



CITY OF  
**West Linn**

22500 Salamo Road  
West Linn, Oregon 97068  
<http://westlinnoregon.gov>

## COMMITTEE FOR CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT MEETING NOTES

Tuesday, August 29, 2017

5:30 p.m. - Meeting –Bolton Conference Room

Present: Chair Thomas Tucker, Bob Martin, Ken Pryor, Emily Smith, and Jim Farrell.

Citizens Present: Pam Yokubaitis and Carrie Pellett.

Staff Present: John Boyd

---

### 1) Call to Order

Meeting called to order at 5:30 p.m.

### 2) Approval of the August 15, 2017 meeting notes

The minutes for August 15, 2017, were reviewed and members discussed changes.

***Motion to approve the meeting notes as amended by Member Martin and Seconded by Member Farrell. Motion passed (one abstention – Emily Smith).***

### 3) Citizen Comments

Pam Yokubaitis spoke on citizen involvement. She outlined her talking points for the presentation at a CCI upcoming meeting. She noted the discussion paper is under review by Neighborhood Association (NA) Presidents, by citizens who has been through a land use process and NA members familiar to the process. It was noted the resulting product should be considered a group effort.

The CCI discussed the need to review the document from Pam Yokubaitis in advance of the meeting in order to provide adequate time for review. Member Martin suggested to provide the members and the public that time, the item should be continued until the September 12<sup>th</sup> meeting. All members concurred and noted at the meeting on September 5<sup>th</sup> the agenda should be revised to reflect the changed agenda item.

Member Smith asked Pam Yokubaitis how the paper review members were selected. Pam Yokubaitis answered that local outreach was completed and was summarized in the document.

### 4) Planning Process Review: Continuation of Problem Identification and Action Topics Summary discussion

Chair Tucker reviewed the August 15<sup>th</sup> meeting notes regarding the set of problem statements. He reminded the members that at the last meeting the CCI was asked to review the list and provide comments. Prior to today's meeting he had not received any comments.

Member Pryor noted he had a few points and discussed concerns regarding the process. He felt there was a lack of understanding of the neighborhood plans. If development was to be responsive to neighborhood concerns, the local review should be responsive to their needs. The concern included density and ability to address infrastructure. Member Martin noted that staff must be responsive to the adopted plans and ordinances. Member Pryor's concern is staff has a bias towards the needs of development over the needs of the community. He felt that staff and developers don't understand or correctly represent the neighborhood plans.

Member Martin noted he understood the concern but as a Councilor explained the process requires staff to address the Code including the process recently reviewed. He reminded the CCI that the review of land use actions includes a process that is outlined in the community development code. Staff's role is also defined in that code. Citizen Pellett expressed a concern that the code has not been updated to correctly respond to the needs of the community. Member Farrell stated staff should be aligned to the needs of the community. The remaining land available to develop is infill and small lots. When considering density, most zones are R-10 with high value homes. This type of housing is not affordable to most citizens. He concluded there needs to be a balance of housing types to allow more affordable housing.

Member Martin noted that the code requires amendment to address these needs but it is more than just the process chapter. To provide for affordable housing, the mapped zones and zoning uses require review. To avoid development that is not what is desired, the CCI can identify problem statements and provide them to the City Council and allow them time to develop recommendations.

#### Problem Draft (continued from prior meeting)

- The need for early engagement and understanding by citizens
- Need to improve the notification process throughout all phases of planning
- The lack of understanding of the pre-application process along with citizen and applicant rights
- Material misrepresentation is not defined
- Problem in tracking changes after the application is deemed complete
- DeNovo versus on-the record appeals
- Time line for review of material. (Who gets notice and what information is made available)
- Staff Reports are limited reviews.
  - Who is responsible for the quality of the review?
  - Does the Staff Report thoroughly evaluate against the criteria?
  - What role does the Comprehensive Plan and Neighborhood Plans play in this role?

#### *Problem Draft (points added during August 29<sup>th</sup> meeting)*

- Criteria should be clarified. What is the decision process to determine if criteria are met (who decides)? The code language as currently written is not clear to reviewers.
  - Staff Boyd pointed out that part of the problem rests in the review of criteria.
    - If you seek more affordable housing, it is difficult to provide more open space or protect the highest number of trees. The challenge is considering where the need is highest (for housing) and the goal to save trees is best served (serves most value.)

- All agreed the consideration of meeting criteria should consider how to set the bar for each part of the city.
  - The questions of code are part of this focus. What are the ways in this process that we can make it easier for citizens to engage.
- The purpose of pre-application conferences should be redefined. There is a perceived lack of understanding in the neighborhood plans with staff and applicant.
  - How does the proposal consider the needs of the community as identified in the Comprehensive Plan and each neighborhood plan?
  - The group suggested providing the plan at the pre-application conference to identify the desires of each area.
- How can trust in the process be developed? It was discussed that citizens often hold their comments to avoid conflicts earlier in the process.
- Is the notice area inadequate?

There was a general discussion on the citizen outreach and planning process. Members were concerned that the process can be considered adversarial by citizens. They noted the goal of developers is to get through the process as quickly as possible. Citizens should be heard earlier in the process. The CCI discussed the NA meeting notice process. Member Martin noted that he wasn't aware a direct notice was already sent to property owners. Member Farrell felt notice area should be greater than 500 feet. There was a general discussion on land use projects and impacts as a support of greater notice area.

The members discussed differing ways of providing notice. The current practice is to get on the agenda of the NA meetings. The CCI discussed mailed notice of meetings from developers, email mailing lists within each of the neighborhood associations and other methods could be expanded.

The members spoke about continuing this discussion in September as weekly meetings. Chair Tucker asked each member again to review these problem statements and provide their comments. Member Martin noted that the goal of meetings over the next weeks should be to complete these problem statements and prioritize them. The final problem statements and suggestions should be forwarded in a memo to City Council

## 5) Member Comments

There were none

## 6) Adjourn

Meeting adjourned at 7:00 p.m. The next meeting is September 5<sup>th</sup>.