



## Architectural Committee Meeting Minutes – December 17, 2020

### **BSAC/Staff in Attendance:**

Amy San Nicolas  
Suzan Scott

### **Using GoTo Meeting:**

Stacy Ossorio  
Greg Clark  
John Gladstein  
John Seelye  
Gary Walton  
Grant Hilton  
Clay Lorinsky

### **Guests:**

Mariya Provost  
Pam & Paul Boneham  
Bernie Cignavitch  
Grant Jardine  
Nathan Shureb - Electrician  
Toby Zangenberg-Lighting Specialist  
Brian Wheeler  
Eryn Schwehr  
Trevor McSpadden  
Margo Ogburn  
Eric Ossorio

### **Project Attending For:**

#04608  
#04608  
#06545  
#06545  
#06545  
#06545  
#06512A  
#06512A  
#06512A  
#06512A  
#06512A  
#06512A

*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 GoToMeeting.*

1. **Membership Forum** – None.
2. **Call to Order** – The Chair, Gary Walton, called the meeting to order at 9 AM.
3. **Meeting Minutes** – December 3, 2020 Corrections: None.

**Motion made by John Gladstein to approve the December 3, 2020 Meeting Minutes; seconded by Stacy Ossorio. Motion passed unanimously.**

### **4. Major Alteration - Sketch**

BSOA #04608 Boneham

Legal: Meadow Village Block 6 Lot 8A

Street: 2165 Spotted Elk

Staff presented the Boneham Major Alteration sketch application for an art studio attached by an open breezeway. The following information was noted: the addition would be 338 square-feet and would have no dwelling features, lots 8 and 9 were aggregated at one point into one lot called 8A which is why the building envelope goes across what appears to be two lots, the average height of the addition would be approximately sixteen feet, the structure would technically be a detached non-dwelling unit which seemed in contradiction to the Covenants, and Meadow Village Covenants do not provide for variances.

Staff recommended the Committee discuss the applicable Covenant and definition from the Design Regulations prior to approving this application.

The Committee discussed the possibility of the structure being attached to the main house either as an addition or an enclosed breezeway and it was noted that the current house was about 3,000 square-feet. The owner applicant expressed the intention to have an expansion of the existing home that provides for a studio space and asked the Committee to discuss steps to move forward to get an approvable plan. It was noted that the Committee cannot give instruction on design but that the applicant should ensure the studio was adequately attached per the Covenants and Design Regulations before resubmitting.

**Motion made by John Gladstein to reject the application as submitted due to noncompliance with the Covenants; seconded by Grant Hilton. Motion passed unanimously.**

## **5. Alteration to Approved Plan Appeal**

BSOA #06545 Hill Condos

Legal: Cascade Block 1 Lot 5A?

Street: 21 Sitting Bull Rd

The Chair clarified the discussion between residential and commercial that was had at the meeting where the plan was approved. It was noted that this site was a Multi-Family Residential and not a Commercial. Staff presented the Hill Condo owner's appeal of the decision made by the Committee at the December 3, 2020 meeting regarding additional lights required by the State. The appellant listed the following concerns: the lighting plan did not meet the code for a residential property, the lighting plan did not meet amount/location/operation of exterior lighting requirements in the State code, wires may have been left in the exposed wall prior to being sided over by the contractor which would be a fire hazard, and the unappealing aesthetic of the electrical conduit installed on the exterior of the building. Staff reviewed the approved amended lighting plan and noted that the Design Regulations specifically state that BSOA/BSAC is in no way liable for an applicant failing to meet regulations outside of BSOA/BSAC Governing Documents and that the applicant is solely responsible in meeting requirements and obtaining permits from other agencies. In addition, staff noted that there seemed to be an internal disagreement about how many lights and what type within HCOA. It was the general opinion of the Committee and Staff that this was an internal conflict exterior to BSACs role. The appellant asked the HCOA's electrician if it was possible to run the conduit through the crawl space under the buildings and why the original lighting was not reinstalled. It was noted by the HCOA representative and electrician that the conduit example sent by applicant was not a part of this project. The Chair noted that this was not the forum to redesign the lighting plan. The HCOA manager did discuss with solutions electricians for the exterior conduit and determined that the Association could paint it after the fact when weather permits.

Staff recommended the Committee discuss Design Regulation 0.0 before granting an appeal.

**Motion made by Clay Lorinsky to deny the appeal due to a lack of BSAC jurisdiction to inhibit the State's requirements and the inappropriateness of the Committee getting involved in an internal conflict within an HOA; seconded by John Gladstein. Motion passed unanimously.**

**6. Single-Family Condo - TBD**

BSOA #06512A Pinnacle

Legal: Cascade Block 4 Tract 12 Plat 4/537

Street: Highpoint Dr.

Prior to discussing the application details, Staff reviewed the history of the application and requested the Committee discuss proper procedure in classification and fees. Staff noted that \$300 had been paid by the applicant prior to this meeting for a major alteration. In the event the Committee felt this project was still new construction, the applicant requested the \$300 be applied toward the resubmission fee of \$500 for the original new construction application that was rejected. There was discussion of the Procedure Resolution language for application expiration and extensions and of Design Regulation 0.0. The Committee felt this project was definitely not a major alteration as there were units in this plan to be built that did not have preexisting foundations and the project would only be considered as a new construction resubmission.

**Motion made by Grant Hilton to proceed with the application if the applicant is willing to submit an additional \$200 today; seconded by Stacy Ossorio. Motion passed unanimously.**

One of the project representatives expressed reservations for submitting an additional fee and the Committee felt that this resistance to comply with a generous exception to procedure made it unreasonable for the Committee to continue reviewing the application. The Committee asked the applicant to only have one representative speaking for the project in the future so there would be less confusion and that staff adequately labels the application. The applicant wanted to address how the Committee came to the conclusion that the initial approval expired and the Chair stated that without the chance for the Legal Committee to respond to this question, the Committee would not be answering while the applicant's attorney was present.

**Motion made by Clay Lorinsky to table this application until an appropriate fee for a new construction project has been submitted; seconded by John Gladstein. Motion passed unanimously.**

**7. Discussion Items:**

- a. Staff Releases/Approvals: Staff released five performance deposits and approved one light fixture change that was not material and still compliant.
- b. Member Report Tracking Update: There had been no updates to the Member Tracking Report that needed the Committee's attention or discussion
- c. Performance Deposit Tracking Update: Staff presented the active project/performance deposit list.

**8. Adjourn - With nothing further to discuss the meeting adjourned at 10:07 AM.**

