



Architectural Committee Meeting Minutes – August 6, 2020

BSAC/Staff in Attendance:

Jess Bevilacqua

Using GoTo Meeting:

Brian Wheeler

Suzan Scott

John Gladstein

Trever McSpadden

Grant Hilton

Kate Scott

Maggie Good

Guests:

LeAnne McMahon

Robert Gilbert

Gail Young

Nate Peckinpaugh

Cassandra Elwell

Mike & Nina Rowe

Tom Walker/Jennifer Jones

Joe Schwem

Becky Brockie

Project Attending For:

#04317 McMahon

#04514A Sarracino

#06110A/06111A Young

#02517 Hall

#06171A Rowe

#06171A Rowe

#06171A Rowe

#06114A Vine Hill Partners LLC (VHP)

#07203 MeadowView Condominiums

Due to precautions being taken to prevent the spread of the COVID19, all BSAC members and guests were allowed to join the meeting remotely using GoTo Meeting.

1. Membership Forum - none

2. Call to Order - Brian Wheeler called the meeting to order at 8:01 AM.

3. Meeting Minutes – Maggie Good made a Motion to approve the July 16, 2020 Meeting Minutes. John Gladstein seconded the Motion. The Motion passed unanimously.

4. Minor Alteration Review

BSOA #04317 McMahon Minor Alterations

Legal: Meadow Village Block 3 Lot 17

Street: 3270 Two Moons Road

Staff presented the plans for the McMahon minor alterations application. The application was to extend a small section of the back deck to accommodate a hot tub, and to replace the railing of the deck with a new aluminum deck rail.

Staff noted that an application to approve a separate side deck on the home and add an irrigation system had been approved at the July 16 BSAC meeting. Staff presented a site planning showing the locations of the previously approved and new proposed alterations. Staff noted a request from the applicant to require only one performance deposit for both the application approved in July and current application. Staff recommended the request be approved.

John Gladstein made a Motion to approve the application as submitted noting that only one performance deposit would be required as requested by the applicant. Maggie Good seconded the Motion. The Motion passed unanimously.

A BSAC member asked for clarification on the color of the deck rail system. Staff noted that it is bronze.

BSOA #04514A Sarracino Minor Alterations

Legal: Meadow Village Block 5 Lot 14A

Street: 2135 Little Coyote Road

Staff presented the plans for the Sarracino minor alterations application, represented by Robert Gilbert. Staff noted that although the list of alterations was extensive, each item alone would be a minor alteration and the application did not fit the description of a major alteration.

The interior of the home was being remodeled as well. The intent of the exterior modifications was to repair and replace weathered materials and enhance the western style architecture of the home with additional materials and detail. The proposed exterior modifications included the following: eliminate the north elevation fireplace and chimney, add new siding to include stained wood or synthetic shingles and install stone veneer, replace and add some windows, replace the garage overhead doors, replace the south decks and rail systems, add a new deck and stairs on the north side of the home, add stained wood ornamental knee braces, and replace an existing timber retaining wall.

Staff presented each elevation and the proposed materials, noting that the proposed changes appeared to be a significant improvement for the appearance of the home. Staff recommended the application be approved as submitted.

A BSAC member asked for clarification regarding the material of the railings. Mr. Gilbert explained that it is a material similar to galvanized steel but powder coated with a rough texture in gray to match the rustic appearance of the home.

Maggie Good made a Motion to approve the application as submitted. John Gladstein seconded the Motion. The Motion passed unanimously.

5. Landscape Alteration Review

BSOA #06110A/06111A Young Landscape Alterations

Legal: Cascade Block 2 Lots 110A/111A

Street: 2/TBD White Butte Road

Staff presented the landscape alteration application for two lots owned by Gail Young on White Butte Road. Staff had been asked by Ms. Young and another BSOA member recently if removing and trimming trees on the properties in order to keep the property healthy and mitigate wildfire risk would require BSAC review and approval. The work proposed by Ms. Young included removal of deadfall timber and dead trees, and live tree trimming as needed for fire mitigation. Windswept Wildfire LLC has been contracted to perform the work and has made recommendations in alignment with the Montana Hazardous Fuels Reduction Program.

Staff noted that according to the Cascade Covenants, owners are not allowed to remove or even trim trees without BSAC approval. Staff presented the referenced covenant language and noted its restrictiveness to property owners who are attempting to be proactive in maintaining a healthy tree population and reducing wildfire risk and potential damage. Staff noted that BSOA design regulation language is equally restrictive. Ms. Young added that Windswept Wildfire LLC is a Department of Natural Resources and Conservation-approved company.

