Policies: Feedback from Planning Commission**

- **Economic Vitality**

Staff distributed the August 17, 2012, Staff Memorandum and Attachment 5, 'Economic Vitality Draft Goals and Policies: Feedback from Planning Commission.' They distributed a handout that discussed the issue of 'community hubs.' They asked the CAC to review the goals and policies and to forward a recommendation to the Planning Commission hearing.

Attachment 5 highlighted the changes staff made in response to CAC and Planning Commission comments. They had revised Policy 9 and created new Policies 10 and 11, which all dealt with Employment Centers, Town Centers and Neighborhood Villages. Staff had heard comments that the policies read too much like definitions and heard questions related to how they translated to the vision map. They explained the vision map was a conceptual map that identified areas by how they functioned. There were different scales and intensities: Employment centers were the largest scale; then Town Centers; then the lowest intensity would be Neighborhood Villages. Policy 9 talked about what the City wanted to happen in each of those types of places and Policy 10 offered locational criteria for each of them. The Commission had also suggested some minor changes to clarify language about promoting shared parking strategies; to address adaptive reuse; and to use language that was consistent with other places in the Plan. The Commission had inquired what happened to 'community hubs,' and the new Policy 11 addressed them.

The CAC had previously found that references here to paths and cultural areas took away from the 'employment' focus. After they were removed, the Commission wanted to know what happened to those references, and suggested they were needed to give a complete picture of what happens in each place, and also suggested definitions. Staff added the references back into these policies and definitions. Staff had not yet developed a definition for 'cultural nodes'; it could be appropriate to put one in Community Culture. A CAC member cautioned that the policies should not exclude cultural uses from places like Marylhurst. Councilor Moncrieff recalled a Planning Commissioner had inquired, 'Where is the art?' Staff noted that the Community Culture section talked about where art should be located. It was agreed that the Plan would define both 'cultural uses' and 'cultural nodes'. The CAC suggested linking definitions with the map so it would direct people where to read the definitions in the Plan.

Mr. Gaar related that the Planning Commissioners did not disapprove of the new approach, but they were struggling with reconciling the existing Plan with the new way of organizing it by topic. That might be why they had asked 'Where is the art?' Staff advised the September packet would have an index. The CAC observed there were more cultural nodes than shown on the map. For example, Downtown featured the theater and sidewalk art. Staff thanked the CAC for bringing that to their attention.

**Proposed Policy 9(c)(i): In the Mountain Park Neighborhood Village, allow additional commercial uses where site conditions, such as parcel size and direct access to the major street system, can support businesses that provide specialized services and unique goods.**

The CAC had asked staff to look at whether the Oswego Town Square site was more like a Town Center or a Neighborhood Village (August 21, 2012 memorandum, 'Economic Vitality Policies for Mountain Park' (see Attachment 5b.)). Staff applied proposed Policy 10 criteria to the site and found it was more similar in function and size to Neighborhood Villages than Town Centers. The Mountain Park Neighborhood Village site was a

“neighborhood commercial, plus” site that allowed most, but not all, General Commercial uses (it limited banking). This particular area allowed a few more uses, but the types of uses were specialized services and unique goods. They proposed to keep it a Neighborhood Village but recognize its uniqueness and additional allowed commercial uses through a specific Comprehensive Plan policy.

The CAC wondered whether the building and parking capacity there was being fully utilized and if there were conditional use requirements. Comments were that the large upper parking lot was often empty; it might have been developed when there were greater parking requirements; and the upper lot supported overflow parking from the adjacent New Seasons and small businesses. Staff clarified the existing Plan, code and proposed policies supported the current uses. They suggested looking at maximizing use during action planning when they looked at how to enhance neighborhood villages. The CAC discussed how the site compared with other neighborhood villages, such as Palisades. Comments were that when considering calling out this site the CAC should consider that it was not that much different from Palisades; that it was ‘Palisades on steroids’ - just a notch or two larger, with a lot more commercial applications; that it was 13 acres when Palisades might be only 3 acres; and that it might be more of a ‘shopping center’ than Palisades was. Staff advised Neighborhood Villages varied in size, scale and character. Staff advised Neighborhood Villages varied in size, scale and character, while Town Centers were pretty similar. Staff observed CAC members were in agreement about sending the Mountain Park policy to the Planning Commission.

