

Please see: <http://pamplinmedia.com/pt/10-opinion/253076-121516-my-view-growth-plan-doesnt-foster-livability>

Carol McCarthy asks in the article above and I really like her question: **Are we paying the planners to manage growth, or to promote it?** While I live downtown where I expect construction noise and welcome at least some of the growth, I would also like planners to do a better job of managing for that growth.

I would like to second Carol's call for recognizing an important role for Neighborhood Associations in the Comp Plan. She says:

*The comprehensive plan currently in place requires that the city coordinate land-use planning by providing notice of official hearings to the neighborhood associations. This language has been removed from the draft plan. Not only that, the proposed glossary definition of "neighborhoods" concludes: "In general, the word 'neighborhoods' is not intended to refer to specific neighborhood geographies."*

I request that the draft plan be amended to define neighborhoods by their association boundaries and that the existing role of the neighborhood associations not only be retained but expanded. One idea she has is to give each neighborhood coalition a seat on the PSC. I think that's worthy of discussion.

Thanks for the opportunity to comment on the 2035 Comp Plan.

Mary Vogel, CNU-A



Bringing services nature provides to community design & planning

A Woman Business Enterprise/Emerging Small Business in Oregon

503-245-7858

[mary@plangreen.net](mailto:mary@plangreen.net)

<http://plangreen.net>

Blog: [A Perspective on Riverwalks](#)