



**Comprehensive Plan
Citizen Advisory Committee
Meeting # 25**

**June 27, 2012
Main Fire Station, 300 B 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), Tom Brennan, Christopher Clee (4:30), Tom Fahey, Bill Gaar, Nancy Gronowski, Liz Hartman, David White

Members not in attendance: Katie Abbott, Dorothy Atwood, Doug Cushing, Jim Johnson, Tim Mather, Bob Needham, Teri Oelrich

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

1. PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

2. CAC COMMENTS

Mr. Brennan asked for consensus to use the affordable housing language he had suggested at the last meeting. The staff polled the group and found the majority accepted it with a refinement by Ms. Gronowski. Mr. Gaar abstained. The agreed-upon language was as follows:

Work with the Lake Oswego Redevelopment Agency to establish strategies and minimum target percentages of affordable housing units as part of Lake Oswego urban renewal plans. Tailor customized strategies for each plan to reflect the citywide targets required to accomplish affordable housing goals. (Complete Neighborhoods & Housing, Housing Affordability Policy C-4).

Staff/CAC discussion points:

- The state requirement is to provide the opportunity (supportive zoning) for a range of housing types that were commensurate with the financial capabilities of area households. There are no specific mandated targets.
- An urban renewal district was just one place to get affordable housing. Other places were along transit corridors and in mixed-use areas using urban design tools.
- It could be helpful to specifically call out urban renewal districts because there were incentives for developers that helped them profit handsomely from public investment in the districts.
- There were tools that other cities used that were not subsidies. One was density incentives to allow a developer to build a greater number of smaller units on a site and agree to rent them at a certain price point.

- Keep in mind the vision to attract more young families and keep up the schools.
- An aging population wants to downsize and stay in the community and walk to services and shopping.
- The fact that 30% of existing Lake Oswego households earned below 80% of the median income (less than \$58,400 a year) shows a need exists in Lake Oswego. 45% of regional households earn below 80%. The city looks to the household needs of urban Clackamas County to meet the statewide planning goal calling for housing opportunities commensurate with the needs of area households (not just Lake Oswego households).
- Providing affordable housing in Foothills would mean the employees of the Foothills retail uses there could live near where they worked.
- Would this be trying to mandate low income housing that this market would not support?
- The economy seemed to dictate what 'affordable housing' was.
- What was affordable housing was relative.
- Referring to 'targets' strengthened the policy, but it was still a policy and thus flexible.
- A minimum target percentage might not be necessary. Plenty of people in every neighborhood were renting or living with relatives so their kids could attend local schools.
- Design and location were critical.
- Mr. Gaar recalled people came to Lake Oswego for its high real estate value and because they enjoyed the community. He was not sure how much of a role affordable housing played. He was concerned about including minimum target language. He asked for some good examples of existing affordable housing so he could go see them.
- Staff advised the new Oakridge Park senior housing in Lake Grove was affordable housing. Portland urban renewal areas had to set aside 30% of the financing for affordable housing units. There were some good examples in the Pearl District that were either fully affordable or mixed affordability complexes.

REGULAR BUSINESS

3. Agenda Review & Announcements

The Planning Commission had recommended Inspiring Spaces goals and policies to the Council and the Council would hold a study session on July 24. CAC members and their boards were encouraged to attend and provide input at Planning Commission and City Council meetings. The Planning Commission was to hear Complete Neighborhoods & Housing on July 9. The City Council would continue deliberating Community Culture on July 10. The TSPAC/CAC joint meeting on Connected Community was on July 11. The community fair on Community Health & Public Safety and Healthy Ecosystems was going to be held during the August 25 Farmers' Market. Staff planned to meet with the NRAB and SAB in July. They asked the CAC members to think about either moving the regular meeting day from Wednesdays to Thursdays or holding the Wednesday meeting at the WEB.

4. Economic Vitality Review 1st Draft of Goals and Policies

The work group had met on June 20. They had simplified the draft and removed specifics, leaving more flexible, higher level, conceptual policies. They had looked at them through the sustainability lens.

Goal 1 was to provide a full range of economic development opportunity that enhanced prosperity and livability. The CAC generally agreed to remove extraneous language from Policy 9 so it just said:

9. Focus employment uses in designated areas at appropriate scales and intensities, such as in Employment Centers, Town Centers and Neighborhood Villages.

