



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

## COMMITTEE FOR CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT MEETING NOTES

Tuesday, December 5, 2017

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

Present: Karie Oakes, Russ Axelrod, Bob Martin, Ken Pryor, Ramiah Ramasubramanian and Gary Walvatne.

Citizens Present: Carrie Pellet

Staff Present: John Boyd

---

### 1) Call to Order

Meeting called to order at 5:40 p.m. **Approval of the November 28, 2017 meeting notes as revised: Moved to approve by Member Axelrod and seconded by Member Pryor. Motion passed unanimously.**

### 2) Citizen Comments

No citizens were present.

### 3) Planning Process: Continuation of Problem Identification and Topics Review – continued discussion from November 28, 2017 meeting

Member Axelrod introduced a version CCI Changes to Application document Version No. 2 provided at the meeting. He summarized the changes to this discussion draft tonight. To assist in the review, the new information or changes are identified in red text in Version No. 2 which was distributed via email and provided as a print document at the meeting.

Member Walvatne arrived at 5:50 pm.

The committee reviewed the material and discussed potential changes. Chair Oakes asked for clarification on the “Two NA Meetings Sections” first paragraph. The question was focused on her assigned review role for “Early Involvement” and the question considered the second NA meeting. The committee discussed the time needed between the two meetings. The second meeting would occur in at period between the submittal of the application and when staff deemed the application complete. Member Pryor noted the process was confusing to him and thought having a timeline would assist citizens in understanding how the process works and to add clarity. Member Pryor supported providing additional information to land use representatives for each NA that would provide details specific to the proposed project. Central to the

review is the timeline and providing the right information at the key points. Member Ramasubramanian noted as a new member he also finds the process cumbersome. He also suggested a timeline and considered breaking those segments into differing phases as a point of reference.

He suggested that having the graphic representation will identify the problem areas by phases and would ease in the understanding of the process. Member Axelrod proposed adding a timeline to his draft comments. Member Martin expressed interest in project tracking tools. He suggested putting this objective under education as a guide and potential outcome. The committee considered a project dashboard that would highlight timeline issues.

Chair Oakes noted an additional comment under the Two NA Meetings section. It related to the second paragraph; her concern was the timeline seemed not to be connected. The application deemed complete and the application review complete timeframes are not always the same. Her question was how the NA completes their review when their NA meeting dates are not consistent with those application (review and deemed complete) dates. Member Walvatne clarified the second item was when the application was deemed complete and when the review was complete. Member Martin noted the applicant is not responsible to meet all needs of the NA; the applicant is responsible to meet the requirements of the code. The outreach to the NA allows the applicant to work with the NA to educate them on the project and to listen to concerns. He clarified this tool is designed to promote communication. Chair Oakes suggested the outreach to NA could be considered a coordination committee role. The committee discussed differing ways to refer to this task; i.e. coordinating review. The roles and responsibilities of these tasks for the coordination committee versus how the NA could require additional review and discussion. For clarification Member Axelrod noted the second meeting is meant to be between application deemed complete and review completed by all staff (that two week period). The purpose was to identify issues raised during the review. The coordination committee could consider the progress of the project after the completion of the review. The CCI committee discussed how the second meeting could serve as a discussion of their last review of the draft application in near final form.

Guest Pellett arrived at 6:05 p.m.

Member Martin noted the second meeting allows the applicant to discuss issues raised at the first meeting and provide their response to question or requested analysis to the NA's. Member Axelrod noted that a coordinating committee can assist in the process. The coordinating committee would consist of staff, the applicant and the land use representative to meet in the interim to discuss core points and consider needed responses to address NA issues or CDC criteria. The role is coordination and communication on the project elements. Chair Oakes asked how this group action would be documented. She asked if the group would have minutes, recording or other documentation. The thought was this would be a working group not subject to public meeting law.

In the end, the applicant's role is to defend their application. The purpose of the coordination meetings is to identify issues, allow opportunity for feedback and try to incorporate a NA representative into the process. The CCI committee discussed this could be considered an experiment that may require a few attempts to see if the process is worthwhile or if adjustments are required. Member Martin noted this process is already substantially in place. The applicant and staff often work together to resolve issues. The proposal adds a NA member to help get the local concerns interjected into the process.

Member Axelrod suggested that a few trained NA representatives may represent multiple NA's. The thought was this person will require knowledge of the process and be able to provide informed feedback and to assist in the communication. He felt that a small number of people could be trained to participate in this process. In addition, it can be difficult to identify NA volunteers that are both willing and qualified to serve in this role. Member Martin expressed a concern about overtaxing this NA representative. Asking a

small group of NA members to review most land use proposals is a significant amount of work. Instead he suggested this role should be addressed at the NAP meeting to give that group feedback on concerns. Member Martin returned to the timeline question, he explained the basic timeline: pre-application, NA meeting #1, application deemed complete, NA meeting #2, review deemed complete, Planning Commission land use decision and council appeal if applicable. Member Walvatne noted that prior to application deemed complete is a longer period of time. Staff Boyd noted that the applicant has to respond in 180 days or the application is considered denied. The statute outlines that once the decision is deemed complete the 120 period begins, the process must conclude within a years' time. (A total of 120 for the original timeline and allowing for 245 days of extensions). Member Axelrod completed a review of his draft document highlighting the summary of changes (typed in red) on version No. 2.

