



CITY OF
West Linn

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

COMMITTEE FOR CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT MEETING NOTES

Tuesday, November 7, 2017

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

Present: Karie Oakes, Emily Smith, Russ Axelrod, Bob Martin and Ken Pryor

Citizens Present: David Baker, Rosemont Summit NA

Staff Present: John Boyd

1) Call to Order

Meeting called to order at 5:40 p.m.

2) Approval of the October 26, 2017 meeting notes:

The meeting notes were reviewed and approved. **Member Martin moved to approve the meeting notes for October 26, 2017, Member Pryor seconded. Motion passed unanimously.**

3) Citizen Comments

Ken Pryor noted receiving a letter from Mr. Parker about a project on Tannler Drive. His objection was it seemed to subvert the process the CCI is developing for citizen engagement. There was a short discussion on the development agreement process found in the Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS). It was noted that there would be additional information available at a Council Work session on November 20, 2017.

David Baker, President of Rosemont Summit NA spoke on a successful outreach at their neighborhood meeting. A local developer spoke at two meetings: first to speak about their proposal and then, he returned to speak to what was heard and how those concerns were addressed. The NA found that to be a successful outreach and was appreciated by the Neighborhood Association. Member Martin and Member Axelrod spoke on the benefits of that outreach and reported the CCI was considering how the CCI recommendations might change the process. The discussion considered having the first meeting soon after the pre-application conference and a second meeting following the completeness determination. The Committee discussed that summary and some members thought those details should be outlined and provided graphically for the CCI consideration. The members considered that the extra clarity

provided by a visual timeline would be helpful. Mr. Baker suggested that having a standardized process for all NA's to consider could be helpful to follow. There are differences between the processes followed by each NA group and can be confusing for citizens. Mr. Baker noted the project reviewed was a seven unit development with a PUD that was located on steep slopes. The NA expressed the benefits to having multiple meetings for the members, for the citizens and hopefully a better outcome for the applicant. From the start of the process there was opposition, but as the discussion progressed some of the opposition was resolved. He also noted the City Manager and Community Development Director were present at a meeting a month prior to provide education and discussion how land use decisions are made.

Member Martin asked what Mr. Baker thought of a concept to survey the Neighborhood Association Presidents considering what a standard process could be and if there would be support for that option. Mr. Baker noted that he is the representative that attends pre-application meetings (addresses land use) and that their NA does not have a NA Plan. There was a short discussion on the benefits of NA's having a designated land use representative to attend meetings on behalf of their NA.

4) Continued from October 26, 2017 meeting - Working group composition to update commercial/mixed use code - report on outreach letter responses

Planning Manager John Boyd summarized the additional outreach efforts requested by the CCI at the last meeting. An updated packet of handouts was provided to the members that gave recommendations from all groups except the Chamber of Commerce. This packet was a series of emails to and from stakeholder groups. In addition, staff provided an updated draft transmittal memo as a concept of one approach for sending the information to Council. It summarized the process Council asked the CCI to use in 99.035 to consider a working group recommendation. Next the memo outlined the goals required by city code and ended with the stakeholder groups and each group's recommendation. Member Axelrod expressed a concern on the layout of the memo that was found to be confusing. With a minor change in formatting, the memo direction was clarified. Member Martin asked about the two Planning Commissioner names – Chair Oakes clarified that Jim Farrell would be the primary member and Gary Walvatne would assist in his transition. Member Axelrod expressed a concern about the lack of a recommendation from the Chamber of Commerce. Member Smith volunteered to reach out to the Chair to get an update. It was recommended that the Chamber provide their feedback to Council by their meeting on Monday night (November 13, 2017.) The committee completed a final review of the memo and listing of potential members. **Member Martin moved to approve sending the recommendations for the creation of a working group to Council and Member Smith and Pryor Seconded. Motion Passed unanimously.**

5) Planning Process: Continuation of Problem Identification and Topics Review – continued discussion from October 26, 2017 meeting

Member Martin summarized his draft submittal that was emailed prior to the meeting and a copy provided at tonight's meeting. There was a discussion on the distribution of drafts and when they are ready for posting. He noted this would be a starting point for the CCI to use in discussion and could be a method to assign the seven areas to CCI members. Member Axelrod committed to share his review with the full committee when he completes the project.

