

**OVERLAND PARK URBAN RENEWAL PLAN
URBAN RENEWAL PLAN FORMATION CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE
(URPFCAC)
SUMMARY MEETING MINUTES**

Meeting Date: August 24, 2005

Location: 9101 SE Sunnybrook Blvd., Clackamas, OR

Attendees & Distribution:

- √ David Bradley, Southgate CPO
- √ Barbara Cartmill, Clackamas County Development Agency
- √ Gary Cook, Clackamas County Development Agency
- √ Greg DeGrazia, North Clackamas Chamber of Commerce
- Carl Grossman, Economic Development Commission
- √ Michael Harrison, Parametrix
- √ Terry Hauck, Clackamas County Planning Commissioner
- √ Christine Hurst, Johnson Creek Watershed Council
- √ Judy Koliass, Southgate CPO
- √ Charles Kupper, Spencer & Kupper
- √ Karen Liebert, Larry's Restaurant
- √ David Mansfield, Property Owner
- √ *Martha McLennan, NW Housing Alternatives (CC Land Trust)
- √ Peter Schraner, Euro Custom Cabinets
- √ Jim Smelser, JD Construction
- √ Norbert Loske, Overland Park Coalition Against Drug Crime

*Jonathan Trutt, NW Housing Alternatives, attended on behalf of Martha McLennan

Prepared By: Michael Harrison

Issue Date: September 8, 2005

Meeting Purposes:

- Resolve issues of Vision, Guiding Principles and project boundary.
- Discuss project ideas.
- Introduce financial issues.
- Provide background on urban renewal process to public and answer questions.

Meeting Summary:

Sixty-three members of the public attended the meeting. Most of the meeting focused on answering questions and discussing issues raised by the public. However, the committee did discuss the Vision, Guiding Principles and project boundary, and were briefed on the urban renewal process and financial issues.

Key Issues & Outcomes:

Vision & Guiding Principles

1) The URPFAC discussed the following ideas from Technical Advisory Committee (TAC): adding “fire/life safety,” “creating new jobs” and a more explicit description of “infrastructure” to the Vision & Guiding Principles. *Outcome: The URPFAC expressed an interest in modifying the “reduction in crime” Guiding Principle to more accurately reflect multiple public health and safety threats. Barbara agreed to draft modified language on public safety. The committee was not interested in adding language on new jobs or including the word “infrastructure.”*

2) The URPFAC supported adding language to the Vision & Guiding Principles to reflect the importance of natural habitat in the Overland Park neighborhood. Support was also given for highlighting the importance of transportation infrastructure (sidewalks, streets, curbs, street lights), even though the committee didn’t like the word “infrastructure.” *Outcome: Barbara agreed to draft language on “habitat” and on “transportation infrastructure” for the Vision & Guiding Principles.*

Urban Renewal Area Boundary

1) The majority of URPFAC members were uncomfortable making recommendations on the boundary without knowing the financial consequences to the urban renewal district. *Outcome: Barbara agreed to provide the URPFAC with information on the financial impacts of removing areas (most specifically King Road to Monroe) from the proposed boundary. As the boundary issue remained unresolved, the URPFAC agreed to schedule an additional meeting to bring this issue to resolution.*

Projects

1) The only project issue discussed in much detail was a desire for projects that assist home owners. *Outcome: the “discussion list” of potential projects will include a specific mention of projects that facilitate home ownership.*

Public Comments/Concerns/Questions

There were a variety of issues and concerns raised by the public, including:

- Could this effort would trigger zoning changes and dense development in Overland Park? *Outcome: It was explained that, while the public, TAC and URPFAC can recommend that the zoning be changed or remain as it is now, zoning changes can only occur through a separate land use process and cannot be triggered by urban renewal.*

- Support and concerns regarding the possibility of installing sewers in the area. *Outcome: It was explained that, though some urban renewal funds are being proposed for a sewer project, urban renewal would not generate enough funds to provide sewer infrastructure to the area. A separate public process will be created in conjunction with WES (Clackamas County Water Environment Services) and the City of Milwaukie to explore the sewer issue. Urban renewal can contribute to studies and efforts to keep the sewerage effort moving forward (matching funds, etc.)*
- Comment about the possibility of the City of Milwaukie annexing the neighborhood. *Outcome: It was explained that annexation involves a separate public process driven by the City, and will neither be prevented nor triggered through urban renewal.*
- Question if there might be a conflict between urban renewal district goals, specifically new development, and the METRO Habitat Protection Program underway along Johnson Creek. *Outcome: Staff agreed to research the Habitat Protection Program to ensure that conflicts do not arise.*
- Concerns about and support for the current proposed project boundary, which extends south to Monroe St., beyond King Road, the traditional Overland Park neighborhood. A concern was raised over whether an “urban renewal” designation would adversely impact property values or increase insurance rates. *Outcome: It was explained that historically, urban renewal has not decreased property values nor increased insurance rates. This area will be further evaluated for costs and benefits as a result of being included in the boundary.*
- What funding impacts would Overland Park urban renewal have on the Clackamas County Sheriff’s Department and Fire District #1? *Charles Kupper will provide information to the TAC and URPFAC on how much money is expected to be diverted from the Sheriff’s Office and all overlapping taxing districts for urban renewal projects.*