

AGENDA ITEM

#1 Introductions

BOARD MEMBERS:	PRESENT - P	ABSENT - A	EXCUSED - E		
JEANNE BOATWRIGHT	P	LOLA HACKETT	P	AARON TERPENING	P
ERIC BRADFIELD	P	TINA HANSEN	P	PAUL TIGAN	P
SADIE CARNEY	A	CYNTHIA KAVANAGH	P		
TIM FRANCE	A	RAY QUISENBERRY	P		
CHRISTOPHER HACKETT	P	SAM SKILLERN	P		

Others present: Mark DeCoursey, Carol DeCoursey, Nick Beleiciks, MaryAnne Spradlin, Cara Kaser, Susan Napack, Scott Mumford, and Virginia Stapleton.

#2 Councilor Update

Cara reported on the following:

- City Council will have a work session on Sept.21st that will address police responses to non-violent crimes. There will be information on how they are handled now and the Council will ask questions. She didn't know if public comments and questions will be allowed, as that varies with different work sessions;
- The construction on the new police building is on time and under budget. The department will start moving in September and will be all there in December. There is a ribbon cutting scheduled for Oct. 10th;
- There is a large crowd gathered tonight at Riverfront Park. It is a faith leader who is in town. The City did not issue a permit for the event. It is happening organically;
- Cara has not received the agenda for the next Council Meeting. A vendor, or contractor, is being selected to conduct an external review and audit of the Salem Police Department regarding performance, practices and policy. The evaluator is an independent third party and the review will be very detailed. The Steering committee includes journalists. Any recommendations will be received next year. When asked, Cara responded that the review is, at least partially, in response to how protests in June were handled. To another question, she said that she didn't know how far back and what particular incidents will be included. She will ask if the standoff at 1050 Summer Street will be part of the incidents reviewed. A neighbor asked if public input will be allowed. She responded that, yes, it would, but she is not sure when – maybe in January.

#3 Grant Community School Progress Report

Sam summarized the actions which have transpired since our last meeting and a bit about the incoming program. He showed, on screen, the layout that the project architect came up with for the Winter Street parking lot use for the bus drop-off area. The District would put all of the buses serving Grant at this location so that all of the transportation issues would be solved in one fell swoop. The GNA subcommittee that is working on this problem was disappointed that it was so “muscular”. It would remove part of the ball field, widen on and create two new driveways, remove at least 6 mature trees located on-site and in the parking strip, remove open green space/play space and turn it into a storm water detention basin, fence in the playground structure and two four-square and two hopscotch courts just south of the playground, eliminate the two tether ball poles and two additional four-square courts. The estimated cost presented was \$1.3 to \$1.5 million. City Council approved the District’s Cottage Street proposal, though not without much criticism of the District’s failure to work with GNA to arrive at a more agreeable solution. At a field meeting on August 24th, the committee met with the same District representatives that they met with in June to review the Winter Street plan and then moved over to Cottage Street to discuss an alternative design for site. For the neighborhood association meeting, the

District provided an initial rough design layout that Sam shared. It would move the bus unloading area to the north and extend it past the Gaines Street intersection. It would accommodate 4 buses. It may remove up to 3 trees, though two of those are smaller and one of the small trees is already somewhat damaged and not very vigorous. Sam reported that, at the field meeting, the sub-committee was receptive of this proposal. From there a more involved discussion ensued regarding what can be done to improve the look of this entrance to the school to make it look more welcoming. Ideas proposed included: signage, landscaping improvements, a large canopy tree on-site and north of the entrance walk; removal of the existing birch tree that is inside the covered walkway, once the new tree begins to reach maturity; potential roof canopy extension towards Cottage Street; and, raised (curb height) crosswalks on Cottage to define the walks and to slow traffic. District representatives said that transportation brought out the buses assigned to this program and they are able to make right turns at the traffic circles on Hood Street, so they can exit the Cottage Street area and circle the school to get back to Market Street. This is the key to being able to allow them to park north of the Gaines Street intersection. A neighbor asked if the area could be reduced from 4 to 3 buses. The neighborhood's goal is to dress this area up and to make it into a welcoming entrance, not a "back door". The District folks present were supportive of our ideas. Neighbors asked Sam if any of the exiting trees could be transplanted. He said we could propose that. Neighbors definitely didn't like the idea of the changes laid out to use the Winter Street side, especially fencing in the play structure area and reducing the available play space by so much. Paul moved that ***"Grant Neighborhood Association notify the School District that we are in support of the new concept proposed for the Cottage Street bus pullout area with the addition of: a large canopy tree in the open space; as many as possible of the parking strip trees are saved or transplanted; the birch tree inside the walkway area to be retained until the large tree begins to reach maturity; the entrance is signed and upgraded and the landscaping is improved in order to make this a more formal and welcoming entrance to the school. The Neighborhood Association also wants a commitment to more public engagement with the Neighborhood Association, the neighbors, Grant Community School staff, and Grant Community School families in developing the final design."*** Tina seconded the motion. The vote was 14 in favor, 0 opposed. Neighbors and board members who are interested in participating with the design meetings are: Carol, Eric, Jeanne, Paul, and Sam.