**Policy 10 regarding designations of Employment Centers, Town Centers, and Neighborhood Villages.**

The group looked at the locational sub-policies listed under Policy 10. Staff recommended dropping language referring to small, medium and large businesses from ‘a. Employment Centers’ and ‘b. Town Centers’ because the code update process was looking at streamlining the code for commercial zones. They clarified that ‘the regional transportation system’ meant freeways and larger highways. They clarified that ‘public facility zone’ was any kind of public use. It was in ‘b. Town Centers’ in case a use such as a fire station was needed.

The CAC inquired whether the Plan would allow new places to be added in the future. Staff advised that Policy 10 criteria would be applied when, for example, the City was considering creating a new neighborhood village. A Land Use chapter would describe the process for making changes. Mr. Gaar related that the Planning Commission had a great deal of discussion about whether the definitions provided clear enough direction. Staff observed the CAC was comfortable with Policy 10.

Ms. St. Amand explained that Handout 2 was a response to public comments. It clarified what kinds of uses were allowed in the SW Employment District.

**Policy 11. Accommodate opportunities for temporary, limited commercial activities in Community Hubs. (a) Community Hubs are: (i) Located in neighborhoods; (ii.) Co-located with schools, parks or other public facilities; and (iii.) Connected by pedestrian and bicycle facilities to the surrounding neighborhood.**

The map showed the hubs as orange dots. Ms. St. Amand reported the Planning Commission had inquired what was in the hubs; there were two different kinds of hubs. Some of them were zoned PNA (for parks and schools) and others were neighborhood commercial, which is the same zoning as neighborhood villages. She asked the CAC to talk about whether they were to just be places for temporary uses such as a car wash, a one-day farmers’ market, and coffee sales; if they were to be established commercial hubs that were neighborhood commercial uses that were smaller in scale than the neighborhood village; and if the Plan should address both kinds of hubs.

The CAC asked about the small commercial center in Westlake just north of Kruse Way. Staff advised it was allowed in that residential zone because it was part of the area’s master plan. The neighborhood representative related that people at neighborhood meetings wanted to know what neighborhood hubs were. Now that the CAC was talking about community hubs and commercial hubs it remained confusing. She recalled the CAC had talked about community hubs as gathering places, not commercial areas, then talked about food carts and events. Other CAC members recalled that temporary commercial activity were to be allowed there. They compared Palisades (which had low activity) with Westlake (with established permanent businesses in it). Mr. Johnson reminded the CAC that the context was economic vitality. If a hub had no economic resources, it should not be in this section. If it was a community center with some commercial aspects, the wording in Handout 2 might or might not be the right wording, but the approach was the right

one. He advised when the Planning Commission was hearing a zone change request and listening to public input about compatibility to certain types of uses he would want to know exactly what the policy meant. Without any commercial uses it did not need to be in this section. Staff agreed the intent of the policies should be clear. The rub was that the policies might describe the intent of a community hub as temporary use while in fact some of them were already zoned to allow permanent commercial use.

The CAC talked about extending the definition of neighborhood villages to include community hubs, noting that Neighborhood Villages were 'Comprised of commercial and mixed-uses'. Mr. Johnson suggested that a community hub with a permanent commercial use might not be a 'community hub' and could be called a 'neighborhood commercial hub' instead. Others recalled the CAC had talked about having gathering spots that could feature uses like car washes and farmers markets. Perhaps community hubs might morph into neighborhood villages at some point in the future. Perhaps community hubs could serve as business incubators for temporary uses as they grew into a more permanent home. Commissioner Johnson cautioned that could require a zone change. Councilor Moncrieff recalled the idea of community hubs originated when people at public forums expressed a desire to have a place to socialize together; it was more about community culture and not intended to create jobs or zone employment land. It was about social aspects that did not preclude the ability to have a car wash or sell coffee. Mr. Johnson observed that might not belong in the Economic Vitality section. But if some aspects of temporary commercial use were allowed, there could be some residential standards for them. Staff suggested the concept could be addressed by a policy in the Community Culture section that would allow hubs at schools and parks; they would not be on the map.

