

Palisades Neighborhood Association
Executive Board Meeting Minutes
Thursday, September 13, 2007

- 1. Call to order and roll call.** The meeting was called to order by Chair Sally Moncrieff at 7:08 pm. In attendance:

Sally Moncrieff (SM)	Mike Ballis (MB)
David Feathers (DF)	Dee Grothe (DG)
Doug Rich (DR)	Mike Nelson (MN)
Keith Oelrich (KO)	Mark Easley (ME)
Sean Gallagher (SG)	Mike Hall (MH)
Brigitte Howley (BH)	Don Irving (DI)

Absent:

Bob Barman (BB)
Greg Palmer (GP)
Travis Boyce (TB)
Albert Almeida (AA)
Rich Wilkins (RW)

2. Approval of the July 5th Board Meeting Minutes. BH moved to approve, ME seconded, passed unanimously.
3. Treasurer's Report (DR): There was a balance of \$3,000 on the legal bill at one point, it has been paid down to the current balance. DI asked whether there was ever a resolution to authorize the contract with the attorney. Molly Miles expressed that the PNA has an obligation to the attorney and should work to pay it down, but that any donations to be used for that should specifically be identified for that purpose when the funds are raised.
DI raised the point that we should recognize that, as a board, we don't have specific authority to enter into contracts without proper authority
DR reported that the attorney didn't seem to be too disappointed that we were only paying \$200 against the invoice.
4. **Public Nuisance** Complaint from neighbor about a home that is a public nuisance.

Neighbor is requesting that the PNA board write a letter to the homeowner and ask him to "clean things up". If met with resistance, could we go to the city and ask for appropriate ordinances to be put in place?

Sally did get guidance from the city, there are some "public nuisance" guidelines on the books, even without specific ordinance or "aesthetics law". The city told her that the PNA can't be an enforcement agency, but we CAN be the party that files the complaint.

BH suggests that PNA should, before filing a complaint, approach the homeowner to let him know that complaints have been received, and give him a chance to rectify the situation before filing a complaint.

The Neighbor said that if nothing is done, she may come back to the PNA Board and ask us to contact the city to put specific aesthetic ordinances in place.

ME pointed out that, with the 20-year plan, this could be a good vehicle for expressing our views as a neighborhood about this kind of issue.

MH points out that there is language in the plan, as it is drafted right now, that broadly addresses this issue.

Motion made by SG that the area manager have a meeting with the homeowner first, and if no progress is made, then a complaint be filed. Seconded by MH. Motion passed.

5. Update from KO regarding PNA Newsletter

DG asked that someone else draft the article on the Riverwest church development.

DR asked about how the newsletter gets distributed. SM responded that after we prepare the newsletter, the city will copy and mail them for us.

BH asked about requirements for when the newsletter needs to go out. SM replied that the newsletter needs to go out at least 3 weeks prior to the General Meeting.

6. Agenda for Oct-17 General Meeting of PNA

SM reports that Exec Manager of Avamere has agreed to come and do a brief presentation about Avamere during the Oct meeting. We've taken the 20-year plan off the agenda for that meeting, at the request of the 20-year plan committee. Also, Kim Gilmer, Director of Lake Oswego Parks and Rec has agreed to come and present regarding the Luscher Farm and other development activity. SM described the current PNA proposal to the city for the Rassekh property, which are to keep the existing parking, fencing and cleared area and turn that into a neighborhood natural park.

Also, we'll have updates on the 20-year plan, the school district's request to change the CUP at Lakeridge, Cemetery House, Riverwest Church development.

ME requested that we add an update on the website to the October agenda. SM said she would add that to the agenda.

MB asked if the PNA Board has a position regarding the Avamere development. DF expressed that we just need to accept that the facility is built, residents are moving in, and those residents will be part of the PNA.

SM indicated that the past PNA Board did a great service for the community on limiting the height of the Avamere buildings; preserves the views and aesthetics in the neighborhood.