The subsections that had been removed from this policy talked about things like cultural opportunities, community gathering places and locational criteria. The CAC agreed those subjects made a policy about employment uses too confusing. That information could be moved to preamble text or a definitions section instead. One of the Neighborhood Village subsections called out Mountain Park. Staff explained the question was whether Lake Oswego Town Square was really a Neighborhood Village. It was consistent with other Neighborhood Villages but it was much larger and generated more users and more traffic. Should it be considered a Neighborhood Village or was it more like a Town Center? A Neighborhood Village was lower intensity. It was not a Metro-designated Town Center as close-by Lake Grove was. The CAC wanted to know what impact making it General Commercial would have. Staff agreed to research that and report back with options.

The Work Group had not been able to quantify how much business activity was created by home occupations so they recommended changing the language of Policy 10 as follows:

10. Encourage home occupations as an important a source of business activity.

Goal 2 was re-worded to say:

Redevelopment and new development in employment zones will address impacts on and enhance the surrounding community and will be well-served by infrastructure.

Policy 1 listed certain things that were to be addressed in providing opportunities for new employment development and redevelopment. The CAC discussed the following items:

- (b) Replace 'Mitigate' with less negative language, "Address adverse impacts."
- Comment: There will be impacts that cannot be mitigated when employment goes into a residential zone.
- (f) through (k) are really transportation policies. Move them or address them through Connected Community and insert cross-references here.
- (c) Reword to say: **(c) Comply with design and aesthetic standards to promote compatibility with Lake Oswego's overall community character.** The staff report will tell the Planning Commission there was a lot of discussion about (c) and how to get to overall character while ensuring neighborhood concerns were addressed.

5. Community Health & Public Safety: Part 1 Review Policy Questions

Ms. St. Amand distributed the June 22 staff memorandum. She and Ms. Selden each presented overviews of Natural Hazards and Energy & Climate Change using slides. The approach to natural hazards was to take a comprehensive approach to hazards and expand the list of hazards to more than just the three listed in the existing Comprehensive Plan (flood, earthquake and landslide).

Staff/CAC comments:

- The Comprehensive Plan should also call for being prepared for man-made disasters.
- The City had many existing plans that contained a lot of good information. They should be acknowledged and integrated and used to make decisions.
- One caveat: not all of those plans are up to date.
- Staff would be working with Dorothy Atwood and the SAB to help identify energy and climate change issues that were important to the community.
- Climate change affected so many aspects that perhaps it should be elevated and addressed everywhere, not just stuffed into the Energy chapter.

6. PUBLIC COMMENT

Lisa Volpel (Rosewood Neighborhood) wanted to know more specifics about the mixed-use district mapped at Jean/Pilkington and how it would impact the surrounding neighborhood. Part of the circled area was not part of any neighborhood group and nearby neighborhood associations did not seem to be willing to absorb it (the area northwest of Lakeview and Pilkington). The scale there should be the right fit for the surrounding neighborhood and appropriate for that 'bad' intersection. The Maintenance site was currently considered a potential site for a second Farmers' Market. The area needed more of those kinds of places. Ms. Volpel indicated she wanted to see things like farm stands and food carts, but not more commercial than was already there.

Discussion/comments:

- The circles were too nebulous. Staff agreed the boundaries of the circled area were still 'fuzzy.' The intent was to capture that existing neighborhood commercial strip of along Pilkington.
- **Ms. Volpel** observed there was higher density there already. The circle just needed to be moved up a little bit. To have it where it was mapped now was making the neighborhood nervous.
- Staff would like to hear from the neighborhood if that was a good place to integrate a community hub and what it wanted to see there.

Mr. Clee related that FAN wanted to be allowed twenty minutes on a future agenda to present the results of its neighborhood survey. Councilor Moncrieff explained CAC time was so limited it could not fit in time to hear from every neighborhood association. The City Council was going to hear the report. Staff suggested FAN share it with the CAC by submitting the highlights in written comments. **Mr. Gaar** suggested FAN talk to the Planning Commission as well during Public Comments time.

CAC COMMENTS

None.

ADJOURNMENT

Councilor Moncrieff adjourned the meeting at 6:00 p.m.