

**Southwest Hills Residential League
Board Meeting
September 26, 2007
Ascension Episcopal Parish**

SWHRL President Jim Thayer called the meeting to order at 7:05 PM.

Board present: Alice Stolzberg, Don Livingstone, Jill Habernigg, Lena Lane, Lucy Bosworth, Nancy Seton, Norman Turrill, Simone Goldfeder, Steve Gann

Board excused: Aloha Wyse, Andrew Holtz, Darroch Cahen, Julia Harris

Board absent: Tom Miller

Members present: Brent Hinrich, Cathe Mansfield

Others present: Doug Strickler, LAN Pacific; Eric Esparza, LAN Pacific; Sean Foushee, Accent Residential Homes

Jim established that a quorum was present.

Motion: Approve the meeting agenda.

Made by: Simone Goldfeder

Second: Nancy Seton

Motion passed unanimously.

Motion: Approve the July 19th meeting minutes, as presented.

Made by: Simone Goldfeder

Second: Norman Turrill

Motion passed unanimously.

Treasurer's Report – Alice Stolzberg

For August, the starting balance was \$21,076.12; the ending balance was \$16,876.12.

Expenses included a \$3700 donation to Three Rivers Land Conservancy, \$200 for the Ice Cream Social clown, and \$300 for printing.

Motion: Approve the Treasurer's report.

Made by: Norman Turrill

Second: Simone Goldfeder

Motion passed unanimously.

Presentation by Doug Strickler, Eric Esparza and Sean Foushee on amended SW Upper Drive development plan

- Doug: This is second round, after their proposal was denied at a hearing.
- The main points of the new proposal is a reduction in the number of lots from 7 to 6, they are redistributed, allows for 6 more trees, 2 of them are large. There are now 14 trees on the build-able lots, up from 8. He has additional detail available on which trees are to be saved, and which are not.
- The slope of tract A, the environmental zone, is problematic, high landslide risk. They are proposing a 25 ft buffer between the home sites and Tract A. The existing buffers are 10 ft.; 40% of Lot 4 is in the environmental zone. Two (no-build) tracts are to be created at the southern and northern ends of the site to preserve additional trees.
- Eric: The footprints presented at the meeting are not final, but conceptual. They are not the maximum allowed, but are a more likely to be allowed. This is not a final proposal. As stated at the hearing, the proposed houses are very nice, and will fit in.

- Sean: He wants to emphasize that they will fit in. The engineers doing the road have meetings over the last 1.5 years with the Bureaus of Transportation, Environment, Water and Fire and the Bureau of Design Services. The alignment of the road was a primary concern, and difficult due to topography and safety codes. The best alternative is shown on the map presented at the meeting. They plan on constructing a retaining wall up to 17 ft. because of the code. There will be a landing so that the Fire Department can turn around. They cannot construct a road that has more than an 18% grade. They tried to align the road with the existing driveway, but that didn't meet code.
- In answer to a question from Simone, Eric said that the plan is what the Fire Department wants. They will only widen SW Upper Drive a small bit. They were required to dedicate a ROW on the property. According to him, the alternatives available for the road wouldn't change regardless of whether there were 2 lots or 6 – in either case it would have the same impact on trees and grading. Seven significant trees will have to be taken out to allow construction of the road. They will construct a retaining wall to minimize the grade on the down-hill side. The grade will require two of the houses to have their entrance on the third floor.
- Sean: The trees are intertwined. They would like to save as many trees as possible.
- Cathe Mansfield: Questioned which trees are in danger. She has an arborists' report. She asked if they are going to do a new geo-tech report that will consider the impact of the development on all of the existing homes.
- They were unable to identify which trees would be affected by the road, and whether any of these were trees designed for saving by the city arborist.
- Sean: Tract D is no longer a build-able lot. The neighbors will see the new homes but there will still be plenty of trees. They are digging quite a bit, but plan to replace the earth they remove with solid materials. It's in his best interests to build houses that will not slide down the hill. He thinks that the new houses will actually stabilize the hillside. He will tie the houses to the hillside; he's done it before, and believes that this will make the hillside stronger.
- Simone: Asked what the impact will be on adjacent homes. She wants to see what in his reports address this issue.
- Eric: This issue will be addressed. There will be a buffer. The foundation design and building process will be clearly addressed in the report. They cannot do anything that would violate the requirements of the various bureaus involved.
- Simone: Accent Homes' arborists' report did not address many of the concerns of the neighbors about the impact the project would have on their homes.
- Lucy: The developers are asking the neighbors and SWHRL to trust them, but the concern is to protect the neighborhood. She asked what the basis was for deciding which trees to save.
- Sean: If it were too costly to satisfy code requirements, he would not be doing the project. There needs to be a compromise between the neighborhood and the developers.
- Lucy: We are not debating aesthetics, rather are asking for a better understanding of what is going into their decision-making process,
- Jim: Asked how the new proposal addresses the list of requirements for the development that the City proposed subsequent to the hearing.
- Simone: The original denial of Accent Home's original proposal stated "the applicant had not submitted an alternate proposal showing all development outside of the resource area of the environmental zone. Has Accent Homes provided this proposal?"
- Doug: They plotted a scenario with no development in the resource area, but they are showing SWHRL the scenario that would best work for them (with development inside