Staff noted that while it does not make sense to require approval for this type of work, the covenants and design regulations do not permit staff to make a decision or owners to perform the work without being noncompliant. Staff noted that this had been brought up at the design regulation subcommittee meeting earlier in the week as it seems to be an area that needs to be addressed.

Staff recommended that the BSAC agree that tree and vegetation removal, dead or alive, that is recommended and performed by an approved contractor for fire prevention measures, not require BSAC approval to avoid restricting proactive owners from maintaining the health and safety of their property and surrounding area. Staff asked for feedback from the BSAC regarding how to handle such requests and if they should require BSAC review and approval.

The BSAC agreed to discuss this particular application first. A BSAC member noted that it would be ideal to know how many or what percentage of trees would be removed, and because the application was intended for the purpose of fire suppression, a review fee should not be required. Another BSAC member agreed but noted that the covenants provide guidelines that should be followed.

Grant Hilton made a Motion to approve the application as submitted noting that no review fee would be required. John Gladstein seconded the Motion. The Motion passed unanimously.

A discussion took place regarding how to handle requests to remove trees and vegetation for fire mitigation purposes. It was agreed that although restrictive, the covenants and design regulations requiring review and approval of any tree removal, trimming or landscaping work should be followed. It was noted that staff should have the authority to allow owners to move ahead with fire mitigation work at their own risk if waiting for the next BSAC meeting will cause difficulty in securing a contractor to complete the work, but that the application will still need to be reviewed by staff or the BSAC depending on the scope of work. The BSAC agreed to allow staff to use discretion in approving any smaller scale tree removal projects intended for fire mitigation purposes, but that the application will still need to be reported to the BSAC.

Staff asked for clarification regarding review fees and performance deposits. It was noted that each case will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis to determine if a review fee is appropriate. The BSAC deferred to the decision made at the March 2020 Retreat allowing staff to determine if a performance deposit should be required, and if there is any question, it can be reviewed by the BSAC on a case-by-case basis.

6. SFR Final Plan Review

BSOA #02517 Hall SFR Final Plan

Legal: Aspen Groves Block A Lot 17

Street: TBD Andesite Road

Staff presented the plans for the Hall single family residence final plan application. The sketch plan had been approved on April 2, 2020 with no conditions. Staff noted that a significant amount of changes were made to the home between sketch and final due to the owner's desire to reduce square footage. The changes as noted by project representative Nate Peckinpugh included removing a bedroom wing behind the garage, changing the angle of the great room to be square with the garage, rotating the entry, relocating an exterior stairwell to inside the home, reorganizing the master bedroom wing, removing a roofline over the covered deck, and shifting gables to break up roof ridgelines. The square footage was reduced to 2,161 s.f. on the main level, 720 s.f. for the ADU, and 732 for the garage.

Staff presented each elevation, renderings and a site plan demonstrating the changes made to the home since sketch plan approval. Staff noted that the home is still compliant, and that there aren't clear guidelines for when a project will require a resubmittal of sketch plan before moving on to final. Staff noted that the roofline on the north elevation included two sections of roofline measuring 41' and 24' in length that were broken up by what appeared to be a 1' jog. Staff noted that the design regulations do not state a minimum for what could be considered a design element change relative to a jog in the roofline. Staff presented the revised height calculations.

Staff presented a landscape plan noting that it appeared that the hot tub would be adequately screened and noting paver and stone steps that had been added. Staff presented the lighting plan noting that the proposed wall fixture has a recessed LED bulb, is listed as dark sky compliant, and has been approved previously by the BSAC. Staff presented photos of the proposed finish materials.

Staff referenced a letter that had been received recently from the owners of the home, Scott Hall and Anna Shipley, explaining their reasons for reducing the size and footprint of the home which would also reduce site impact and grading. Mr. Peckinpugh noted that the owners chose to reduce the budget of the home by reducing square footage while maintaining the character and quality of finish materials.

John Gladstein made a Motion to approve the application as submitted. Maggie Good seconded the Motion. The Motion passed unanimously.

A BSAC member noted that when there is a fair amount of deviation from the original sketch plan at final submittal, the owner submits the final plan assuming some risk that a resubmittal will be required. Staff agreed that there are no clear guidelines outlining changes that require a sketch resubmittal versus a final submittal, and staff typically agrees to present the final application while communicating to the applicant that there is a risk of having to resubmit sketch plan.