Molly Miles asked about whether the restriction addresses her concern that Avamere will expand into the Bethlehem Church parking lot. SM indicated that, if Avamere is going to expand any further, they would need to go out for a new CUP, and the PNA would get notice and have the opportunity to comment on that at that time. Molly indicated that Avamere has now brought commercial entities into an area that was previously rural and residential.

BH asked if PNA plans to do something to welcome the new residents at Avamere? SM indicated that she and DF have met with Avamere, and talked about doing something to welcome the new neighbors. DF indicated that Avamere has many plans to try to integrate themselves into the neighborhood, including an open house that PNA Board should attend.

7. Update on the 20-year plan: DI, MH, ME presented. At past meeting, SM requested DI, MH, ME, represent the Board in working with the plan committee. Suggested some changes, in 5 categories:
 - Substantive changes—discussion to follow below
 - Restructuring changes
 - Changes in verbiage, based on the sense of the Aug-29th neighborhood meeting. Wanted the document to be more visionary, not controversial. Tried to convert concerns that were expressed into positive “goals” of the neighborhood.
 - Formatting changes
 - Discussion questions or comments; things we want to clarify with the Plan Committee

Existing Plan Committee met with city; they expressed that given the school district’s request to change the CUP at Lakeridge, the 20-year plan effort should be tabled until the CUP issue is resolved.

DI asked whether the Board wants to delay work on the 20-year plan until the CUP is resolved. DI, MH, and ME believe that the work on the 20-year plan should move ahead without waiting for resolution on the Lakeridge CUP issue.

On Sep-24th the planning commission is going to meet to discuss the issue of whether the 20-year plan should be put on hold pending resolution of the Lakeridge CUP issue.

City has said that they would like to have PNA Board members join with the current Plan Committee, and then continue moving forward.

DF asked why the commission is discussing whether the plan should be put on hold. MH reported that there was apparently a comment that “we need to figure out which way we’re going to go with the Plan”. There is a notion that somehow there are two divergent plans. MH feels this is not the case; most of the comments the new PNA Board has provided don’t substantively change the nature of the Plan as previously prepared. MH feels that at the round-table meeting, the Plan Committee may have felt “challenged” by the board, and gotten a feeling that the Board wants wholesale changes to the plan.

DI suggests sending a cover note explaining changes, so that the Plan Committee can see that the changes required are not a significant difference from the current draft—for the most part.

DI suggests that the plan, with the proposed amendments that make it a more visionary document, would not be impacted by the CUP decision, and therefore we should move forward with preparing the Plan.

Some discussion of some of the substantive changes

- Easement
- Sunnyhill Neighborhood Park
- Lake Grove Swim Park Property Rights
- Grandfathering residential homeowner overlays
- Explicit mention of the high school, and supporting athletics—many responses to the community survey cited that the community supports athletics, this wasn’t reflected in the prior draft
- Community Playing Fields—Plan contains information that shows that we don’t have enough park space
- Tree Rules

Molly made a suggestion for changing some specific language in the proposed amendment about “close” neighbors vs nearby, affected, etc. MH points out that there will be an open house where the specific language in the Plan will be available for review.

DF agrees that, regardless of how the CUP issue comes out this time, that the PNA should continue with the draft plan.

DR raised the issue that the Plan doesn’t deal enough with Emergency Preparedness. MH mentioned that he is heading up an effort to explore resources available pertaining to Emergency Preparedness, with the possibilities of holding events to raise awareness, and/or forming a committee to develop a formal neighborhood plan. MH mentioned that he felt we shouldn’t hold up the 20 yr Plan for a specific Emergency Response plan; this is a 20-year plan and those

plans would change over time. DR suggests that we should at least make sure the Plan requires that we always have a current Emergency Response plan in place.