the environmental zone). They did do a scenario without development in the environmental zone, but did not provide it to us.

- Sean: Marketability is a factor for them. It's not reasonable for them to build a \$1 million house that skirts around the environmental zone.
- Cathe: We need to weigh the impacts of marketability vs. environmental concerns. Her concern is the proposed removal of a 42" tree that is stabilizing her home.
- Sean: He does not want to construct houses that will slide down the hill and result in a lawsuit.
- Norman: Asked about what one of the lines on the map represented.
- Sean: That defines the limit of development. Some of the existing driveways are already in the environmental zone. Much of the environmental zone is already impacted by the existing homes. 70% of lot 4 is already asphalt. He claimed that his development would have a very minor impact.
- Cathe: The ground is already so unstable.
- Jim: The area is an active slide. One house has been tied down twice and is still sliding. He asked them to directly address, one by one, the concerns put forth at the hearing.
- Eric: They will explain how and why they thought things out.
- Simone: Asked about foot print alternatives.
- Sean: They are going for cost-effective footprints.
- Jim: Asked about having 5 lots instead of 6, perhaps that would lessen the impact on existing homes.
- Sean: Construction costs are a large factor in this. Each lot can cost \$300K to develop. He hopes to break even on the lot cost and make his profit on the houses. In answer to Lena's question, he said that their geo-tech firm is PBS.
- Steve: Their proposal got rejected at the hearing because of SWHRL's opposition, which was backed by the city. He expected a more precise answer to the neighbor's objections.
- Jim: We want the developers to directly address the hearing objections point by point.
- Cathe: When are they going to file the next proposal?
- Sean: They need to go through neighborhood meetings, basically start the whole process over again. They know that they did not make a good presentation the last time, but maybe now, the net effect will be a better project.
- Jim: Advised them to use the list presented at the hearing to show how the new proposal has addressed each of these concerns, and then come back with that to SWHRL again before the next round with the city.
- Sean: They will address the issues outlined in the denial when they resubmit their new proposal to the City.
- The developers left the meeting at 8:00, and then we had cake to celebrate Jim's birthday.

President's Message – Jim Thayer

- The Ice Cream Social was a success, despite the iffy weather. Kudos to Lucy for arranging for the clown; he was a popular addition to the event.
- There are neighborhood grants available from SWNI, for up to \$2000. He encouraged everyone to think about a project we could do using that money.

Transportation Report – Alice Stolzberg for Julia Harris

- SW Broadway Drive is being repaved. The walkway on the lowest section is problematic. The repaving does not improve the walkways except for one small section.
- The Council Crest radio tower work will be addressed at the next meeting.

