

**Coalition of Gresham Neighborhood Associations  
April 9, 2024 – Remotely Held (Zoom)  
Meeting Minutes**

NEIGHBORHOOD	ATTENDEES	NEIGHBORHOOD	ATTENDEES
Centennial		North Central	INACTIVE
Central City	INACTIVE	Northeast	INACTIVE
Gresham Butte	Stephen Estes, Theresa Tschirky, Jim Buck	North Gresham	INACTIVE
Gresham Pleasant Valley	Richard Barker, John Maxwell	Northwest	Kat Todd, John Bildsoe
Historic Southeast	INACTIVE	Powell Valley	Stella Butler
Hogan Cedars	INACTIVE	Rockwood	Catherine Nicewood, Anthony Crossman
Hollybrook	INACTIVE	Southwest	Monica Ford, Dana Duval, Thea Hayes
Kelly Creek	Karin Zachow, Carol Rulla	Wilkes-East	
Staff & Guests	Lina Sizmin, Community Engagement; Terra Wilcoxson, Comprehensive Planning Manager, City of Gresham; Carly Rice, Planner 2, City of Gresham; Gabby Sinagra, Planner 2, City of Gresham; Jeff Kaiser; Thomas Stanley; Janet Unruh		

The meeting opened at 7:02 p.m., Carol Rulla, Coalition Co-President, presiding.

1. The meeting minutes for March 12, 2024 were approved after a typographic correction.
2. No public comment presented.
3. Pleasant Valley Plan Update by Terra Wilcoxson, Comprehensive Planning Manager; Carly Rice, Pleasant Valley Plan Project Manager and Gabby Sinagra Pleasant Valley Plan Primary Planner:

a. Terra Wilcoxson: The Pleasant Valley project is in mid-project with a lot of moving parts. This presentation will include the key points, the community feedback and the next steps. Council is not expected to consider this project for adoption until this fall. The planning project team is willing to come back later in the summer or early fall when the solid recommendations that will go to the planning commission and city council are available.

b. Carly Rice:

1) As background, the city first established a plan for the Pleasant Valley (PV) area in the early 2000's to guide the creation of a complete community with a mix of land uses, transportation options and natural spaces. In the 2 decades since that plan was created, mostly only single-family houses have been built. This is expected as the first development in an area such as the PV project. Other parts of the original vision such as parks, businesses and a variety of housing options, have been slower to come to life. Review to understand the barriers to that full breadth of development and what is needed to support that original vision for the area is under way.

2) There are 2 phases to the project. The first phase of the project is wrapping up and some of the challenges to the development of the area as the original vision laid out are being identified. This included an analysis of the area with a land use audit, market study and an infrastructure report which looked at the streets and utilities in the area. The market study showed that the area can support some commercial development in the near term. In this phase, some potential changes to the Gresham code and practices concerning some of the streets and parks have been identified. These changes are currently being evaluated along with the feedback received from the community. Next month, focus groups with the community stakeholders will begin to further help refine the project work.

3) Communication has been a big part of this project. At first, communication focused on reaffirming the vision for a complete community. Opportunities to hear back from the community were through an open house, an on-line open house and a survey that was open for several months. Last year, over 160 responses were received, mostly from people that live in PV but also from people that live in other areas. Next, the communication focused on getting feedback on the draft code concepts and strategies for reaching the vision for PV. A couple of workshops were held, as well as meeting with the PV Neighborhood Association. As a result, further refinements to the project are being made.

4) Highlights of the expressed concerns and project responses:

a. Raising overall housing densities: Overall densities will not be increased. Higher densities will be located near commercial areas.

b. Support for replacing Master Plan with clear and objective standards: The master planning requirement in our code exists only in PV and not elsewhere in the city. This adds another step to the development process and is not consistent with the standards across the rest of the city. As an example, a future street plan is referenced to get the street connectivity needed for a development in the rest of the city. Alternatives to the master plan requirement and how to get things like streets and parks built are being explored.

c. Concern about potential wetlands on concept map: The city is working with one of their consultants to perform some wetland delineation work and the results should be available next week.

d. Concern over lack of parks and open spaces: Currently working with the parks staff and the city attorney to understand how to better support parks and open spaces through the development process.

e. The city needs to take on larger transportation improvements: With more potential funding becoming available at the state and Federal level, better ways to advocate for the nearer term improvements are being explored.