ME and MH had some discussion around the terminology in the 20 yr plan: some confusion about what is a Goal, a Policy, an Action Step. It's not clear what each of these terms in the Plan mean.

Molly Miles comment: PNA was essentially dormant until about 4 years ago; about 2 years ago the Plan was started—as a result of the impact on the neighborhood of all the growth plans from the high school, Avamere, other development. Molly wanted to acknowledge that it is a great idea to get Emergency Response in place—but feels we should get the Plan wrapped up first and then add the Emergency stuff into the plan as an amendment later. MH agreed.

SM tabled discussion on the plan. **ME moved that the PNA Board recommend that the 20-year plan preparation moved forward toward approval without delay. Seconded by BH. Passed.**

SM moves that, as per Sarah Selden's recommendation, MH, DI and ME join the PNA 20-year Plan Committee. Motion was seconded and passed.

8. Update by BH on the Lakeridge CUP. Large group of neighbors on both sides of the lake have requested to make changes to Lakeridge CUP. Recently, Mike Lehman the Lakeridge principal, has requested and received approval from the school board that changing the CUP would allow Lakeridge to remain competitive as a 6A school. The original CUP for Lakeridge, in 1969, allowed for a stadium with 3,400 seats, plus lights, PA system, concession stand, and bathrooms. Current CUP requires that the lights must go off at 9:30; doesn't allow for any street parking for athletic events; no PA system is allowed. Lehman received approval from school board to look into ways to "bring the pacers home". Steering committee has been formed; it is being led by Cathy Shroyer. BH is representing PNA on the steering committee, also has members from Lakeridge, Lake Oswego, all the various youth sports leagues. The steering committee investigated the possibility of using the new field being built at Luscher Farm, but for a variety of reasons that doesn't support the needs. Mike Lehman and Sally are committed to ensuring that open dialogue is maintained with the nearby neighbors as we go through this process.

BH points out that this is not just about football; even during soccer games we have visiting parents parking in the wrong spots. Lakeridge is in violation of its CUP quite often, and needs to have the CUP amended so that Lakeridge isn't always in violation of its CUP.

BH points out that we're NOT talking about a full stadium. Also, BH points out that there is no burden for tax-payers; the steering committee believes that the costs will be covered by booster club or other donations.

Steering Committee has had one meeting and has not developed any recommendations yet.

ME commented that, as a taxpayer, he has the right to drive and park on Cloverleaf. He believes the current CUP is in violation of the law, and suggests we shouldn't make another CUP that is in violation of the law.

Brigitte shared a few of the ideas the steering committee is discussing, but cautioned that all these ideas are in the formative stages and not recommendations of the committee.

Molly Miles shared some comments: concerns about cars, people, traffic.

BH explained the process: the steering committee will make recommendations to the school board; the school board will take a recommendation to the city planning committee; there will be a public hearing, then the city can rule.

DI suggested that PNA Board should monitor developments of this process, and be available to advise this process as representatives of the neighborhood.

ME asked BH to have the steering committee think about: make sure that changes to the CUP don't include side promises, especially to keep taxpayers from using public property. Also, the steering committee should request that the city do something about parking around the high school. ME encouraged the steering committee to consider using buses for transportation in and out of high-attendance events.

9. Discussion of "no skateboarding" sign. Lots of skateboarding on this street; Lowenbergs request a "no skateboarding" sign. **SM moves that the PNA Board request that the city place a "no skateboarding" sign at this location... . BH seconds, motion passed.**
10. Riverwest Church Development. Church has requested from the city that they develop six homes in the church site. SM shared some neighborhood concerns with the city. Developer will be holding a neighborhood meeting.
11. SM gave a website update in AA's absence. www.Palisadesneighborhood.org
12. SM update. October is American Planning Month, and "invite a planner to school" month. The city would appreciate us inviting planners to school.
13. Next Meeting October 17th, 7pm, at Lakeridge.

14. Meeting was adjourned at 9:07pm