

Community Development 541-593-6645 • Natural Resources 541-593-1522  
PO Box 3278 / 57455 Abbot Drive, Sunriver, OR 97707 • [www.sunriverowners.org](http://www.sunriverowners.org)

*[This document was received by the author, Paul Conte, on April 18, 2026.  
The author's response is interleaved.]*

Response to 'Analysis of Design Manual Restrictions on  
Plant Protections' of October 26, 2025  
[designmanualtreeprotectionanalysis.pdf](#)

From the Design Committee Manual Section 1.01(c)(2)(b):

Provide reasonable flexibility for owners to design their residences and  
landscapes to suit their lifestyles while maintaining Sunriver's aesthetic  
standards, protecting the natural environment and reducing wildfire risk.

Yes, aesthetics are important! [\*]

Yes, the Design Manual will be revised to use a consistent term for the  
physical protection barriers.

Physical protection barriers at trees should not be confused with 'fencing'  
at condominiums or community facilities. See DCM Sections 5.02(e) & (f)  
and 4.02.

Appendix 'F' lists Quaking Aspen as not recommended under the  
'prohibited/ not recommended plantings'. The dictionary definition of  
plantings includes trees. Appendix 'F' doesn't specifically say 'Quaking  
Aspen Tree' but it is a tree and can be protected per DCM Section 3.18.

1. A definition for the term 'tree' has been added to Appendix 'A' Definitions.

*[\* This response does not refute the fact that the only basis for these restrictions is limiting visual impacts on assumed aesthetic standards, i.e., "fences diminish the attractiveness of Sunriver's single-family residential areas." However, no actual theory of aesthetic standards has ever been presented, nor any basis for applying the assumed standard only to single-family residential areas, nor is there any supporting data at all as to the visual preferences of owners. Instead, an apparent standard that "fences are bad" has been imposed on owners without their involvement or consent. The only data on owner preference was overwhelmingly opposed to these severe restrictions.]*

2. Physical protection barriers are defined in Section 3.18 [\*], size, material, location and number. If other plants grow within a physical protection barrier around a tree, they can enjoy the use of a tree's physical protection barrier. It would take too many reams of paper to cover all the myriads of possible tree groupings and physical protection barrier configurations. If owners have questions regarding groupings such as aspens planted by mother nature, contact SROA staff with questions and/or proposals.
3. 14 gauge is readily available in ioca1 stores and doesn't deform easily.
4. The Beaver Institute recommends 2"x4" welded wire fencing. In an attempt not to confuse, we are requiring materials that are consistent with each other. 2"x4" and 2"x3" are sizes that are readily available in local stores. Porcupines can be fairly small and might be able to fit through 6"x6" openings.
5. Yes, deer physical protection barriers don't need to extend to the ground. We will eliminate that requirement. We will change the distance between the physical protection barriers from six feet to five feet.
6. No comment. [*Actually, the second sentence under #5, above, addresses this item.*]
7. We chose to require wood or 'T' posts because they are readily available at local stores. We will add 'U' posts. Rebar posts can be hazardous and will not be added.
8. Five physical protection barriers was the compromise between the owners that want zero physical protection barriers, the owners that want few physical protection barriers and the owners that want many physical protection barriers.  
[*There was no owner survey or engagement to determine a "compromise. This was purely a "compromise" among a handful of individuals.*]
9. The Design Committee can and has approved time extensions for physical protection barriers (deer). There is no time limit for beaver and porcupine physical protection barriers. Listing all of the possible reasons would be too cumbersome to list in the manual. Contact the SROA staff if you have a specific extension need.
10. The date will be removed since it has passed.
11. It never hurts to overstate the obvious. The Sunriver Rules and Regulations are being reviewed, as you know. This reference may need revising.
12. It seems obvious but....

2

*[\*2 Physical protection barriers are patently not defined. The size, material, location, and number are obviously limitations on what can be used as a physical protection barrier. The absurdity of this claim is obvious in a) listing "number" as a defining characteristic of physical protection barriers, and b) if the only items that are "physical protection barriers," then there are no existing "physical protection barriers" that don't comply with the criteria. For example, a wooden fence would, by this definition, not be a "physical protection barriers," and thus not prohibited by Sections 3.18.c.1 and d.1.]*

13. Quaking Aspens are listed under 'not recommended' in Appendix F' but still 'listed'. We will add lodgepoles to trees that may be protected (beaver and porcupine). Lodgepoles are prohibited from being planted in Appendix 'F' and sprouts are recommended to be removed, thus deer protection isn't needed.

14. See above.

15. You are correct. We will coordinate the physical protection barrier term.

*[The response did not address these significant flaws:*

- The use of "diameter" does not work for many cases. Use "perimeter." (See #2 in the analysis.)*
- "Grouping" of trees is undefined; a 4' diameter is too small for "deer protection," and the minimum 4" and maximum 12" for "beaver protection" is impossible to satisfy for all the trees in a group (See #2 in the analysis)*
- The four year limit is not enforceable and makes no sense. "Five is five" as a limit that should be perpetual. (See #10 in the analysis.)]*

  
CHARLIE MEYER  
DESIGN COMMITTEE CHAIR