

OAK LODGE COMMUNITY

MEETING

CHAIR: ELEANORE HUNTER

DATE 1/26/2011

DRAFT

RECORDER: CATHERINE BLOSSER

LOCATION: ROSE VILLA

VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT: Roland ATKINSON, CATHERINE BLOSSER, SUE CONACHAN, EDITH COULTER, GEORGE DIETZ, TERRY DOLAN, LYNN FISHER, TOM FOELLER, GERALD FOY, THELMA HAGGEMILLER, ELEANORE HUNTER, PAT KENNEDY, JIM KNAPP, JIM MARTIN, ED RIDDLE, PAUL SAVAS, FRED SAWYER, HENRY SCHMIDT, BALDWIN VAN DER BIJL, JO ANN WEAVER, CHAUNDA WILD, WILLIAM WILD, DOUG WOODS, BERNHARD MASTERSON, HENRY SCHMIDT

GUESTS: KEY: Gail Curtis, Mike McCallister, Crista Gardner, Ed Gronke, Shari Gilevich, Dave Queener, Lisa Gronke, Pat Russell, Jim Frisbee, Prad Shah, Wayne Foley
 LUART = Land Use Application Review Team; OLCC = Oak Lodge Community Council; PD = Planning Department; F/U = follow up; Re = regarding; MAP = McLoughlin Area Project; LU = land use; .McL = McLoughlin Blvd; CCty = Clackamas County; OG = Oak Grove; ped = pedestrian; EIS environmental impact statement; RFP = request for proposals; NCP & R = North Clackamas Parks and Recreation.

ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION PLAN	DUE DATE	PERSON RESPONSIBLE
		Meeting called to order at 7:05 PM		Eleanore Hunter
Budget Report	Prior balance \$673.58 Input December \$49 Outputs (Clackamas Women's Svcs, Operation Santa Claus, Annie Ross House and Avalon House: [\$200] Subtotal: \$522.58 Savings \$5 TOTAL: \$527.58			
Old Minutes		Unanimously accepted		
Discussion: McLoughlin Blvd: Gail Curtis [ODOT], Mike McCallister [Clack. Cty.], Crista Gardner [Metro]	Gail Curtis: Planning is a matter of policy. Who has responsibility for signage? State ODOT We need to pay attention to statewide land use goals and policies---we're funding more multi-modal			

	<p>projects (bike, walking, car, rail, etc.). Goal 12 (Transportation) has administrative rule (“transportation planning rule) that requires cities/counties be consistent with regional (State) plan. Everybody has chance to be “at the table” to make transportation changes/decisions. Crista Gardner: 2040 Growth Map shows where growth will occur in Metro area. Regional decision making done with others (cities, counties, ODOT, TriMet, JPACT, TPAC [transportation advisory group], MTAC [land use advisory group]). Metro is clearing house for federal transportation projects: Regional Transportation Plan (inc. high capacity transit corridors and mobility-compromised population) complies with JPACT and Federal requirements. Metro, TriMet and ODOT help implement the over Regional Trans. Plan. Shari Gilevitch: MAP plan done in coordination with public input. Traffic issues can limit how much you can do (e.g., landscaped traffic</p>			
--	---	--	--	--

	<p>islands).</p> <p>Gail Curtis: What do you do now until high capacity plan is completed (over 20 years)? Goal is to provide more options for people (i.e. more bike, pedestrian). Land use side is key in order to enable people to access other modes of transportation (e.g., residences, workplaces) rather than be auto dependent. So, we are trying to write codes to encourage land use that will fit overall transportation plan. Technology allows more “smart” planning (e.g., dial 511 and get info about road report as to congestion; intertying lights). There is need for road improvement and more transportation.</p> <p>Shari Gilevitch: Various committees involved in planning corridor, as to transportation and land use: MAP (looking at whole corridor); Park Ave. Neighborhood and Station Area Plan; Trolley Trail (offers opportunity for ped/bike travel).</p> <p>Gail Curtis: Obsolete funding method (gas tax), which is not indexed to inflation. We will, therefore, see 40% reduction in that money,</p>			
--	---	--	--	--