Ms. Weigel suggested calling areas similar to the small Westlake commercial area a 'commercial hub' and addressing 'commercial hub' in the Economic Vitality section. The 'community hub' that was a community gathering place could be addressed in Community Culture. Staff polled the group and the consensus was to agree to Ms. Weigel's suggestion to have 'commercial hubs' in this section and address 'community hubs' elsewhere. Supplemental comments were that the map did not really reflect that community hubs were essentially in all schools and parks; that they could fit under Complete Neighborhoods and Housing and the 20-Minute Neighborhood concept; that it was getting easier to understand what the differences between hubs were; that the original intent of community hubs was places for people to gather and sell stuff; and that the primary purpose of the community hub was social gathering, but one should be able to buy a burrito there. Staff related they planned to update the map.

**Goal 1. Provide a full range of economic development opportunities that enhance prosperity and livability. Policy 2. Maximize use of employment land through the following: a. Fully utilize existing buildings, with an emphasis on adaptive reuse.**

The CAC discussed the language 'with an emphasis on adaptive reuse'. One concern was that it might have unintended consequences. 'Emphasis' might be interpreted to mean that someone had to first look at whether they could adapt a structure like the existing old barn off Kruse Way before they could consider redeveloping the site. Without that term, the policy would give owners the flexibility to reuse existing buildings so the City could maximize its existing properties before expanding outward. Staff suggested finding a better word than 'emphasis.' They observed that saying 'fully' utilize existing buildings was a very strong statement too. Mr. Gaar and Councilor Moncrieff recalled the Planning Commission had discussed having of code language that would allow a building to be used in a different fashion than just pure commercial space. Otherwise, because of the zoning, some old buildings in Lake Grove might be torn down. Staff asked if the CAC would be satisfied with making it an action item to identify strategies to encourage adaptive reuse of existing buildings. Mr. Gaar indicated he might agree to that as long as it was clear that the CAC did not want the unintended consequence. After discussion, the CAC agreed to retain the first half of the sentence, and drop the second half, with the intention to address this in the action plan. They observed the CAC agreed to that.

**Goal 2. Redevelopment and development in employment zones will address impacts on and enhance the surrounding community and will be well-served by infrastructure. Policy 1 listed conditions a. through j. related to providing opportunities for new employment redevelopment and development. Policy 2 called for preventing new "strip commercial development" and encouraging redevelopment of existing strip commercial areas to promote pedestrian orientation, active streetscapes, access to businesses and transit.**

Staff had highlighted the changes they had made to keep this consistent with Connected Community. CAC comments were that 1(i) language related to minimizing traffic impacts ‘when feasible’ was a “cop-out”; in 1(f) Commercial Hubs should be added to the list of Employment Centers, Town Centers, and Neighborhood Villages; 1(i) should start with ‘Minimizing’; and Policy 2 should start with ‘Prevent’. Staff advised that the highlighted language in (h), ‘Promoting the efficient use of land dedicated to vehicle parking’, reflected the Planning Commission’s desire to have a way to go toward shared parking by looking at strategies for it. Mr. Cushing asked if (h) would be a stronger statement if ‘dedicated to vehicle parking’ was struck. Staff confirmed it would be stronger. They invited the CAC members to email any other questions or suggestions they had after the meeting.

#### **Attachment 5a. Memo from Mary’s Woods (July 5, 2012)**

Mary’s Woods at Marylhurst submitted a memo to the CAC and Planning Commission (Attachment 5a), asking them to consider how Economic Vitality goals and polices or action planning could address the growth of the 50+ population.