Land Use Report – Nancy Seton

- The Broadway Condo Project has been amended to include twice as many units (46), but will be more street-friendly, give SW Broadway a more attractive streetscape, have a lower height, be moved away from the environmental zone, and will have a public trail with steps down the hill.
- Norman: He would like SWHRL to work on its neighborhood plan so that it can fit into the City’s comprehensive plan.
- Jim: He thinks that neighborhood plans are a thing of the past that encouraged Balkanization. Our plan is only a wish list for ourselves, and not an official document.
- Nancy Seton passed out a document she compiled listing various resources for the neighborhood.
- Jim mentioned something about HALO LIDS for constructing sidewalks on Hamilton St, Dosch Rd and Shattuck Ave.

Election of Officers

Nominations for President were opened and Jim Thayer was nominated for President.

Motion: Close the nominations for President.

Motion passed unanimously.

Motion: Cast a unanimous ballot for Jim Thayer for President.

Made by: Norman Turrill

Motion passed unanimously.

Motion: Vote on a slate for the remaining officers, instead of voting for each separately.

Made by: Norman Turrill

Second: Alice Stolzberg

Motion passed unanimously.

There was a discussion about who to have in each position. Alice said that she would be willing to continue as Treasurer, and Lena that she would be willing continue as Secretary. Norman was persuaded to continue as First Vice President. Julia was not present, but had indicated in the past her willingness to continue as Second Vice President.

Motion: Nominate Norman Turrill First Vice President, Julia Harris Second Vice President, Alice Stolzberg Treasurer, and Lena Lane Secretary.

Made by: Nancy Seton

Second: Steve Gann

Motion passed unanimously.

Motion: Cast a unanimous ballot for the nominated slate of officers.

Made by Norman Turrill

Motion passed unanimously.

Other Business

- Nanette will coordinate a meeting of the Membership Committee. Lucy and Alice both offered to join the committee.
- There was a discussion about speakers for the January Membership Meeting. Jill suggested inviting Steve Burns, a geologist, which might be of interest to the many residents facing land use issues. Jim suggested inviting political candidates, perhaps candidates for Portland Mayor. It would not be a debate, rather, a “meet the candidate”

affair. We should consider having a very brief business agenda for the meeting in order to devote more time to the speaker(s). But it will be necessary to have a second vote on the bylaws amendments that were first voted on in September.

- It was agreed that we will discontinue the Yahoo! listserv, now that we have our own listserv.
- There was a discussion about whether or not to donate more money to the Three Rivers Land Conservancy. Last year we gave \$3,700. Jim said that organization has exceeded its goals for enlisting volunteer labor on the project. Corporate money that they receive is dedicated to the costs of pulling ivy; ours would help pay for a Volunteer Coordinator.
- Don suggested that we could use the money from the SWNI grant for this.

Motion: Donate \$1,000 to the Three Rivers Land Conservancy.

Made by: Jim Thayer

Second: Lucy Bosworth

Motion passed, with Steve Gann abstaining, everyone else voting yes.

- There was a discussion about the Spirit of Portland award. Nanette will speak to Sylvia Bogert of SWNI about nominating the Bridlemile, Hillsdale, Homestead and SWHRL neighborhood associations for their collaborative work on resolving the overlap issues.

Jim adjourned the meeting at 9:10.

Respectfully submitted,

Nanette Klimkow

Executive Assistant to SWHRL

Action Items:

- **Jim** and **Norman** will confer about inviting mayoral candidates to the January membership Meeting.
- **Lucy Bosworth** and/or **Jim Thayer** will attend an informational session for the SWNI grant on October 1st.
- **Tom** will write up an article on his proposal for a summer program for children at Stroheckers and circulate it to Board members. This is left over from the July meeting. **Nanette** will check up with him on the status of this.