	<p>partly because cars are becoming more energy-efficient so there is less gas tax. We don't have enough money to just maintain the system, let alone enough to expand. We are following the McL Corridor Plan. Landscaping/sidewalks responsibility of adjacent property owners; islands in two locations only due to driveway conflicts (if we can close driveways later on, more islands can go in for pedestrians). State reqs/codes. Apply to McL. Has does ODOT support local values: it responds to those. Special Transportation Areas: a policy for recognizing that a roadway is a main corridor through a city center---we allow it to move more slowly (using slowing methods). This does not apply to McLoughlin (it does to downtown Milwaukie now). McLoughlin provides too much of a through connection, so ODOT not inclined to make it a special area.</p> <p>Q: Regarding High Capacity Plan: when do the three priority areas projects start? (Powell to Gresham; Commuter rail</p>			
--	---	--	--	--

	<p>Beaverton-Wilsonville; Portland-Sherwood). Most of these will take 20+ years. McL in second tier 15-20 years to start planning, probably.</p> <p>Q: Where are the ped islands?</p> <p>A: 26th /McL and Risley/McL. Rothe being looked at.</p> <p>Q: Last I heard McL was classified as an “expressway” that is supposed to impose limits. Is ODOT pushing that and what doing?</p> <p>A: McL is classified as “regional.” 224 is an expressway (few of those; have limited access), and McL will never be such.</p> <p>Pat Russell: MAP had presentation about Beaverton taking over Canyon Rd/Highway 8. How can State view McL and Canyon Rd/Hwy 8, which are urban, to keep up the rate of travel designated by “highways.” Is ODOT treating Beaverton differently? Decisions feel like they are coming down from the top, not what local community wants for the corridor.</p> <p>Aspirations submitted by County/citizens carried the message about how we want our</p>			
--	--	--	--	--

	<p>corridor to look. It is not a super highway.</p> <p>A: 2040 Plan being implemented and 10 yrs. ago it was decided to make that change. We think it a valid plan. It is roll up sleeves time.</p> <p>Q: Corridor targeted for higher density, therefore, without better concentration on safety issues, do you envision time when a Special Transportation Area could be designated? Even 82nd has 30 mph sections now.</p> <p>A: Not for a long time. ...strip malls; a chicken-egg balancing act. Doubt you would see that designation.</p> <p>Gail Curtis: criteria for a Special Transportation Area: need to be an original "old town." It would be tremendous project by landowners to make McL that sort of regional area.</p> <p>Q: What is the most effective way to begin making the changes?</p> <p>A: Urban design—character of design (trees to enclose spaces; bring buildings closer to street for walking; make it interesting)—creating places where people want to be.</p> <p>Ed Gronke: after listening to all of above, not sure why we have</p>			
--	---	--	--	--

	<p>MAP, as ODOT has already made the decisions. As, our centerpiece was to make McL more attractive and calm traffic. Am I misunderstanding something?</p> <p>A: Other ways to get there.....knitting together a lot of elements (McL is just one piece).</p> <p>Q: Lots of buildings falling down on McL...improvement needs to occur something like the Park Ave. Station to regenerate/focus new development in a certain area. Therefore, to start initiating change, seems reasonable to promote multi-modal at that area to start (a “node” there).</p> <p>Q: Paving Rothe south; redoing Boardman Creek corridor?</p> <p>A: Didn’t know. Spring public meetings will start (per Fred Sawyer)—goal now is to pave and do some sidewalk work.</p> <p>Comment: Lack of patience in room. Asks for ODOT to be straight up with us...McL 20 years out. So Ed’s concern is based on lack of money. MAP can serve to layout what we want eventually on</p>			
--	--	--	--	--