The Planning Commission discussed the proposal to have a 50+ citizens economic policy, concluding that there should not be a policy specifically focused on an age demographic. That could be more appropriately done in the action planning stage. Staff advised that the Comprehensive Plan update was about both land use-related items and community wants and needs. The CAC comments were that the logical place for such a policy could be in under Goal 1, in policies 4 or 6 or 8; other parts of the Plan recognized the City’s demographics, so recognize it in Economic Vitality as well; it would be helpful to have something in the policies that would lead to development of this concept; recognizing a 50+ or aging demographic was good because it was reality; it was a kind of marketing effort similar to attracting young families to the City; it was not so similar; there was a special economic benefit; and the ‘mentorship’ idea had been brought up during Community Culture/Education policy discussions. Staff suggested if the action planning group looking at economic vitality wanted to pursue this as an economic component, it could fashion an action plan to work with groups such as the ACC or the 50+ group. Staff observed the CAC agreed to have a policy, not just an action item. Mr. Brennan and Mr. Cushing volunteered to work with staff to prepare the language prior to the Planning Commission hearing.

Councilor Moncrieff and staff asked if the CAC wanted to say it had reached consensus or conduct a formal vote to recommend these goals and policies as they had amended them to the Planning Commission. The two Planning Commissioners indicated it did not matter because the CAC was a representative group and the strength of its unanimity was the key for the Planning Commission. Staff asked anyone who objected to say so for the record. No one objected and the staff announced consensus.

=====

- **Connected Community**

#### **VISION STATEMENT**

**We have safe, efficient and convenient transportation choices. There are frequent and reliable public transportation options that make it easy to move around our City and the region. Pathways, sidewalks, roadways and bike routes encourage residents of all neighborhoods to walk and bike safely.**

Staff distributed Attachment 4. Connected Community Draft Goals and Policies: Feedback from Planning Commission. The Commission had suggested adding the word ‘drive’ to the Vision Statement so it would read, ‘Pathways, sidewalks, roadways and bike routes to encourage residents of all neighborhoods to walk, bike and drive safely.’ The consultant had suggested alternative language, ‘Roadways and bike routes encourage safe travel for all.’ Mr. Johnson recalled that the Commission had a strong discussion about this. One or two of the Commissioners advocated inserting ‘driving’ and the rest were ok with that if the rest of the statement was still there. He related that he liked the consultant’s suggestion and would advocate for that language at the hearing. He indicated he thought the Commission as a whole recognized that people drove in the community. They were not saying the community would be without cars. But they would like to promote some of the other

modes of transportation based on what the Commission had heard from the public for years. Other CAC comments were:

that it was interesting to include all travel modes and then not list 'drive'; "I typically advocate walking and biking at every opportunity, so just leave it as it is"; adding 'drive' here was important because so many of the safety issues surrounding walking and biking had to do with how people drive; driving was the "status quo" and the community was trying to get to truly multimodal; this was trying to capture bringing those other modes up to a higher level in the community; if the idea was to encourage walking and biking then drop 'safely' and do not talk about driving; people would always drive in this City; if the focus was to walk and bike safely this would help create code that creates pathways and bike routes that will encourage walking and biking; including driving was logical and to list the other modes - but not driving - made no sense; the way this was written the concept was doing the traveling safely – having code for pathways, sidewalks, roadways and bike routes to encourage some kind of safer transportation; change 'encourage' to 'enable'; one could not walk and bike in some of the areas here; if the focus was on enabling walking and biking, then drop 'safely'; if the intent was to do something safely then it made no sense to leave cars out; make it two statements to say that the community wanted safety and then say it wanted to promote other modes of transportation; the vision was to make it easier to walk and bike and it was already feasible to drive from point to point in the community, but that was not necessarily true for walking and biking.

Councilor Moncrieff stressed that the vision statement reflected input from 1,200 people. Driving had not come forward during all of the community engagement. People could drive anywhere in the City safely. Any driving issues were because there were too many cars or they were driven too quickly. The public was looking through the sustainability lens, looking at 2035, considering 20-Minute Neighborhoods and saying they wanted more transportation choices than just cars. She acknowledged that she wanted to be able to walk and bike safely. No one was under the illusion that the community would start making the roads into paths. Mr. Cushing observed there were a lot of policies that were focused on streets and driving. He asked how that aligned with the vision. Ms. Atwood explained it was about transportation choices the community wanted. They already had the driving option and this vision did not preclude driving as a transportation choice. Staff advised that there was a positive tie-in to community health.