#4 905-925 Cottage Street NE Zone Change Update

Paul reported that the subcommittee had submitted a 42 page comment/rebuttal document to the City Planner on September 2nd, which was the deadline date for addressing the land-use application. The public posting notices for the Planning Commission hearing are up on the property. The application includes a Comprehensive Plan change, Neighborhood Plan Change, Zone Change, Design Review, Adjustments, and Site Plan Review. The City staff will review our documents, the applicant's material, and any other comments submitted to prepare the staff report for the Commission. GNA is asking for a denial based on the applicant not meeting the burden of proof that the proposal is in accordance with the Salem Revised Code and that the RH zone is not appropriate. The applicant states that they need the RH to get the density requested, which is 19 units. The burden is on the applicant when the zone change is disruptive and the more disruptive it is, the higher the burden. The applicant must address changes in the area that support the request. Staff suggested that we dial in on changes we would like to see to the proposal. We cited several items, including the parking and parking district issues. The Planning Commission also needs to hear from neighbors. The Commission meets the evening of Tuesday, September 15th. The project is a good project, but it is in the wrong location. A neighbor asked if there is a newer set of plans than what was submitted with the application. Paul said no. There is considerable concern about the lack of review of the existing structures by an architect or an engineer. There is no evidence that any study has been done. There is very minimal information on the plans and a note that the information is ". . . compiled from aerial views, tax maps, and minimal site observation . . ." None of the plans are stamped by a licensed professional. Eric will send out emails to all in attendance with the application documents attached. GNA's focus is on the land use and the density. The City resolved to meet the housing deficit and to address it in a coordinated manner. If the building

is going to be changed from church use to housing, then the appropriate density is RM2. If the zone change to RH is allowed, it could present entire to more zone changes. The proposed nineteen doors are not family housing with 19 bedrooms. They could actually result in 38, or more, residents. A neighbor asked how well this Church is attended. Paul said that the applicant states that the Church is not needed. In fact, it is so successful that it needs a bigger facility. A neighbor asked if it could be used for a studio. Paul replied that the use would have to match what is allowed in the zone. Religious assembly is allowed in the RS zone but a studio is a commercial venture and would require a zone change to site it here. A neighbor commented about the Temple Beth Shalom building on Broadway being turned into a ballet studio. A neighbor commented that he was not against this development, per se. However, one has to understand the principles and the precedent it sets to change it to the RH zone. It is incongruous with the City's plan. Why not go for an RM2 zone with an exception for the 19 units for this development, only, which would then expire if it falls through? The applicant's position is: because we are proposing housing that is in great need, we should be allowed to do what we ask for. However, you cannot get a variance for density in the RM1 or RM2 zones because density is where the impact is. DevNW is very mission-focused for outreach, an office, and housing. When we bring up external impacts, they do not consider those. You have to justify to the City that your use is OK for the surrounding area. It boils down to finding a property that fits your needs and proposals, and is properly zoned to allow them, so you don't have to fight this fight.

#5 Board Member Elections

Christopher Bechtel submitted his resignation from the board this afternoon. This leaves positions open on the board. Christopher H. moved that "We reelect all those currently serving on the board." Lola seconded the motion. During discussion, Paul nominated Mark DeCoursey for one of the open positions. Christopher accepted the amendment to the motion to add Mark. Lola also accepted it. The motion was changed to "***We reelect all those currently serving on the board and add Mark DeCoursey to the roster.***" The vote was 13 in favor, 0 opposed.

#6 Board Member Reports

Lola, CERT – CERT is flying a bit under the radar due to the COVID restrictions. No classes are scheduled yet, but the next set will be online, again.

#7 Other Business

Lola commented that the Willamette Heritage Center is hosting a trick-or-treat drive-through in their parking lot on Saturday October 31st. Booths will hand out candy and also the booth sponsors can hand out flyers or other information about their organizations. Our October neighborhood meeting will be via Zoom.

Meeting adjourned at 7:53 pm

Respectfully submitted by: Jeanne Boatwright