	<p>McL. Comment: Regarding older plan of 1995 for McL: wasn't about McL but about providing transportation east-west within county. Nothing ever happened to this planning. Gail Curtis: local regions updating their transportation plans now (due to Regional Transportation Plan). CCty. just gearing up to address this. No shortage of planning but capital improvement monies are thin. Q: PSU study for revitalization: infrastructure and nodal approach proposed. Private money follows public money (sets planning mode). Is that right? Would ODOT join in to that vision? Gail Curtis: OCOT onboard with transportation vision. Q: Are there advantages to these planning processes and making changes to these transportation corridors... doing the planning for an unincorporated area? Shari G: We have to make our plans consistent with State plans. Q: Why do cities have more influence in making decisions?</p>			
--	--	--	--	--

	<p>Gail Curtis: Structural difference is how money flows into the system (cities have more mechanisms to create debt and leverage money....and have more to say about how money spent).</p> <p>Comment: Not my experience that there is a difference between city and county influence in planning for influencing State on how transportation funds are spent.</p>			
	<p>NOTE: MANY VOTING MEMBERS LEFT AFTER THE ABOVE DISCUSSION SO WERE NOT PRESENT FOR THE REST OF THE MEETING.</p>			
<p>Z0598-10-C</p>	<p>Conditional Use for addition to Oak Hills Presbyterian Church (5101 SE Thiessen): extending building in to a green area church has. LUART feels no issues of concern; there wil be a half street improvement done.</p> <p>Fred Sawyer: small church on big piece of land</p> <p>Mike McCallister: "Half-street improvement": from middle of road along property line (sidewalks, etc.).</p> <p>Wm Wild: why not full street improvement to include play area.</p> <p>Jerry Foy: cost...may</p>	<p>Move to approve: Doug Woods 2nd: Tom Foeller</p> <p>VOTE: 15 - 0 - 1 (Tom Foeller)</p> <p>Motion passed</p>		

	<p>not be good rationale, but opportunity for church to add on to current development only. If they wanted to add additional structures, that may be the time to do a full-street improvement.</p> <p>Wm Wild: provides safety in to the future.</p> <p>Pat Russell: money depends upon cost of improvement.</p> <p>Bernard Masterson: doesn't make sense to put a lot of money into street improvement based upon usage.</p> <p>Jim Martin: there are opportunities</p>			
<p>Z0639-10</p>	<p>Time extension for 33 unit Concord Vineyards II Subdivision. Original application 2 1/4 years ago to change zoning from R-1 to R 7. OLCC rec. not to approve for number of reasons (e.g., not in accord with character of neighborhood). Zoning change was made and OLCC did not prevail. Developer wants one year time extension. LUART rec: "rules to receive a time extension: a) good reason to not get time ("recession") and b) application in on time ("met"). Therefore, both those requirements have been met. LUART rec. time approval BUT take</p>	<p>Motion: approve extension with list of our reservations: Doug Woods 2nd Tom Foeller VOTE: 7 - 2 - 3 No: Wm Wild, C. Blosser Abs: Thelma Haggemiller, Paul Savas, Chaunda Wild, Edith Coulter Motion passed.</p>		

	<p>opportunity to state that what we said originally are still true (issue with small lots, large houses, tree destruction). Rec. reply to Cty. that devilment not in concert with MAP plans and reiterate other objections.</p> <p>Jerry Foy: important that applicant...refile plat, designs have to be submitted within that time frame with list of conditions (list made on division). Developer will have to live with ordinances in effect with current design requirements (like surface water req. now not in place in 2007). I have problem with skinny streets.</p> <p>Jim Martin: another issue: close to McL...so higher density because these people can get to transportation, but they can't get to McL to access it as have to go in a round about way. So, car transportation will still be primary mode.</p> <p>Wm Wild: do any trees now fall under counties new ordinance. If extension granted, can extensions be renewed in perpetuity.</p> <p>Jerry Foy: they can file one more time for a total of 3 years.</p> <p>Ed Riddle: tree</p>			
--	---	--	--	--

