

Project Review Committee
Meeting Minutes, February 29, 2016
Confidential – Do Not Copy

Attending:

Committee Members: Ed Dobrowski, Gerald Dubiel, Leo Keeler;

Board Members: Charlotte Mizzi;

Landowners: Aza Ziegler, Christopher Fitzgerald, Catherine Fitzgerald, Jerry Ladewig; Chris Williams, Donna Anderson, George Larsen.

Start: 7:15 PM, End 8:30 PM

Summary

.The PR Committee recommends the board establish performance bonds to assure project completion and/or site rehabilitation.

Project Application for residence and guest house on SG 28B is complete and approval is recommended.

Project Application for a green house on SG 58 is complete and should be approved.

Payment of an assessment for a dwelling to be applied to the barn on SG 41B is inappropriate and the landowner wants the amount credited towards the 2017 assessments.

The growing concern for business operations visible from roads needs to be addressed by the Board as soon as possible.

All Landowners should be aware of tensions that are created when issues are discussed naming individuals rather than focusing on the specific concern or issue. Using names makes it personal.

Eliminating eyesores and enforcement of all Covenants continues to be an issue for Landowners and Board action is desired.

MEETING TOPICS

Bond Requirements: Prior to the official start of the meeting a Landowner asked a question about bond requirements. Discussion completed as first item of the meeting.

Issue: The maximum construction bond of \$250.00 is inadequate to rehabilitate or remove items on a lot if the work is not completed. Projects started and not completed has resulted in weed infestations impacting adjoining Landowners, unsightly disturbed areas and could result in health and safety concerns.

- A. Instances of incomplete work were presented as examples.
 - a. The variety of projects, from small additions to large homes and multiple buildings, identified the need for bond calculations based on amount of work or ground disturbance.
 - b. Adjoining Landowners look to the Board to assure project completion or enforce rehabilitation of disturbed lands to prevent impacts to their property.
- B. Need for, and methods to obtain adequate performance bonds were discussed.
- C. Landowners requested the Project Review Committee work with Landowners to establish procedures to require and obtain adequate bond coverage.

The Committee recognized the issue as a problem not yet addressed by the Board. The need for Covenant and/or policy changes is to be presented to the Board.

Agenda Items: 1. Application for residence and guesthouse on SG 28E; 2. Application for Greenhouse on SG 58; 3. Assessment over payment on SG 41B; 4. Status of new application instructions and project inspection checklist.

- 1. Application by Fitzgerald's on SG 28E.
 - a. The DEQ approval has been given and owners worked to assure full compliance.
 - b. Gerald Dubiel has done survey work to help located the road and buildings to assure compliance with DEQ and GLA Setbacks.
 - c. Gerald stated he considered his involvement to prohibit his voting on the issue at the Board meeting.
 - d. Guest home on application is 546 square feet, within 1,200 square foot limit in the Covenants.
 - e. Two well locations on the plat were discussed, with well in SW corner of SG 28E to be the owners well providing water to the residence and guest house.
 - f. Owners identified they had moved the guest house location to the west of original plat location in order to not impact potential home location of SG 28 A or SG 28.
 - g. Owners identified the need for a culvert to be placed in the driveway at/near its junction with Arcturus.
 - h. Gerald identified the sight distance at the junction with Arcturus is adequate.
 - i. Landowners present did not present any issue to address.

The Project Review Committee agreed the project should be presented to the Board with a recommendation to approve.

2. Application for a greenhouse on SG- 58.
 - a. The original application was submitted with an excessive fee calculation.
 - b. The application and fees have been corrected.
 - c. The application is to add a 14x20 extension to the detached garage.
 - d. Ed, Leo and Gerald visited the site and found no setback, visual, construction or other issues.
 - e. Landowners present did not present any issues.

3. Assessment over payment on Lot 41B.
 - a. The Landowner had brought all assessments up to date, and had over paid by paying a dwelling assessment on the barn.
 - b. The Covenants authorize assessments only on land and dwellings, making the payment for the barn inappropriate.
 - c. The Landowner was asked if he wanted a refund or to have the dwelling assessment credited to next year's fees, and he chose to have the money held as a credit.
 - d. Land and Building use in a business and old cars visible on the lot were additional topics discussed. They are noted below.

4. Project Application Instructions and Site Inspection Checklist
No new action has been taken toward these objectives and they were not discussed during the meeting.

Other Topics

1. A second dwelling on a small lot.
2. Business operations.
3. Eyesores
4. Uniform and consistent enforcement of Covenants.

The owner of lot 41B presented his long range plans were to have a residence on the lot, but in the near future may add living accommodations inside the barn on the lot.

- i. The Committee pointed out the lot was only 2.85 acres, below the 3.5 acres the Master Plan requires in order to have two dwellings units on the same lot.

Business operations outside of buildings were discussed again.

- a. The owner of Lot 41B presented that he has become very concerned because he has heard his name being discussed very often and wanted to find out why and how to best proceed.
 - i. He informed the Committee he has discussed his land use with neighbors and had a document with 10 signatures supporting/accepting his activities.
- b. Landowners and the Committee discussed the growing concern on interpretations of the covenants pertaining to business operations.
 - i. A conflict exists between Landowners desiring and interrupting the covenants to require business activities to be inside buildings or totally concealed, and other Landowners desiring to enable outside business operations with limited constriction of activities.
- c. Committee members familiar with the conflict and specific site discussions felt it was not a personal issue but as the first commercial operation clearly visible from the road system, the operations had brought the conflict to light.
- d. A Landowner presented that the Community needs to define itself as we are and never will be a Gated Community, and Landowners need to understand what the community is or wants to be recognized as.
- e. Changing the governing documents was mentioned as a process to utilize.

The Committee agreed this issue should be brought before the Board and a process developed to enable Landowners to determine what changes in covenants and/or enforcement of covenants is needed.

Eyesores became a topic of discussion during the meeting.

- a. The question of the Old/antique cars on Lot 41 B1 being considered an eyesore was raised.
 - i. The covenants specifically prohibiting inoperative or unregistered cars and equipment on lots was mentioned.
 - ii. It was pointed out one of the cars was made in 1917, making it an antique.
 - iii. Old and antique cars, tractors and mining equipment are used as lawn ornaments or lawn art has not been considered.
 - iv. Numerous lots have old, likely unregistered, cars and the covenant is not being enforced.

- v. Enforcement of covenants on eyesores has been attempted by the Board in the past, with not having the money to address the issue being a common reply, which as stopped Board action.

A concern of uniform enforcement of Covenants was expressed. The major elements were enforcing selective Covenants or enforcing all Covenants. Landowners and the Committee recognized the need for the Board to become active in enforcement issues and to work with Landowners to set priorities and develop enforcement mechanisms.