New language was suggested and agreed upon:

**We have safe, efficient and convenient transportation choices for all users. There are frequent and reliable public transportation options that make it easy to move around our City and the region. Safe pathways, sidewalks, roadways and bike routes enable residents of all neighborhoods to walk and bike.**

**Mr. Brennan suggested a minor tweak to say 'Safe pathways...'**

**Safety Policy 10 was a new policy that called for coordinating with the schools and surrounding neighbors to plan for safe and effective transportation for students and surrounding neighbors.**

The Planning Commission had talked about adding a policy about coordinating with the School District in the transportation chapter. This policy was an exact copy of a policy listed under Education in Community Culture. Staff asked if the CAC agreed to have it in two places in the Plan. Comments were that either way was ok but the planners should be sure to use connector terms; and it seemed that it was more travel connected so if it was only in one place it should be in Connected Community. Staff observed the CAC was comfortable having it just in Connected Community.

#### **Goal1 Safety:**

**Policy 5. Identify and prioritize locations with high rates of crashes and implement appropriate improvements.**

The CAC agreed with suggestions to remove the word, 'appropriate' and change the end of the sentence to 'and to implement improvements'.

**Goal 4 Accessibility.**

Policy 1 was proposed to be replaced because the Vision Statement already told the City where to put Town Centers and Employment Centers. The replacement language focused on where to provide the transit services. The CAC agreed to make this change.

The Planning Commission had pointed out that Policies 1 and 2 applied to geography and 3 applied more to demographics and that could be confusing to people. CAC members observed all the policies supported the goal; and having the amenities would encourage people to use transit. They agreed to leave the policies as they were.

**Goal 5. Connectivity.**

**Policy 1. Provide pedestrian, bicycle, transit, and vehicle connections to schools, parks, employment centers, town centers, neighborhood villages, community hubs, and recreational areas by identifying and implementing improvements that address connectivity needs.**

A Commissioner had suggested saying ‘connections from neighborhoods to schools...’ The CAC suggested saying, ‘among neighborhoods, schools, parks...’ and adding ‘commercial hubs’ to the list.

**Policy 8. Give additional weight to connectivity when prioritizing projects for funding**

The Planning Commission had suggested adding this kind of policy. It wanted connectivity to be given additional weight. Staff advised this policy would mean the City had to give connectivity more weight than the other criteria the City also used, such as safety, livability, sustainability. They recalled that the number one priority they had heard the community had was safety. Councilor Moncrieff could not imagine a situation where safety would not be the overriding consideration. Others noted that:

the policy was about funding, not code requirements; suggested the Commission wanted to make sure connectivity was considered in funding decisions; and indicated there should be an emphasis on connected routes and pathways so people could get to gathering places in twenty minutes or less. Mr. Johnson would support using ‘emphasis’ because his experience in applying these types of policies was that if some factors were more important than others that needed to be stated. Balancing all factors as equal made it hard to make decisions.

Staff suggested it could say, ‘emphasize connectivity when prioritizing projects for funding.’ They observed the CAC would accept that.

Staff observed the CAC was comfortable with moving the amended Connected Community vision goals and policies forward to the Planning Commission hearing.

=====

• **Community Health &Public Safety**

- Access to Local Food (Postponed): The CAC would review the Food Systems report at its next meeting.
- Survey Questions

Ms. St. Amand distributed copies of the draft Survey Questions (see Attachment 6b.). Staff needed a little more information in order to finish it. The draft had been through SAB, NRAB and Planning Commission reviews.

• **Healthy Ecosystems**

- Survey Questions

The CAC examined Attachment 7. DRAFT Healthy Ecosystems questions and made minor revisions.

Mr. Johnson advised that the Comprehensive Plan should provide direction regarding Stafford so the issue was resolved one way or the other. It would be clear when the City dealt with the region and the community’s position would not change with each City Council. Staff acknowledged that was an issue to be addressed at a higher level.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

None.

**CAC COMMENTS**

None.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 6:22 p.m.