The committee discussed the best method to share the material. It will be listed as draft and will contain a version number and date. The header will be Working Draft, the Date and version number. In addition, page numbers and draft watermark will be added. Member Axelrod discussed key themes to issues he will provide for consideration in the document. First, there were text changes made to use terms consistent with the CDC. Overall, the proposed changes

proposed to review Member Martin's original document and consider revisions at the next scheduled meeting. Member Axelrod also clarified that the reference for recommendations should be the CCI and not be an individual acknowledgement. Member Martin asked committee members to consider as part of the review if the document is clear, is it complete (anything missing) and will it meet the defined goals (process clear)? Member Pryor asked for a project timeline to better understand how all the pieces fit together and the needed review points. In addition, he asked for earlier input from engineering on their review of the process. Having that clarification in the timeline would assist in discussing critical points.

The Committee discussed goals of all staff reviews being completed within two weeks from the time the application was deemed complete. There was an extended discussion on the timeline, how reviews could be improved and what depth of review should be considered. Many questions on the type of review (architectural, engineering and content of base application responses) are still being considered. Member Martin asked the time required for each department to review and comment on the application. The goal was to obtain not only a preliminary review but an assertion that the project as proposed would create no impact to the adjacent properties or the broader surrounding area. Member Pryor noted that there should be background information to rely upon. Engineering should know the city, have ready comments on the concerns of that area proposed for development and what mitigation would be required.

Some of the questions considered: what information is readily available, what information is required to consider the application and how that information can be transmitted to the public in an understandable matter. It was suggested, a database be created that identifies the issues within the city. If it didn't already exist, it should be created.

Member Martin noted the focus should be the scope of the review. He explained that those applications presented to the Planning Commission should first be reviewed by City departments. Each department should confirm that systems will work, traffic impacts are understood, and hazards have been mitigated or will not be further impacted. The committee discussed that by accepting the application, the city becomes responsible for that new area developed. The Committee discussed existing and aging infrastructure that prior to development has needed improvements. The impact of development on that aging infrastructure requires additional consideration when reviewing development. What conditions can be applied on development depends upon the nexus and proportionality tests. How to get the information was the challenge, and have that information in adequate time for citizens to review and address their concerns.

In moving forward, the committee will continue discussions on the concept application review process. As the Committee determines a draft is ready for discussion; it would be time to invite the City Attorney, Development Director and Public Works Director to review and comment on this conceptual process. Their feedback will be helpful in gaining understanding on the feasibility of the proposal or determine what adjustments might be considered. Member Martin noted the process should require adequate information for staff to consider and evaluate against base data. That analysis should be provided as feedback to the Planning Commission to help them be aware of impacts and adequacy of the project. In the end, Member Martin's concern was how to identify those key points, to get feedback from impacted departments and then if needed, have the applicant request to stop the 120 day clock to allow time for addressing key issues raised.

Additional discussion was held on sub points on the process and those points will be provided as written feedback on the concept paper. Chair Oakes expressed a core concern on the amount of time provided to neighborhood associations was being constrained by proposed changes. The Chair supported an existing process where each NA assigned a land use representative to receive notices and to speak on behalf of each NA. That person would attend land use meetings and report back to their NA's. She felt it would not benefit the process by taking the NA land use representative out of the process. There was no opposition to that process and Member Axelrod

noted he emphasized the NAP representative role in his draft comments. The discussion focused on how the information flowed from the pre-application meetings, to the neighborhood meeting and other additional neighborhood meetings. The Committee discussed having the NA meeting almost immediately after the pre-application meeting. The core is how information flows, the education of citizens occur and what the best method is to provide information. The benefit of having the NA meeting following the pre-application conference was the land use representative does not have to report back on the pre-application conference. The applicant will be at the meeting providing their presentation.

The discussion moved to how all concepts can be implemented in this process. While some are feasible to assign to the process, others may take more time and require additional discussion. As this concept moves forward, the future committee discussion will consider the table with seven components under consideration and how to move forward.

6) Member Comments

Member comments was held as part of the public comment section. There was a discussion on new member appointments before City Council. Information will be ready following those appointments.

7) Adjourn

Meeting adjourned at 7:15 p.m. The next meeting is November 14, 2017 at 5:30 p.m. and location will be the Rosemont Room. The meeting scheduled for November 21, 2017 will be cancelled.