

GLFPC Summary/Interpretation

of GLA Project Review Committee Meeting Monday February 29, 2016

As a volunteer service by GLFPC, this meeting summary/interpretation is being distributed to the GLA Board and Association. Your suggestions are welcome should there be oversights or errors.

GLA's Project Review Committee held a meeting Monday February 29, 2016 at Liberty Hall at 7 pm to review Project Review applications and approvals. While waiting for a quorum, one attendee asked the committee to consider a higher bond to motivate owners to complete their projects. She noted how incomplete projects become eyesores and how, as an example, disturbed land returns to weeds. Construction bond for a 2000 sq. ft. home is currently set at \$220. The committee did not reach a consensus on increasing the construction bonds.

With three committee members finally present, namely Co-Chair Gerald Dubiel, board member Ed Dobrowski and landowner Leo Keeler, the committee found no issues of concern in their review of Fitzgerald's request to build a home and a guesthouse on their 7-acre Parcel 28E SG. In particular, it was noted that the applicant's plan is to use modular construction for the main dwelling and guesthouse, and that their private driveway plans conform to the GLA standards.

Similarly, the committee found no issues with plans to build a 20 x 14 foot green house in SG. It would be attached to a garage and not visible from any platted road.

Board action/approval for each application is expected at the next monthly board meeting scheduled for Monday, March 14, 2016.

Asa Ziegler, owner of SG parcel 41-B, which is currently being used as a lumberyard, told the committee that he felt singled out and that he had come to this meeting to find resolution. Ziegler, who has been given GLA approval for a barn structure, stated he does not believe he has broken any rules. He explained how it is stressful when there is so much criticism about his operation.

GLA President Charlotte Mizzi, an attendee at the meeting, noted that Ziegler owns two parcels adjacent to each other; one parcel has a dwelling and one is used for his lumberyard business.

One issue, said Keeler, is that there is a business on a parcel without a dwelling in a community that is primarily designed for residential use. And related to that a barn, by GLA definition, is an accessory building. Thus, a few landowners see the approved barn as problematic because there is no dwelling for it to be an accessory to.

Another is that while businesses are allowed by GLA, they are required to be out of sight, Keeler said. The problem is that the lay of the land for Ziegler's operation makes it visible to neighbors and road traffic, even though Ziegler fenced the entire area.

Ziegler's collection of four or five rusty cars, which are stored on this parcel, was also cited as a problem by one of the attendees. Per the GLA regulations, non-operable cars are eyesores and cannot be stored on a parcel. Ziegler countered that his old cars are actually Montana Yard Art and that it is not uncommon for passers-by to stop and photograph them. Ziegler likened the old cars to old tractors that are commonly displayed as yard art in rural areas.

Ziegler's adjacent neighbor, George Larsen, urged the committee to be more even-handed in their work to enforce GLA rules. He cited the example of a nearby parcel with an abandoned building site, which was leveled, left as raw land and is now full of weeds. Larsen said his effort to keep his property relatively weed-free is hindered by wind-blown weed seeds from this parcel.

Larsen said that Zeigler keeps his property orderly and neat and has been a good neighbor in all ways. To support that, Ziegler said he has the signatures of ten other neighbors who agree with Larsen.

Though the committee reached no consensus on any of the above discussion, it did agree to credit Ziegler's voluntary payment of an assessment fee on his barn for this year to his 2017 assessments. It was noted that while a business does generate traffic and impact GLA roads, just like a dwelling does, at this time GLA only assesses land and dwellings. The committee reasoned that until GLA changes its assessment policy to include business structures, there is no legal way to accept a barn assessment fee.

The meeting adjourned about 8:30 pm.

[Glastonbury Landowners For Positive Change](#)