5) Land Use Maps: Some changes to the land use map are being reviewed. Alternatives for the location of the neighborhood, commercial and employment areas may be based on changes to the transportation network, such as the Giese/172<sup>nd</sup> extension, delineation of the wetlands and the viability in terms of accessibility and visibility in the short term (prior to the transportation network changes).

c. Gabby Sinagra: Code Concepts:

1) Focused Goals:

a. Make it easier to build the complete community – plan for commercial in areas likely to be viable sooner; leverage remaining large properties to deliver more housing mix and neighborhood parks; and consider future opportunities for future parks on public land.

b. Removing barriers to incremental development – align land use designations with property lines and take site size into consideration.

c. Aligning with the current market – little demand for office and employment uses as originally planned, commercial uses are viable in a strong location and there is a demand for a mix of housing types.

- 2) Commercial Goal: provide a mix of commercial services that encourages local walking, biking and driving trips from adjacent neighborhoods
  - a. Challenges: lack of flexibility in code, code requires a mix of uses that doesn't align with the market, and code requires building with multiple stories (no single stories)
  - b. Draft recommendations: small and medium scale walkable commercial development; pedestrian-friendly, stand-alone commercial nearby residential; and small amounts of commercial with mixed-use development
- 3) Employments Goal: provide business/office, medical services and other employment services
  - a. Challenges: two subdistricts—multi-use employment-PV and employment use-PV with two sets of standards, excess of employment land
  - b. Draft recommendations: consolidate districts, reduce overall acreage and allow a range of businesses and limit residential uses
- 4) Housing Goal: support housing variety and clarify residential densities
  - a. Challenges: lack of housing variety with existing standards and minor density standard mismatch
  - b. Draft recommendations: explore menu of options for housing variety and adjust density to address density mismatch
- 5) Parks Goal: support the vision of a complete community with parks and open spaces within a short walk of where people live
  - a. Strategies: maintain the map of planned parks as shown in the 2023 Parks SDC report, evaluate the location of parks with the city's Parks Master Planning project, explore opportunity for parks on existing public land and clarify requirements for park land dedication with development
- 6) Transportation Goal: support the vision of a complete community with a street system that provides adequate routes for travel and a safe environment for walking, biking and rolling
  - a. Strategies: Giese and 172nd extensions will need to be city projects, better advocate for funding for larger projects, identify potential nearer-term improvements, new collector and local roads can be built incrementally with development, and potential to use Future Street Plan code instead of Master Plan requirements

d. Carly Rice: Next Steps:

- 1) April – The wetlands report will be reviewed with the consultant and city departments. With those results, potential map changes will begin along with evaluating the location of different densities of residential based on map changes. The project team will meet with park staff and city attorneys to discuss coordination with the parks master plan process and integrating parks acquisition into the development code.
- 2) May – Kick off 3 focus group meetings to discuss the land use maps and that feedback will be used to further refine the map. The focus groups will involve some members of the PV Neighborhood Association as well as some other community stakeholders.
- 3) June – A second work session with the planning commission is planned. The focus will be on the map and other updates that have occurred since the last meeting in March.

e. Staff answered Coalition questions:

- 1) Questions about community engagement: To date there have been 3 community workshops on the map concepts and the code concepts and 2 meetings with the PV Neighborhood Association Board. In May, there will be 3 focus group meetings on the land use maps. Feedback is used to refine the plan, and it is an iterative process.
- 2) Questions about employment areas and the multi-story requirement: The market study showed that there was not a lot of demand for the employment center but there is some demand for limited office and commercial, especially focused on services. There is still going to

be a town center and there is still going to be some neighborhood commercial. One of the code concepts is to allow more flexibility for commercial uses in the high-density zones. For example, if someone wants to have a childcare center on the first floor of an apartment building, it could be done—the code doesn't allow it at this time. Flexibility in building height would not preclude multi-story development.

3) Questions about density: When the 2021 housing capacity analysis was done, the population forecast for the residential capacity for all of the current PV land use districts as reconfigured or potentially reconfigured, the aim was not to increase the capacity but to keep the same residential unit capacity. There will be growth over time but the plan is to not increase the density or increase the capacity just by amending the land use districts.

4) Questions about traffic impacts: The transportation analysis required when a land use district is amended has not yet been done.

5) Question about school capacity: The Centennial School District maintains an on-going facilities assessment and capacity planning process and has a 10-year forecast for the area. They currently have a 15 to 30% excess capacity for additional students to support future growth. There is also some development land in the PV area that is being held as a future school site. The level and type of school will be determined based on future needs.