7. SFR Sketch Plan Review

BSOA #06171A Rowe SFR Sketch Plan

Legal: Cascade Block 3 Lot 171A

Street: TBD Speaking Eagle Road

Staff presented the plans for the Rowe single family residence sketch plan application, represented by Cassandra Elwell. A variance to move the building envelope for the home was denied on July 16, 2020. The home is a traditional stick frame/trussed roof single family residence with 2,610 s.f. of livable space on the main level, 1,312 s.f. on the upper level and 1,091 s.f. of garage, storage and mechanical space with four bedrooms and 4.5 baths. Finishes would include wire brush stained fir vertical and lap siding, stone masonry, stained timbers and fascia, asphalt and standing seam metal roof and aluminum clad windows. There were several small boulder retaining walls to be broken into 2' and 4' tiers around the east and south sides of the home.

Staff presented a site plan noting that the driveway does not exceed 10% slope and that construction staging would be required for final. Staff presented a rendering and each elevation of the home. Staff presented the height calculations provided by Ms. Elwell that came out to a 28' average using the four point method. Staff recommended the application be approved as submitted.

A BSAC member asked for clarification of an area on the east elevation. Ms. Elwell confirmed that the area in question was a utility closet and that a roof overhang was designed to cover the ski patio on the lower level.

Grant Hilton made a Motion to approve the application as submitted. Maggie Good seconded the Motion. The Motion passed unanimously.

BSOA #06114A VHP West LLC (Lepper) SFR Sketch Plan

Legal: Cascade Block 2 Lot 114A

Street: TBD White Butte Road

Staff presented the plans for the Vine Hill Partners LLC single family residence sketch plan application, represented by Joe Schwem. The home is a two and a half story single family with 1,920 s.f. of livable space on the main level, 1,928 s.f. on the lower level, and 676 s.f. of garage space with four bedrooms and 4.5 baths. Finish materials would include horizontal stained wood siding, trim, and fascia, vertical metal siding, metal roofing and clad windows.

Staff presented a site plan, each elevation, and height calculations. Staff noted the south elevation roofline, which consists of several sections all under 40' in length. There appeared to be a 1' jog in between each section. Staff noted that there is metal siding on the home but that it appears appropriate in proportion to the other siding materials.

A BSAC member asked Mr. Schwem to be considerate in the placement of outdoor lighting that may appear visible from the road.

Maggie Good made a Motion to approve the application as submitted. John Gladstein seconded the Motion. The Motion passed unanimously.

8. Review Fee Waiver (refund) Request

BSOA #07203 MeadowView Condominiums

Legal: Sweetgrass Hills Lot 1A

Street: Arapahoe Trail

Staff presented a request from Laura Seyfang to waive a \$200 review fee paid by the MeadowView Condominiums Owners Association for an alteration to approved plan application that was reviewed by the BSAC on June 4, 2020. Ms. Seyfang had paid the review fee at the time as it was the third alteration to approved plan application for MeadowView Condominiums but later requested a refund of the fee. Becky Brockie attended the call as Ms. Seyfang was unable to attend and noted that she had been told that non-profits were not required to pay review fees. Executive Director Suzan Scott noted that while there is no blanket rule, the BSOA has done this in the past.

Grant Hilton made a Motion to refund the \$200 fee as requested in support of MeadowView as an affordable housing initiative. Kate Scott seconded the Motion. The Motion passed unanimously.

9. Discussion Items:

a) Member Report Tracking Update

Staff provided an update on 2510 Curley Bear Road, the site of a home fire in 2019 that is owned by the Wolfram's and was rented at the time of the fire. Staff has spoken to Jon Epstein and was referred to Matt Haus, Mr. Wolfram's attorney, who would be able to provide an update of the

status of insurance negotiations. Staff is currently working with Matt Haus to provide a timeline for the demolition and next steps with the home. A response is expected this week.

A discussion took place regarding the increased traffic on Little Coyote and Two Moons due to the highway 64 bridge construction. Brian Wheeler noted that the traffic on Little Coyote has increased significantly and has become a major concern. Suzan Scott noted that the BSOA is still trying to modify the county ordinance to put in speed tables but it is a lengthy process. The concerns will be relayed to staff that is currently working on the traffic issues.

b) Performance Deposit Tracking Update

Staff presented the active project/performance deposit list.

c) Subcommittee Update

Staff noted that the design regulation subcommittee had met at length on Tuesday and is making progress. Trevor McSpadden noted that the subcommittee is now trying to meet weekly and is hopeful that the Committee will be able to provide a deliverable for the BSAC by the end of August.

d) Adjourn

Brian Wheeler, Chair

The meeting adjourned at 9:28 AM.

Brian Wheeler, BSAC Chairman