Member Pryor reviewed his comments entitled "Consistency with Community Vision"; this review had three sections Education, Administrative and Code. His summary considered education of the public on the comprehensive plan, support documents, core code components, the physical site characteristics, and he urged that clear timelines be addressed. An additional resource that he thought would be helpful was summary of historical issues that have been addressed by citizens in the area. He concluded his summary with a suggestion of a centralized location on the city's website to obtain information. The NA meetings attended by the applicant should be available online. The next step he suggested was NA recordings and notes should be available on the project website. The meeting notes that come with the application are often brief. The committee discussed differing steps to be addressed to assure that all steps are completed. He discussed that some information should be condensed into basic information to guide citizens on what is local law, what is supportive information and other items that are sub area (neighborhood) profiles. The information should be available on a NA area basis to assist citizens understand the local issues and criteria at the NA level.

Member Axelrod noted that the land use hearings are recorded. Chair Oakes noted that the neighborhood associations often record their meetings. It was proposed that the NA minutes and meeting recordings should be part of the record. Often the meeting notes are truncated and consist of questions provided by the developer. Chair Oakes felt the process should be double checked. It was suggested that a resource should be available at City Hall for check out (a video recorder or audio recorder). Other members noted the NA's receive a stipend which could be used by the NA's to purchase recording devices. Member Martin asked Member Pryor about the community vision piece. His question related to the Changes Document related to the architectural review board. As lots are sold and used for infill; one house can be taken down and replaced with two larger houses. This outcome changes the neighborhood in scale (larger and taller houses) and in value (impacted tax valuation.) He noted as infill occurs there are no controls to consider the uniformity of design for existing and new development within the neighborhoods. The question he posed was how to address the goal of infill. If you let the market decide, then oversized houses may be built (larger than exists in the neighborhood). If the goal is to protect existing design of neighborhoods, let design controls limit the types of houses to be consistent with existing housing stock in the area. The question then arises how to address compatibility for the neighborhood. This leads to the formation of an architectural review board. Member Oakes was concerned about infill impacting affordability. As land divides and is built upon questions arise about how the lots are designed.

The committee discussed the design of neighborhoods and the protection of the neighborhood character. Staff Boyd discussed other community efforts to address those issues and to meet those criteria requires sub area zones that identify by neighborhood the specific dimensional standards. This provides equity for the neighborhood and for the citizens considering moving to that neighborhood. It provides clear, objective and enforceable criteria or standards. The committee noted this would be a significant step to consider. The question then becomes how to move the concept forward.

Member Pryor had concerns related to capacity of infrastructure. The core issue is transportation. Until the area is served by transit, the auto is the sole source of transportation. This will be a challenge to address because traffic is a top concern to most residents. Member Ramasubramanian discussed livable cities and noted the City of Portland's efforts to become certified. He noted this field is expanding and training is available to address those items. He supported creating enforceable standards to protect areas of our community. Member Pryor noted his concern was street standards and our roads cannot tolerate additional growth until transit reaches our area. Chair Oakes noted that West Linn is a smaller community without options for transit. She supports the concept and noted to be certified most aspects are not available to our community. Member Pryor concluded his comments on his research piece and suggested that information should be available to educate the community. He urged the City have an electronic library of buildable land. Those studies should be updated and working maps produced to reflect how development has occurred over the past five years. Those inventories should be made more accessible to citizens. He finished his comments suggesting additional inventories consider the city's economic health and sustainability.

Member Walvatne discussed the County's goal of reviewing affordability and wondered how that information could be used by the City. The Committee discussed a study underway at the county level. Member Martin suggested the committee add a discussion of zoning overlays to address neighborhood compatibility. He asked committee members reviewing their assigned topics if they had any needs that would assist them in completing their review. Members had no specific needs but would work to complete assignments. The Committee reviewed assignments and considered tasks not assigned. He urged they start on their drafts to allow the larger committee to assist them in their project. The only item not assigned was application cost and complexity and it was suggested that Member Smith be assigned to assist in that item. She had not been assigned a topic because she missed the last meeting.

Member Walvatne spoke on affordable housing versus needed housing. His core point was the cost of fees in the city for land use items and the cost of SDC's make the cost of homes outside the range of most people. Member Oakes asked for clarification on how the topic of needed housing and the complexity and cost of housing was assigned as an aspect of CCI. She felt it is an important point, but she wondered how it fit as a role to be considered for the committee in this review process. There was a short discussion without action taken. There was a discussion on the process of citizen involvement and potential impacts to the cost of the process. The members noted additional discussion is needed to consider if that item will be retained in this review process. Chair Oakes noted the discussion of this item would end for the night and moved onto the next task.

#### 4) Member Comments

Chair Oakes introduced a task for the CCI to report upon for their annual report. She referred to Staff Boyd print out of the 2017 Advisory Group Annual Report. In addition she discussed a compilation of the committee activities. She noted that the next meeting agenda will include a discussion on the goals for the upcoming year. Member Axelrod suggested adding recognition to committee members who have served and left the committee. The CCI considered meetings on December 12<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup>. Members noted they should work on their draft assignments and could share with Member Axelrod who may not be able to attend. Member Martin thought the draft should be ready to create a new planning process working group by March 2018. Conceptually, the new planning process working group would have their work completed by the end of July 2018 for recommendations to Council by the CCI for action before the end of next year.

#### 5) Adjourn

Meeting was adjourned at 7:10. The next meeting is December 12, 2017 at 5:30 p.m. and will be held in the Rosemont Room located in City Hall.