6) Questions about tree canopy: Work on the tree code update will be starting soon.

#### 4. Highway 26 – ODOT Tree Canopy Issue, Jim Buck:

a. Highway 26, Entrance to Gresham: The initial concern for trying to get ODOT to be responsive to the need for tree canopy was just improving the city's image. Now, there are the additional issues of climate change and the impact on the neighborhoods through which highway 26 passes. When traveling from Portland to Beaverton and all the way out to Hillsboro, you will see there are hundreds of trees that have been planted and maintained by ODOT. At the Cedar Hills exit, there are at least 70 trees in that one little area. If you keep looking at these exchanges on the west side, you'll see probably more than a thousand trees in just a matter of 2 or 3 miles. ODOT has said that Hillsboro maintains these trees, but the city of Hillsboro says that ODOT does the maintenance. Then, looking at highway 26 coming into Gresham from Sandy and there are virtually no trees on the shoulders and the area looks pretty unkept. There is a huge median just past Hillyard Road. ODOT is planning to use that median as a soil dumping area for other projects. In terms of landscaping, ODOT should hold the Gresham area at the same standard as the west side. Along highway 26, the Hogan Cedars area has one of the lowest tree canopies in Gresham—at 11.7%. I would like the Coalition to actually take a stand on this and advocate for the decades of neglect that ODOT has given to our section of highway 26 compared to everything they are doing on the west side.

b. Carol Rulla: Is there a motion to bring this up with the city council, as a Coalition, on whether the council wants to join us in taking the issue to the Oregon Transportation Commission (ODOT)?

1) John Bildsoe: I'll make that motion. I move that the Coalition ask Jim Buck to represent the Coalition and take this before council first and have council understand the need for this issue to be raised in front of ODOT and whatever other representatives are involved in this.

2) Kat Todd: I second that.

3) Carol Rulla: Is there any discussion on the motion? With that motion, the intent is to eventually take the issue to the Oregon Transportation Commission (ODOT). John, is that your motion?

4) John Bildsoe: Yes.

5) Discussion: Stephen Estes requested that the motion be put in writing and was concerned that having the motion in the minutes and on the meeting recording may not be enough since both eventually are archived. Carol Rulla stated that the motion will be put in a letter and Jim Buck will actually make a presentation to be put in public comment and it will then be on the council agenda.

6) Carol Rulla: Each neighborhood has one vote. Vote by a raise of hand. Representatives from all seven present neighborhood associations (Kelly Creek, Powell Valley, Southwest, Gresham Butte, Rockwood, Northwest, and Gresham Pleasant Valley) voted yes. The motion passed unanimously.

## 5. Neighborhoods and City News and Reports.

### a. Neighborhood Services Division Report – Lina Sizmin:

1) Tomorrow, we are planning to send out an email with all the upcoming levy meeting dates, the state of the city, and the green and clean event that community engagement and neighborhood services is putting together.

2) With the transition of neighborhood services joining community engagement, more detailed timelines for all the different processes for neighborhoods (such as the timeline for getting the postcards distributed) will be added. A draft proposal will be sent to the Coalition for review.

3) As of right now, I will be the point person for neighborhoods and Alex Logue will be supporting. We will have a neighborhood services email address so anyone on our team will be able to respond if Alex and I are not available. The email address is: [neighborhoodservices@greshamoregon.gov](mailto:neighborhoodservices@greshamoregon.gov) We will be able to respond to you at least within 2 business days, at most.

4) Our 9<sup>th</sup> annual green and clean event is April 20<sup>th</sup>. This year we will be focusing on cleaning up the trails for the Lilac Run.

5) We will be opening the neighborhood matching grant in the beginning of May and will send out an email to notify everyone.

### b. Co-President Report. No report.

### c. NA Reports and Concerns:

1) Stephen Estes, Gresham Butte: The revision of the Gresham Butte Neighborhood Association Bylaws has been reviewed by the city and we may vote on the revised bylaws tomorrow night. Of note, the city administrative procedures and the neighborhood administrative procedures indicate that the boundaries of the neighborhoods ought to be contiguous. There was a gap between Gresham Butte and Central City (basically within the Main City Park). We did not address it in the current Bylaws revision, but I wanted to point it out as something to consider.

Meeting adjourned at 8:46 p.m.

Minutes prepared by Dana Duval – Coalition Secretary-Treasurer

Next meeting: <b>Tuesday, May 14th</b>
--