	<p>ordinance fairly toothless; hope is to change culture in county planning to enter into a dialogue to try and save trees. If encouraging developer to save trees, county can have some effect. Suggest we make our recommendations clear and concise, as a community.</p> <p>Thelma Haggemiller: Cty. Planning dept. density take precedence over trees.</p> <p>Cathie Blosser: When we researched development in cities with tree ordinances, in no case was density/development limited by tree ordinances; developers can design/work around trees when they are mandated/required to do so.</p>			
Z0575-10-STC	<p>Update: Approval of Temporary Dwelling for care permit (1525 SE Madrona Lane)—OLCC had approved; County concurred.</p>			
Z0242-10-TE	<p>Update: Approval of Time Extension for partition of lot into 3 lots (2009 SE Courtney). OLCC approved and Cty. concurred</p>			
Nominating Committee Report: 2011-2013 elections	<p>The following candidates are presented: Chair: Eleanore Hunter</p>			

<p>(Eleanore Hunter, Roland Atkinson, Ed Riddle, Jerry Foy)</p>	<p>Vice Chair: Ed Riddle, Jim Knapp Sec: Cathie Blosser Treasurer: Chaunda Wild Member at large: Tom Foeller, Jim Martin, Fred Nelligan, Fred Sawyer, Leonard Waldemar No nominations from floor tonight. Another meeting for nominations in March with voting then.</p>			
<p>Member Reports</p>				
<p>• Green Day: Leah Robbins</p>	<p>Eleanore Hunter: Plans advancing</p>			
<p>• Boardman Creek project</p>	<p>Eleanore Hunter: OLCC letter in support has gone in to support grants funds to do this.</p>			
<p>Friends of Local Control</p>	<p>Discussion: Jerry Foy: not sure legal for OLCC to contribute to fund-raiser. Fred Sawyer: we have made donations to non-profits before. Wm Wild: FoLOC different from charitable org.---it was formed for purpose of educating community; thinks it OK for OLCC to donate to this endeavor. Discussion ensued about Motion #1 and amendment.</p>	<p>Motion: have OLCC write letter to FoLC to support survey (motion was later amended): Baldwin van der Bijl. 2nd: Thelma Haggemiller Vote: 11 - 4 - 1 (EH: please put in names here) Fred Sawyer: moved to amend above and include \$100. This motion was voted on first 2nd: Chaunda</p>		

		<p>Wild VOTE: 11 – 4 - 2 No: Jerry Foy, Thelma Haggenmiller, Jim Knapp, Doug Woods Abs: Jim Martin, Paul Savas</p>		
<p>Public Comments, announcements</p>	<p>CPO Leaders to meet on Code Enforcement: Mike McCallister: codes enforced differently. Health and safety issue at top; others lower priority and are not enforced. BCC has directed staff to re-look at priorities. Public meetings will be occurring for input. Other ZDO changes on the horizon: some are rural related. Other affect Cty: ZDO—time limits for application approvals depending upon type of project (e.g., only can get a time extension on subdivisions and lot splitting...not to others). We're going to be looking at approval criteria, time extensions.....in staff research now and will come out with staff recs. Public will be notified Pre-application conferences: if they want it, we give it to developer. Only applies</p>	<p>Presentation by Cty. staff: Monday, Jan 31, 2011 6:30-8:30 PM @ Dev.Serv. Bldg. at the CPO leaders meeting.</p>		

	<p>now on design-review application (multi-family, industrial, commercial projects). Good process, adds value. Cty. considering pre-ap be required for partitions and subdivisions, too. Pre-ap meetings do not include having the local CPO present. Right now, CPO can give feedback to the pre-ap process but not participate.</p> <p>Ed Riddle: expect that new tree protection ordinance will be added to this pre-ap conference?</p> <p>Mike: yes</p> <p>Pat Russell: look at ways other jurisdictions handle this?</p>			
		<p>Next OLCC meeting 2/23/2011 (Cam Gilmour, Lynn Peterson to talk about Counties role in serving unincorporated areas).</p>		
		<p>Meeting adjourning at 9:05 PM</p>		